

Attachment 1

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This document contains a summary of each Municipal Program Review. To see the full evaluation of each Municipal Program Review, please refer to Attachment 2.

CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Finance Division Program Review

Accounts Payable

This report assesses opportunities to modernize Accounts Payable (AP) by moving from the current email/SharePoint and paper-dependent workflow to a fully digital invoice intake, approval, and retention process integrated with Business Central. AP processes approximately 1,500 invoices per month with significant overtime, and volumes are expected to increase with organizational growth. A paperless solution is expected to improve processing speed, accuracy, auditability, and transparency while reducing printing, storage, and manual handling.

Three options are considered as part of this review:

- **Option A: Maintain the current AP process (status quo).**
Budget savings: None - continued overtime pressure and higher risk of requiring additional staffing as invoice volumes grow.
- **Option B: Implement a phased paperless AP module/workflow**
Integrated with Business Central.
Budget savings: one-time implementation cost estimated at \$30,000–\$60,000 plus staff time; ongoing annual system cost estimated at \$10,000–\$20,000. Current AP budget is not expected to decrease; however, avoided staffing costs as volumes grow are estimated up to \$105,000 annually, resulting in net cost avoidance of up to \$95,000 per year after implementation.
- **Option C: Implement select digital improvements**
Without a full end-to-end solution (e.g. digital invoice capture, electronic approvals, limited vendor self-service, or process redesign while retaining parts of the current workflow).
Budget savings: None - partial efficiency gains but may not fully eliminate manual entry, printing, and filing, and may not fully avoid future staffing needs.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option B - A phased implementation of the paperless AP module/workflow integrated with Business Central, beginning with a pilot in high-volume departments, followed by organization-wide rollout.

DEVELOPMENT & TOURISM DEPARTMENT

Economic Development Division Program Review

Economic Development Function

The Economic Development Division supports business retention and expansion, investment attraction, workforce development, tourism, rural and agricultural growth, and quality of place, aligned with the County's 2025–2030 Economic Development Strategy. This assessment summarizes the current delivery model, identifies key strengths and risks, and outlines potential service and budget options for Council consideration.

The document outlines the following service delivery options, with budget implications dependent on final staffing and operating decisions:

- **Option A - Reduce or eliminate services/programs:**
Budget savings: \$546,910 - personnel and operating reductions.
The operating items identified total approximately \$165K annually
Potential offsets and broader impacts, including loss/reduction of external funding such as approximately \$40K annually currently provided to SBEC, and wider economic impacts (tourism revenue, business growth, investment, workforce outcomes).
- **Option B - Alternate delivery model** (regional partnership, municipal consortium, or contracted services):
Budget savings: Potential to reduce some in-house operating costs, but may introduce new contract/administration costs and reduce local control and responsiveness; savings are not quantified in the document and depend on the scope of work being contracted and by what service provider.
- **Option C - Targeted productivity enhancements** (e.g., digital service delivery, streamlined grant administration, performance dashboards):
Budget savings: Potential to reduce contracted/operating pressure over time; savings are not quantified in the document and would require a detailed implementation plan.
- **Option D – Additional Revenue Sources**
Budget savings: Additional revenue opportunities through sponsorships and partnerships, cooperative tourism marketing, provincial and federal grants, and potential fee for- service training or workshops to help offset costs while maintaining the Economic Development function. Cost savings could be achieved by reducing operating expenses (approximately \$165K annually) or through -longer term- productivity enhancements
- **Option E – Options C&D Concurrently**

Budget savings: potential savings from targeted rescoping. Maintain a County-led economic development function while pursuing near-term productivity enhancements and external revenue opportunities (e.g., grants, sponsorships, cooperative tourism asset land development and marketed and promoted to external stakeholders and investors) to reduce pressure on the tax levy. If Council requires additional reductions, prioritize a targeted service re-scoping approach over program elimination, and return with a detailed costing model that identifies specific service changes, quantified savings, and associated risks/trade-offs.

- **Option F -Maintain current in-house delivery (status quo):**

Budget savings: None.

Recommendation

For the consideration of Council.

Customer Relationship Management Tool (CRM): Zoho CRM

As part of the Municipal Program Assessment, staff reviewed the Economic Development Client Relationship Management (CRM) tool (Zoho CRM) to confirm ongoing alignment with the County's evolving role and service level, and to identify opportunities to reduce discretionary operating costs. The review found that the CRM provides value when a fully resourced Economic Development function is delivered (e.g., centralized contact management, engagement tracking, surveys/email campaigns, and reporting). However, if Economic Development services are reduced or scaled back at the County level, the advanced CRM functionality is no longer required and can be replaced with basic corporate tools for limited record-keeping needs.

Three options have been evaluated as part of this review:

- **Option 1 – Maintain Zoho CRM (status quo):**

Continue licensing (4 CRM licenses and 1 Forms license) and staff administration (estimated ~3 hours/week).

No cost savings; retains advanced tracking, automation, surveys/campaigns, and reporting.

- **Option 2 – Transition to basic corporate tools:**

Discontinue CRM-supported advanced functions and use lower-cost tools (e.g., shared databases/spreadsheets/Outlook) for basic contact management where required.

Expected savings include \$4,000/year in licensing plus approximately \$11,750/year in reduced staff administration time, with reduced ability to track detailed Economic Development KPIs.

- **Option 3 – Eliminate Zoho CRM:**

Export and archive data, then cancel/non-renew licenses. Expected savings include \$4,000/year in licensing plus approximately \$11,750/year in reduced staff administration time (as estimated in the review). This option removes the CRM platform and associated workflows, and reduces capacity for centralized engagement history and reporting should the service expand in future.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option 3 (eliminate Zoho CRM) to align discretionary systems with a reduced Economic Development mandate and to realize ongoing operating savings. Prior to shutdown, staff should export and securely archive all CRM data and key reports, document core data fields/workflows for future reference, and transition any remaining contact management requirements to basic corporate tools to ensure continuity of records.

Building Services Program Review

AI Supported Prosecution Process

The Prosecution Process within the Development and Tourism, Building Services Division supports enforcement of the *Building Code Act, 1992* by ensuring that Building Code violations are prosecuted in a fair, transparent, and legally defensible manner. A core component of this process is the preparation of comprehensive disclosure packages and a chronological synopsis of events, which are required under the *Provincial Offences Act* to meet disclosure obligations and support successful prosecutions.

Under the current manual preparation model, prosecution packages are assembled entirely by Building Inspectors, with oversight by the Chief Building Official (CBO). While there are minimal out-of-pocket expenses, the true cost of the program is driven by staff time, overtime, and opportunity cost.

Two options were reviewed in this assessment:

- **Option A — Maintain current manual process (status quo)**

The 2025 overtime impact (\$3,457.81) as the likely ongoing pressure.
Budget savings: None

- **Option B — Implement AI-supported process (Microsoft Copilot)**

Budget savings: \$3,457.81/year (based on 2025 overtime, assuming similar volumes)
Time savings: ~100 staff hours/year (~83%) (from ~120 hours to ~20 hours annually at ~10 files/year)

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option B to implement an AI-supported prosecution brief preparation process using Microsoft Copilot to reduce staff time and overtime costs while maintaining legislative compliance and oversight.

Hurricane Clip Rebate Program

The Hurricane Clip Rebate Program is a discretionary initiative administered by Building Services to encourage the voluntary installation of hurricane clips in residential construction. While the program has seen participation, it is not legislated, not aligned with a Council approved strategic plan, and its performance is measured by activity rather than demonstrated- outcomes. Program costs are unpredictable and have exceeded the approved annual budget in multiple years, driven by fluctuating construction activity and significant administrative effort.

This report provides an assessment of two program options:

- **Option A - Eliminate the Hurricane Clip Rebate Program**
Remove the discretionary rebate program entirely. The program is not legislated, not tied to a Council approved strategic plan, and is resource- intensive- relative to its benefits. Regulatory building inspection and compliance services would continue unchanged, with staff time redirected to core Building Code Act responsibilities.
Budget Savings: \$11,000–\$22,000 annually; \$55,000–\$110,000 over five years
- **Option B – Maintain the Hurricane Clip Rebate Program (Status Quo)**
Budget Savings: None

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Museum of Dufferin Program Review**Archives Program**

This review assesses the County of Dufferin Archives program (Museum of Dufferin) with a focus on service sustainability, modernization opportunities, and budget pressures. The Archives continue to play a key role in preserving and providing access to municipal and community records; however, demand for staff-supported research services has declined in recent years (83 research requests in 2025).

Three options are presented as part of this review:

- **Option A - Maintain current service model (status quo).**
Continue current levels of in-person and staff-supported research services; no service elimination is proposed at this time.
Budget savings: None identified (ongoing cost pressures remain).
- **Option B - Remove Archivist, Assistant Curator, and Archive Student Role and create Collections Specialist Role.**
Combine archive services and collections management into one role to reduce staffing costs while maintaining core preservation and access functions.
Budget savings: Up to \$92,450 annually (primarily through removal of one permanent FT position, one permanent PT position, and a summer student position, as detailed in the budget section).
- **Option C: Implement productivity enhancements through technology (portal migration).**
Complete the migration from the legacy Dufferin Archives portal to Past Perfect and Our Digital World to improve digital access and reduce reliance on the legacy system.
Budget savings: \$10,000 annually in hosting costs, expected after implementation (target completion: end of April 2026).

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option C – the technology migration as planned to capture the near-term \$10,000 savings while protecting public access and data integrity. In parallel, advance planning for the archives/collections consolidation to realize up to \$92,450 in annual savings, with mitigations to manage service impacts (e.g., cross-training, appointment-based research support, prioritization of municipal records needs, and clear communication of revised service levels). Monitor research response times, service usage, and stakeholder feedback during the first year and adjust workflows as required.

Museum of Dufferin Dissolution

This review assesses the Museum of Dufferin’s service delivery and financial footprint, with a focus on options to address budget constraints while considering operational, legal, and community impacts. The analysis highlights that the museum delivers measurable community value (education, tourism, heritage preservation and outreach) and has recently improved performance (attendance, revenues and external funding). Options were evaluated based on net financial impact (including foregone revenues and funding), feasibility, risk, and alignment with County strategic priorities.

- **Option A – Dissolve/close the Museum of Dufferin (cease operations)**

Budget savings: \$1,342,575/year through elimination of personnel and operating costs. Key considerations: While this option reduces the ongoing operating budget, it does not reflect significant short- and long-term dissolution costs (e.g., staff time for cataloguing, deaccessioning, transportation, storage, and disposal of 48,000+ artefacts and heritage structures) and would likely reduce near-term savings. It would also result in the loss of grants, donations, earned revenues (programming, rentals, retail), and endowment interest dedicated to museum operations, along with substantial reputational, legal/compliance, and community impact risks.

- **Option B – Maintain operations and mitigate fiscal pressure through revenue growth and service optimization**

Budget savings: partial offset/revenue potential.

Estimated annual offset/revenue potential: partial offset through expanded rentals and commercial filming, continued fundraising growth, and endowment interest of ~3–4% on \$750,000 annually (net of management fees).

Key considerations: This option preserves core community benefits and avoids the irreversible impacts of collection dispersal. It also maintains eligibility for external grants and the ability to generate earned revenues, while allowing Council/Staff to pursue targeted operating adjustments, partnership opportunities, and a transparent engagement process to guide any future service-level decisions.

Please keep in mind the above dollar figure is an estimated value based on past records of grants received and potential for fundraising and sponsorship.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option B as the preferred path at this time. Although Option A presents an estimated \$1.3M in annual operating savings, the review identifies substantial unquantified dissolution costs, loss of external funding and earned revenues, and significant reputational/legal risks that could materially reduce net savings while creating permanent cultural and service impacts. Maintaining operations while strengthening revenue generation and optimization efforts provides a more balanced approach that preserves community value and keeps future decisions evidence-based and reversible.

Programming & Outreach Coordinator Positions

This assessment reviews the Museum of Dufferin’s Programming & Outreach Coordinator positions and their role in delivering public programs, camps, school programming, tours, and outreach activities that support the Museum’s Strategic Plan and County objectives related to tourism and community engagement.

Three options are presented in this review:

- **Option A - Maintain two (2) Programming & Outreach Coordinator positions (status quo)**

Budget savings: None

Summary of impact: Preserves current service levels, capacity to deliver approximately 80+ programs annually plus events, camps, school programming, group tours, and outreach. Maintains alignment with the Museum's Strategic Plan, sustains the recent growth trajectory in attendance and earned revenue, and retains cross-coverage to reduce cancellations due to illness, emergencies, or vacation coverage.

- **Option B - Reduce from two (2) Programming & Outreach Coordinator positions to one (1) Programming & Outreach Coordinator position**

Budget savings: \$99,100 annually (salary and benefits less lost revenue).

Summary of impact: Would require a significant reduction in services (estimated 50–60% reduction in annual programs/workshops, reduced school and tour capacity, and camps reduced from 6 weeks (planned 8) to a maximum of 4 weeks). An estimated \$30,000+ annual loss in direct program revenue (with additional indirect losses across admissions and ancillary sales), and a projected decline in overall attendance (estimated 30–40%), potentially returning to approximately 3,500–4,500 visitors annually. This option reduces resiliency (no cross-coverage), increases burnout/turnover risk, and creates misalignment with the Museum's Strategic Plan growth objectives.

- **Option C: Reduce Programming & Outreach Coordinator position from (2) to (1) and increase use of contracted instructors for select programs (alternate delivery method)**

Budget savings: None expected. Contracted delivery typically increases per-program costs (fees plus preparation time and materials) and would likely require a reduction in programming volume. To maintain the same number of workshops per year that we currently offer with two (2) Programming & Outreach Coordinators, we would need to spend approx. \$32,000 on contracted instructors.

Summary of impact: May support delivery of some specialty programming; however, it does not replace the planning, coordination, marketing, logistics, and on-site delivery functions performed by Programming & Outreach Coordinator's. It also does not factor in the other forms of programming that we deliver, such as tours, school bookings, and off-site programming. If used as a substitute for staffing, the likely outcome is increased costs, fewer programs, reduced attendance, and reduced earned revenue.

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Community Support Services Program Review

Seniors At Risk Coordinator Position

The Seniors at Risk Coordinator position was established to provide a centralized point of contact and system navigation support for vulnerable seniors with complex health and social needs, addressing service gaps and improving coordination across providers. While the role aligns with County strategic priorities and has demonstrated historical demand, implementation challenges have left the position vacant since 2023.

Three options were explored through this review:

- **Option A – Proceed with Mid-Year Recruitment in 2026**

Recruit and fill the Seniors at Risk Coordinator position mid-year in 2026, aligning with the recommendations of the Older Adult Services Review.

Budget Impact: Cost (2026) - \$72,900. One-time Budgetary Savings (2026): \$67,200

- **Option B – Defer Implementation to 2027**

Do not proceed in 2026; move the position to the 2027–2028 budget year while exploring potential funding to offset costs.

Budget Impact in 2027: \$134,400 annually

Budget Savings (2026): \$141,400 (one time)

- **Option C – Do Not Move Forward with the Position**

Permanently discontinue the Seniors at Risk Coordinator position and maintain the current service model.

Budget Impact: Avoids all future staffing and operating costs.

Budget Savings: \$141,000

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option A because the Seniors at Risk Coordinator role directly addresses identified service gaps for vulnerable seniors by providing a centralized point of contact, system navigation, and coordination across health and social service providers. The report notes that the position aligns with County strategic priorities and the recommendations of the Older Adult Services Review, and that historical data shows consistent demand for this support. Proceeding mid-year allows the County to re-establish dedicated accountability and advocacy for seniors at risk, rather than continuing to rely on already-stretched community partners to absorb these responsibilities.

Ontario Works Program Review

Shelburne Employment Resource Centre

As part of the Program Review, the Shelburne Employment Resource Centre (SERC) could be considered for elimination due to provincial Employment Services Transformation, which shifted all employment programming to Employment Ontario providers. Eliminating SERC would generate operational cost savings (approximately \$113,900 annually) while maintaining access to employment supports through the HART Hub and allowing Ontario Works to refocus on life stabilization, navigation, and program integrity.

One option is under consideration in this review:

- **Option A – Eliminate the Shelburne Employment Resource Centre (SERC)**
Discontinue the Shelburne ERC due to the provincial Employment Services Transformation (employment services now delivered through Employment Ontario/Serco). Redirect employment-related needs to the HART Hub; Ontario Works refocuses on stabilization, navigation, and program integrity.
Budget Savings: \$113,900

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option A: eliminate/close the Shelburne Employment Resource Centre (SERC) to realize \$113,900 in annual savings while maintaining access via the HART Hub.

OFFICE OF THE CAO DEPARTMENT

Communications Division Program Review

Communications Process Review

The County remains committed to improving its communications and engagement to inform residents, stakeholders and staff and foster two-way relationships that positively impact the community and influence decision-making.

Three options are explored in this review:

- **Option A: Maintain the current service delivery model with efficiency improvements**

Implement an organization-wide communications support request intake process to enable earlier planning, clearer prioritization, and better workload/resource allocation. Budget savings: None identified (primarily time/capacity benefits).

- **Option B: Consolidate and streamline communications-related software and subscriptions**

Example: social media management, design, and newsletter tools, to reduce duplication across the organization.

Budget savings: approximately \$3,800 in operating costs.

- **Option C: Require Council support/approval before initiating large-scale community engagement projects**

Ensure alignment with priorities and avoid investing staff time and engagement budgets in initiatives without full buy-in.

Budget savings: Avoidance of potential future spend and more efficient use of existing resources.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Options A, B and C. As Communications does not have its own budget, staff propose prioritizing communications processes to improve strategy and make the best use of resources/staff time, consolidating subscriptions and software and ensuring all community engagement projects are supported/approved by Council to ensure best use of budget and staff resources.

Emergency Management Division Program Review

Outreach Programs

This report reviews two components of the Emergency Management Outreach Programs - public preparedness outreach activities and the internal staff alerting platform (Alertable) - to identify efficiencies that modernize delivery while maintaining legislative compliance. The recommended direction is to refocus outreach on higher-impact, community-wide engagement and standardized/digital messaging, and to discontinue the underutilized Alertable platform. Combined, the changes are expected to provide approximately \$6,400 in annual budget savings (estimate; to be confirmed) while shifting some support work to existing Corporate Communications and IT resources.

Three options were explored in this review:

- **Option A - Discontinue Alertable**

Alertable - Internal emergency alerting platform is at contract renewal
Move towards relying on existing internal notification methods (e.g., email, Microsoft Teams, call-out lists, EOC procedures) and external alerting systems for awareness.
Budget savings: \$8,400/year - \$4,000 in operating costs plus \$4,400 in staff time that could be reallocated.

- **Option B - Scale and refocus public preparedness outreach**

Refocus by reducing participation in lower-impact in-person events and shifting toward standardized provincial campaigns, digital/self-serve resources, and centrally supported messaging.
Budget savings: \$3,900/year - \$2,400 in promotional materials plus \$1,500 in staff time that could be reallocated.

- **Option C - Implement both Option A and Option B**

Move forward as an integrated efficiency package.
Budget savings: \$12,300/year with additional staff time capacity potentially available for reallocation.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option C - Implement both Option A and Option B by discontinuing the Alertable platform at contract renewal and scaling/refocusing public preparedness outreach toward higher-impact community engagement and standardized/digital messaging, for estimated savings of approximately \$12,300 per year.

Clerks Division Program Review

Bill Hill Scholarship Program

The Bill Hill Scholarship Program is a discretionary recognition initiative administered by the Clerks Division, providing one-time financial awards to Dufferin County students pursuing post-secondary education. While the program generates positive community goodwill, it is not mandated, has limited measurable outcomes, and requires administrative effort disproportionate to its scale.

Three options have been evaluated as part of the County's broader review of discretionary services:

- **Option A – Eliminate the Program:**
Ends a non-essential initiative, producing modest savings and reducing staff workload, but may create perception concerns related to reduced youth support.
Budget savings: \$22,000
- **Option B – School-Nomination Model:**
Retains the scholarship while improving fairness, integrity, and workload management through educator-validated nominations and standardized criteria.
Budget savings: None, with reduction to staff time.
- **Option C – Transfer Administration to the Dufferin Community Foundation (DCF):**
Shifts program delivery to a community-based organization experienced in administering bursaries and donor-advised funds, enhancing sustainability and process integrity while reducing internal administrative burden.
Budget savings: None, with reduction to staff time.

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Dufferin County Community Grant Program

The Dufferin County Community Grant Program is a discretionary initiative that provides financial support to not-for-profit- and charitable organizations advancing County priorities, including community wellbeing, equity, food security, arts and culture, youth programming, and environmental initiatives.

It should be noted that the Food for Thought Grant Program (FFTG) was not included in this review. The FFTG program provides direct funding (\$98,000) to the County's three local food banks (Orangeville - \$70,000, Dufferin Food Share - \$14,000 and Shepherd's Cupboard-\$14,000) and operates with minimal administrative requirements. Due to its streamlined

delivery model and well-documented, high community benefit in addressing food insecurity, the program was considered out of scope for this assessment and remains distinct from the broader Community Grant Program review.

Three delivery options were evaluated:

- **Option A - Maintain the status quo**
Preserving established processes but continuing staff workload and reliance on HCIA.
Budget savings: None
- **Option B - Transition administration to the Dufferin Community Foundation**
Potentially increasing philanthropic alignment but with unknown costs and transition risks.
Budget savings: None, possible reduction in staff time
- **Option C - Eliminate the program**
Delivering financial savings but resulting in significant community and reputational impacts, particularly for grassroots and equity deserving groups.
Budget savings: \$157,500 total (\$140,000 grant envelope + \$17,500 HCIA administration) with County staff time savings

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

PEOPLE & EQUITY DEPARTMENT

People & Equity Administration Program Review

Human Rights Program

The Human Rights Function supports a safe, respectful, and legally compliant workplace by managing workplace discrimination and harassment complaints in accordance with the *Ontario Human Rights Code* and the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*. Delivered through an internal, centralized model within the People and Equity Department, the program provides intake, triage, investigation, case management, training, and policy support related to respectful workplace and human rights matters. The function was established following Council's approval of the Equity Strategic Plan and is informed by findings from the 2022 Equity Audit and subsequent staff engagement surveys.

Three options were considered in this review:

- **Option A – Maintain the Human Rights Function**
This option maintains the current in-house delivery model, with a dedicated Human Rights and Respect in the Workplace Investigator responsible for intake, investigations, early resolution, training, and legislative compliance.
Budget Savings: None
- **Option B – Eliminate the In-House Function and Outsource Investigations**
Under this option, the internal Human Rights position would be eliminated and investigations would be conducted by external third-party investigators as required. This approach is commonly used by many organizations and can provide independence and expertise, particularly in complex or senior-level cases.
Budget savings: \$138,200/year in staffing costs.
However, investigation costs would become variable and unpredictable, with third-party investigations typically ranging from \$20,000–\$30,000 per case, resulting in potential annual costs significantly exceeding current expenditures depending on volume.
- **Option C – Eliminate the Function and Distribute Investigations Internally**
This option would eliminate the dedicated Human Rights role and distribute investigation responsibilities to managers or Human Resources staff as an "off-the-side-of-the-desk" function.
Budget savings: \$138,200/year in staffing costs.
This option introduces operational, legal, and reputational risks associated with inconsistent investigative quality, delays in meeting legislative timelines, conflicts of interest, and reduced procedural fairness.

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Human Resource Information System (HRIS) Implementation Program

The Human Resource Information System (HRIS) Implementation Program supports the modernization of the County’s people management functions through the deployment of UKG Pro, an integrated, enterprise-grade HRIS. Delivered in partnership by People and Equity, Information Technology, and Finance, the program centralizes employee data and automates core processes including recruitment, onboarding, payroll, time and attendance, benefits administration, and reporting. The system replaces fragmented legacy tools and manual processes, strengthens data governance and privacy controls, and enables employee and manager self-service across the organization.

Two options were considered in this review:

- **Option A – Eliminate the HRIS Program**

Under this option, the UKG Pro system would be discontinued with no immediate replacement. HR, payroll, and workforce management functions would revert to manual, decentralized, or legacy processes managed across departments.

Budget savings: approximately \$183,000, consisting of \$141,000 in UKG Pro licensing costs and \$42,000 in UKG Payroll costs.

However, this option would introduce significant operational, compliance, financial, and reputational risks, including increased payroll error risk, loss of audit trails and controls, greater staff workload, reduced data accuracy, and diminished employee self-service.

- **Option B – Maintain the HRIS Program**

This option maintains the current HRIS delivery model using UKG Pro as the County’s centralized system of record for employee, payroll, and workforce data.

Budget savings: None.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option B – Maintain the HRIS Program. While eliminating the HRIS would generate identifiable short-term cost savings, those savings are outweighed by the operational inefficiencies, staffing pressures, and compliance risks associated with reverting to manual and decentralized processes. The HRIS provides critical infrastructure that supports payroll accuracy, legislative compliance, internal controls, workforce analytics, and employee experience. Given the County’s strategic priorities related to digital service modernization, financial stewardship, and being an inclusive and supportive Employer of Choice, maintaining the HRIS represents the most effective and fiscally responsible approach over the medium to long term.

Staff Recognition Events

The Corporate Recognition Program supports employee engagement, morale, and organizational culture by formally acknowledging staff contributions through Long Service and Retiree Awards, the annual Staff Appreciation Event, and the CAICC Awards. Delivered directly by the People and Equity Department with collaboration across multiple divisions, the program reinforces the County's commitment to being an inclusive and equitable Employer of Choice and aligns with strategic priorities related to employee experience, belonging, and wellness.

Three options were considered in this review:

- **Option A – Eliminate All Staff Recognition Programs**

Under this option, the Long Service and Retiree Awards, Staff Appreciation Event, and CAICC Awards would be discontinued.

Budget savings: \$39,600 in operating costs, plus associated staff time.

- **Option B – Eliminate One Staff Recognition Program**

This option would retain two programs while discontinuing one, resulting in partial cost and staff time savings depending on which program is removed.

Budget savings: \$3,600 to \$18,000 in operating costs, plus 52 to 282 hours of staff time.

- **Option C – Maintain Staff Recognition Programs with Operational Efficiencies**

This option maintains all existing recognition programs while achieving savings through 5–7% operational efficiencies across the overall budget.

Budget savings: \$1,980 to \$2,772, with no reduction in programming.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option C – Maintain Staff Recognition Programs with Operational Efficiencies. While eliminating recognition programs would generate higher short-term savings, the risks to employee engagement, morale, retention, and workplace culture outweigh the financial benefits. The Corporate Recognition Program contributes to measurable improvements in employee experience and supports strategic equity and organizational goals at a relatively modest cost. Maintaining the program while identifying targeted efficiencies elsewhere provides a balanced approach that preserves organizational health, minimizes risk, and maintains the County's commitment to valuing and recognizing its workforce.

Health & Safety Program Review

Health & Safety Program

The Health and Safety Program ensures the County's compliance with Ontario's *Occupational Health and Safety Act* (OHSA) by supporting a safe work environment through training, policy development, hazard identification, and active participation in the Internal Responsibility System. Delivered through a centralized internal model led by a dedicated Health and Safety Advisor, the program provides direct support to all County departments, Joint Health and Safety Committees, and two member municipalities (East Garafraxa and Melancthon). The program plays a critical role in managing legal risk, sustaining a strong safety culture, and demonstrating due diligence as required under provincial legislation.

Two options were considered in this review:

- **Option A – Eliminate the Internal Health and Safety Program and Outsource Services**

Under this option, the County would transition from an internally managed Health and Safety Program to a fully outsourced service delivery model provided by an external contractor.

Budget savings: None. Savings in staff and employee costs would be offset by the costs of a fully outsourced health and safety program which ranges from \$130,000 to \$160,000 annually, and this option introduces increased operational, legal, and reputational risks, including reduced internal oversight and challenges demonstrating due diligence under the OHSA.

- **Option B – Maintain the Internal Health and Safety Program**

This option retains the current internal delivery model, preserving dedicated in-house expertise, embedded operational knowledge, and direct oversight of health and safety responsibilities.

Budget savings: None

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option B – Maintain the Internal Health and Safety Program. While outsourcing may offer perceived short-term financial savings, these are offset by increased risk exposure, reduced responsiveness, and weakened alignment with the Internal Responsibility System required under the OHSA. Retaining the internal program supports strong governance, regulatory compliance, and a proactive safety culture, while enabling the County to demonstrate due diligence and maintain direct control over worker health and safety outcomes. Given the non-delegable legal responsibilities placed on the employer, the benefits of maintaining internal capacity significantly outweigh the limited and uncertain savings associated with outsourcing.

Learning & Organizational Development Program Review

Leadership Development Series

The Leadership Development Series supports the effectiveness and capability of the County's leadership team by providing targeted, externally facilitated learning opportunities focused on core leadership competencies such as people leadership, communication, conflict management, and leading change. Delivered through two to three in-person workshops or keynotes annually—typically as part of Manager Town Halls, the series strengthens leadership confidence, builds cohesion, and supports a positive and inclusive workplace culture aligned with the County's Corporate Strategic Plan and Equity Strategic Plan.

Three options were considered in this review:

- **Option A – Maintain the Leadership Development Series**

This option maintains the current structure of the Leadership Development Series, with two to three externally facilitated, in-person sessions delivered annually by subject matter experts.

Budget savings: None

- **Option B – Reduce the Leadership Development Series**

Under this option, the series would be scaled back to one externally facilitated session per year, supplemented by internally developed resources and self-directed learning.

Budget savings: \$6,000

- **Option C – Eliminate the Leadership Development Series**

This option would discontinue all externally facilitated leadership development sessions, relying solely on internal resources and self-directed learning to support leadership development.

Budget savings: approximately \$12,000 in operating costs, plus reduced staff time associated with planning and coordination.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option A – Maintain the Leadership Development Series as currently structured. While reduction or elimination of the series would result in modest cost savings, maintaining the full program provides greater long-term value by strengthening leadership effectiveness, supporting employee engagement and retention, and advancing strategic objectives related to equity, inclusion, and organizational performance. Feedback from participants demonstrates that externally facilitated, in-person leadership development is highly valued and contributes to recent improvements in leadership behaviours. Given the relatively low cost of the program and its strong alignment with the County's Leadership Strategy and Employer of Choice goals, the benefits of maintaining the current structure outweigh the limited financial savings that would be achieved through scaling back or eliminating the program.

Equity Program Review

Equity Programming

The Equity Strategic Plan is the County of Dufferin's first comprehensive, multi-year framework for advancing inclusion, diversity, equity, and accessibility across the organization. Delivered through the Equity Division within the People and Equity Department, the program supports legislative responsibilities under the *Ontario Human Rights Code* and the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)*, while also advancing the County's Corporate Strategic Plan objective of being an inclusive, equitable, and supportive Employer of Choice. Since implementation, the program has contributed to measurable improvements in staff engagement, inclusion, belonging, and workplace culture.

Three options were considered in this review:

- **Option A – Eliminate the Equity Strategic Plan and Equity Division**

Under this option, the Equity Strategic Plan and centralized equity function would be eliminated, with responsibility for equity-related work decentralized across departments. Budget savings: approximately \$396,100/year, including staff positions and operating budgets.

This option presents significant risks related to legislative compliance, reputational harm, increased exposure to human rights complaints, erosion of workplace culture, and loss of accountability for systemic equity work.

- **Option B – Reduce Equity Programming and Services**

This option maintains the Equity Strategic Plan but reduces delivery capacity through continued vacancy or elimination of the Equity Advisor role, resulting in slower implementation of planned initiatives.

Budget savings: approximately \$125,000/year.

While preserving alignment with strategic and legislative obligations, this option slows progress, reduces organizational support, and increases pressure on other departments to assume equity responsibilities without centralized coordination.

- **Option C – Maintain the Equity Strategic Plan and Current Equity Programming**

This option maintains the current equity framework, staffing structure, and programming model to continue implementation of the Equity Strategic Plan as approved by Council.

Budget savings: None

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Climate & Energy Division Program Review

Community Facing Engagement

The Climate & Energy Community Communications and Engagement Program delivers approximately 20 annual events and campaigns to raise awareness of climate risks, energy efficiency, and household resilience. While it supports County climate goals, the program is resource-intensive, and outcomes are largely long-term and difficult to quantify.

A streamlined program would focus on targeted, high-impact campaigns aligned with core County programs, supported by digital outreach, partnerships, and integrated communications, with fewer in-person events.

This approach would achieve approximately \$20,000 in annual operating savings, increasing to \$30,000 if the Climate Intern student position is eliminated. Full program elimination would yield approximately \$48,000 annually but is not recommended given the increasing need for strategic engagement and communications capacity.

Two options were explored in this review:

- **Option A – Streamline the program and eliminate the Climate Intern Position:** Retain the Climate Engagement Specialist while reducing the breadth of community engagement and strategically reallocate hours to municipal capacity building. Budget savings: approximately \$30,000 per year.
- **Option B – Eliminate the program:** Discontinue the Climate & Energy Community Communications and Engagement Program. Budget savings: approximately \$48,000 per year.
Note: The report does not recommend full elimination given the increasing need for strategic engagement and communications capacity.

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Experimental Acres Program

The Experimental Acres Program supports farmer-led trials of innovative agricultural practices that improve soil health, enhance climate resilience, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Delivered through a contract with Grey Agricultural Services, the program provides small grants and technical guidance for local farmers to test new practices and share results with the broader agricultural community.

Two options were considered in this review:

- **Option A – Eliminate the Experimental Acres Program**

Under this option, the program would be discontinued.

Budget savings: \$10,000 in operating costs and approximately \$1,374 in staff time that could be reallocated.

- **Option B – Maintain the Experimental Acres Program**

This option maintains the current delivery model through Grey Agricultural Services, with opportunities for minor refinements such as enhanced knowledge-sharing, stronger partnerships, and pursuit of external funding.

Budget savings: None

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Rural Water Quality Program

The Rural Water Quality Program is a cost-effective, partnership-based initiative that delivers measurable environmental outcomes by leveraging County funding to support rural landowners in implementing water protection projects.

Two options were reviewed as part of this assessment:

- **Option A – Retain Program (Status Quo)**

In 2025 alone, \$65,619 in grants supported over \$219,000 in total project value, demonstrating strong return on investment and alignment with County climate, watershed, and infrastructure risk reduction goals.

Budget Savings: None

- **Option B - Reducing or eliminating services/programs**

Includes a review of reducing annual grant allocations, limiting eligible project types, pausing program intake and eliminating the program.

Budget Savings: \$60,000 in annual savings for full elimination; and short term or variable for partial reductions

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Youth Climate Activation Circle (YCAC)

The Youth Climate Activation Circle (YCAC) is a volunteer leadership program that empowers Dufferin youth (ages 16–25) to design and implement community climate action projects aligned with the Dufferin Climate Action Plan. The program builds climate literacy, leadership

skills, and civic engagement while supporting community awareness of climate solutions.

Three options were explored in this assessment:

- **Option A – Continue the Program**

Annual program costs: \$10,000 in operating expenses, \$5,300 for a part-time program assistant, and approximately \$13,100 in staff time.

Delivers ongoing climate engagement, youth leadership development, and community outreach that supports County climate priorities.

Budget savings: None

- **Option B – Eliminate the Program**

Would result in reduced youth engagement in climate action and loss of leadership development opportunities.

Budget savings: approximately \$15,300 annually, plus staff time redeployment.

- **Option C – Contract Delivery to a Third Party**

Based on comparable coordination rates and overhead, external delivery is estimated to cost \$45,000–\$60,000 annually, significantly higher than the current model.

Budget savings: Increased annual costs compared to current delivery; no savings identified.

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

County Forest Program Review

County Forest Partial Delivery Model

An evaluation of potential cost-saving measures related to winter snowplowing and portable toilet services at the DCF Main Tract, and to assess their financial, operational, environmental, and public-use impacts.

The Forestry Division currently provides:

- Main Tract north parking lot snowplowing (\$13,200 annually)
- Two portable toilet rentals (one year-round, one seasonal) (\$3,500 annually)
- Total annual cost for these services is \$16,700.

This review includes five options:

- **Option A – Maintain Existing Services (Status Quo)**

- Maintains year-round public access and winter recreation.
- Provides essential sanitation for daily users and organized events.
- Supports may multi-day equestrian camping events annually.
- Prevents environmental degradation from unmanaged human waste.

- Aligns with documented year-round use and County strategic priorities.
- Overall value: High

Budget Savings: None

- **Option B – Eliminate Portable Toilets Only.**

- Loss of public restroom access at a high-use site.
- Increased environmental and public health risks.
- Reduced accessibility for seniors, families, and organized user groups.
- Cost transfer to user groups (event-based rentals are more expensive).
- Overall Value: Low

Budget Savings: \$3,500

- **Option C – Eliminate Snowplowing Only.**

- Loss of winter parking access and reduced winter recreation use.
- Conflicts with confirmed year-round demand.
- Snowplowing service is bundled within a County-wide contract, limiting cost-effective alternatives.
- Overall Value: Moderate

Budget Savings: \$13,200

- **Option D – Eliminate Snowplowing & Portable Toilets**

- Converts Main Tract from year-round to limited-season use.
- Significant decline in accessibility, user experience, and site safety.
- Increased sanitation and environmental risks.
- Overall Value: Low

Budget Savings: \$16,700

- **Option E – Event-Based Portable Toilets (User-Paid Model)**

Impacts:

- Higher cumulative costs for user groups.
- No restroom access for general users outside events.
- Equity and partnership concerns.
- Overall Value: Low

Budget Savings: Up to \$3,500 (costs shifted, not eliminated)

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option A – Maintaining Existing Services. Eliminating snowplowing and/or portable toilet services generates modest financial savings while causing disproportionately negative impacts on accessibility, environmental protection, user experience, and community relationships. Maintaining existing services at the DCF Main Tract offers the highest overall value, preserves year-round public access, and protects the County’s investment in its flagship forest and trail infrastructure.

County Forest Revenues & Private Sponsorships

The Forest Division's financial model remains heavily reliant on timber sales as its primary and most reliable revenue source, generating \$134,934 in total actual revenue in 2025 against \$383,000 in operating expenditures, reinforcing that revenues are intended to partially offset costs rather than fully recover them. While non-timber revenues such as forest user permits, land-use agreements, and invasive species grants provide useful operational support, they remain modest in scale and do not significantly reduce dependency on harvesting activities. Legislative constraints further limit opportunities for revenue diversification beyond forestry-aligned and cost-recovery activities. A cost-benefit analysis of supplementary revenue options confirms that no alternative can meaningfully replace timber revenues; however, select initiatives, particularly grant funding, may deliver incremental benefits when pursued cautiously and in alignment with forestry objectives.

This review includes four additional revenue options:

- **Option A - Additional Grant Funding**

Grant funding offers the strongest alignment with the Forest Division's mandate, supporting initiatives such as invasive species management, trail accessibility, certification compliance, and student employment. While funding is competitive and non-guaranteed, it provides clear program value. The primary limitation is the administrative workload associated with applications, reporting, and financial tracking.

Estimated Revenue Increase: \$5,000–\$15,000 (project-specific)

- **Option B - Limited Onsite Advertising (Main Tract)**

Controlled onsite advertising could provide incremental revenue; however, this option carries aesthetic concerns, public sensitivity, vandalism risk, and ongoing maintenance responsibilities. Financial returns are modest relative to reputational and operational impacts.

Estimated Revenue Increase: \$3,000–\$8,000

- **Option C - Increased User Fees**

User fees are restricted by legislation to cost recovery. Even with substantial increases, revenues would remain limited and may generate public dissatisfaction without producing meaningful financial gains.

Budget savings: Revenue Increase - \$3,000–\$6,000

- **Option D - Communications Infrastructure Leasing**

Leasing land for communications infrastructure presents a potentially higher single-source revenue option but involves significant political, reputational, and approval risks. Historical precedent indicates limited support for this approach, and financial outcomes are not assured.

Budget savings: Revenue Increase - \$5,000–\$10,000

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option A – Additional Grand Funding. The analysis confirms that timber sales will remain the Forest Division’s primary revenue source. Supplementary revenue opportunities can enhance financial resilience and program capacity but only at a modest scale. Grant funding represents the most prudent and strategically aligned option, while other measures offer limited returns and higher risk. A cautious, selective approach to revenue diversification, focused on grants and forestry-compatible partnerships, best supports long-term stewardship objectives, public trust, and operational stability. Additional revenue - \$5,000-\$15,000.

Engineering Division Program Review

Development Review – Hybrid Model

The Development Engineering Review program ensures that new developments progress in such a way that they do not negatively impact County transportation infrastructure and that growth is coordinated with long-term infrastructure planning. Engineering staff review development applications to assess traffic impacts, access to County roads, corridor protection, and infrastructure upgrades required because of development. This review process helps protect County assets while supporting safe and coordinated growth across the County.

As part of the Municipal Program Review, this program was assessed to ensure it remains efficient, sustainable, and aligned with current service demands. The review was undertaken in support of the corporate objective to maintain service levels while ensuring responsible financial management.

The evaluation considered key performance indicators including review turnaround time, cost per application, infrastructure protection, institutional knowledge retention, organizational capacity, and financial flexibility.

Three service delivery models were evaluated:

- **Option A – Primarily Internal (Approved Staffing Model – 2 Staff)**
Reference point for savings comparisons
Budget Savings: None, annual program cost \$167,300
- **Option B – Hybrid (1 Staff Supported by External Consultants)**
Budget savings are achieved by eliminating the second approved position (currently vacant) while maintaining service levels through scalable, partially cost-recoverable consultant support.
Budget Savings: \$72,100
- **Option C – Fully External (Consultant based)**
Budget Savings: None. Budget increase vs Option A

While Option A performs strongly across several operational indicators, it reflects a two-

position staffing structure that is not aligned with current workload levels and introduces unnecessary fixed costs under current conditions.

Option C was determined to be less favorable due to higher overall costs, increased reliance on external consultants, reduced internal control over review timelines, and diminished retention of institutional knowledge.

Recommendation:

Option B is recommended as the preferred approach. This model maintains one full-time internal staff resource to provide oversight, coordination, and continuity, while leveraging external consultants as required to support peak workloads and specialized technical reviews. This approach maintains internal expertise while introducing flexible, scalable support.

A key advantage of Option B is the use of cost-recoverable peer review services, allowing consultant costs associated with development applications to be partially or fully offset through existing by-laws. This reduces the net financial impact while maintaining service quality and responsiveness.

From a financial perspective, Option B is expected to generate annual savings of approximately \$72,100 when compared to Option A, by avoiding underutilized staffing costs while maintaining service levels through scalable consultant support.

From an operational perspective, Option B:

- Maintains strong internal oversight and institutional knowledge
- Aligns staffing resources with current workload demand
- Improves flexibility to respond to fluctuations in development activity
- Supports long-term sustainability of the program

Based on the findings of this review, it is recommended that the County: Adopt Option B – Hybrid service delivery

- Continue to defer filling the currently vacant support position
- Utilize cost-recoverable consultant support as required
- Monitor development application volumes and service levels
- Monitor how the redistributed 45% workload is absorbed within the Engineering team following the adoption of Option B and the transition to a single staff member.
- Reassess staffing requirements if sustained increases in workload occur

Overall, Option B provides a balanced, cost-effective, and flexible service delivery approach that aligns with current operational needs, supports corporate financial objectives, and maintains the County’s ability to effectively manage growth and protect infrastructure.

Facilities Division Program Review

Facilities Management – Procurement Strategies

The report assesses the County’s current approach to procuring technical assessments and engineering documentation for capital projects and identifies opportunities to improve efficiency, reduce costs, and shorten project timelines. The report explores alternative procurement approaches and recommends a balanced model that preserves compliance and public trust while delivering measurable savings and operational efficiencies.

- **Option A – Status Quo: Competitive Procurement for All Assessments**
Continue using traditional RFP and tender processes for all asset assessments and technical documentation, regardless of whether systems are proprietary.
Budget Savings: None.
- **Option B – Manufacturer-Led Assessments (Sole Source Where Applicable)**
Use manufacturer-provided assessments, drawings, and specifications for proprietary systems under sole source provisions in the Procurement By-law.
Budget Savings: Estimated \$25,400–\$50,800 in savings for 2026 capital projects, \$1,600 in Procurement staff time and \$900 in Facilities staff time saved per project.
- **Option C – Hybrid Model**
Combine direct manufacturer engagement for proprietary systems with targeted use of engineering consultants for independent review, system integration, and regulatory compliance.
Budget Savings: 20–40% reduction in assessment costs, while mitigating associated risks. Potential redirection of up to \$17,500 in staff time annually.

Recommendation:

Progress with Option C – the Hybrid Procurement Model as the preferred approach, delivering meaningful cost savings, faster project initiation, and improved technical accuracy while maintaining appropriate oversight and compliance with procurement legislation.

D. Maintenance Technician

The Maintenance Technician function provides licensed, in-house capability to keep County facilities safe, reliable, and code-compliant while supporting preventive maintenance and asset stewardship. The analysis indicates in-house delivery is generally more economical for high-utilization, core maintenance work, while selective outsourcing can be effective for specialized, intermittent, or overflow tasks. A structured hybrid model (clear boundaries, service-level expectations, and performance monitoring) is identified as the preferred path to balance cost control, service reliability, and risk management.

Three options are explored in this review:

- **Option A — Maintain primarily in-house delivery (status quo with incremental improvements)**

Retain licensed technicians as the primary service model and focus on reducing reactive work and improving preventive maintenance and documentation.

Budget Savings: no direct structural savings assumed; savings would be indirect (e.g., reduced downtime/asset failures) and are not quantified in this report.

- **Option B — Outsource a larger share of maintenance work (contractor-led model)**

Shift more routine and/or reactive maintenance to contractors, retaining limited internal oversight and coordination.

Budget Savings: potential savings are only achievable if contractor all-in rates (including call-out, travel, and admin time) are consistently below the relevant breakeven threshold.

- **Option C — Structured hybrid model**

Maintain in-house technicians for core, high-frequency work (where utilization is high and responsiveness is critical), while outsourcing specialized, intermittent, or overflow work under defined service levels and performance-based expectations.

Budget Savings: savings are scenario-dependent and come from avoiding higher-cost contractor hours for routine work while using contractors only where they are more cost-effective (e.g., specialized work or peaks in demand).

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option C by adopting a structured hybrid service delivery model that keeps licensed technicians in-house for core, high-frequency work and strategically outsources specialized, intermittent, or overflow work under defined scopes, service levels, and performance expectations.

Working Foreperson

This review assesses the Facilities Division's Working Foreperson role within the current facilities service delivery model and reviews whether the role should be kept, eliminated, or restructured, based on evidence about cost, workload, and operational impact.

It is evaluating the value and criticality of the Working Foreperson role as an operational anchor, restructuring scenarios, performance and workload indicators, budget and financial impacts and service delivery and operational impacts.

Three options are reviewed as part of this assessment:

- **Option A – Eliminate the Working Foreperson role**

Eliminates approximately \$171,350 in direct salary cost, but requires replacing 1,820 hours/year via overtime/contractors.

Budget Savings: None. Net budget impact is a loss of \$40,000–\$60,000 annually

- **Option B – Transition the role to a Maintenance Technician (Grade F) and shift supervision to the Facilities Coordinator:**

Generates approximately \$6,900 in salary savings, but adds an estimated \$55,315 in overtime/oversight/contractor costs.

Budget Savings: None. Net budget impact is an annual loss of approximately \$47,410.

- **Option C – Retain and refine the Working Foreperson role:**

Budget Savings: None. Focuses on role clarity, shifting administrative/ strategic tasks to the Facilities Coordinator, and strengthening field leadership to reduce operational risk and avoid cost escalation associated with Options A and B.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option C - Retaining and refining the role, rather than removing or reclassifying it, offers the strongest operational stability, the lowest financial risk, and the greatest alignment with the County's goals for asset stewardship, service quality, and workforce sustainability. Overall, the evidence shows that the Working Foreperson is essential to maintaining safe, reliable, and cost-effective facility operations.

The financial analysis indicates neither restructuring option produces net budget savings; both increase cost and operational risk. The report supports retaining the Working Foreperson and implementing targeted role clarification and workflow improvements as the lowest-risk path for service reliability and cost control.

Housing Unit Turnover Procedure

A unit turnover procedure is the end-to-end process used to return a vacated community housing unit to a safe, functional, "move-in ready" condition between tenancies.

This report assesses the County's Housing Unit Turnover Program to determine why units remain vacant beyond target timelines and to identify practical service-delivery options to reduce vacancy duration, improve quality and compliance, and better align outcomes with the requested 30-day turnaround target. It summarizes current performance, identifies the key process bottlenecks and presents options for potential cost savings - up to and including end-to-end outsourcing under enforceable performance targets - to support decision-making and implementation planning.

Three options are considered in this assessment:

- **Option A – Maintain current hybrid delivery model (status quo)**
Budget Savings: none. Maintains current vacancy-loss: \$385,000 over three years
- **Option B – Strengthen the hybrid model through standardization and enforceable Service Level Agreement (SLAs)**
Budget Savings: estimated vacancy-loss reduction 30–50%; \$40,000–\$75,000 annual additional rent revenue
- **Option C – Outsource end-to-end Unit Turnover Service under performance-based SLAs**
Budget Savings: estimated \$40,000–\$75,000 annual additional revenue generation

Recommendation:

To proceed with Option C – outsourcing the end-to-end Housing Unit Turnover Service under performance-based Service Level Agreements (SLAs). This approach would shift responsibility for unit turnovers to a qualified contractor operating under clearly defined timelines, quality standards, and accountability measures. Based on turnover data and the Avaanz (2022) review, outsourcing is expected to reduce vacancy durations, provide predictable “move-in ready” dates, and achieve a 30–50% reduction in vacancy loss, generating approximately \$40,000–\$75,000 in annual additional rent generation, while allowing County staff to focus on preventive maintenance and core facility operations.

Operations Division Program Review

Crack Sealing Program

This assessment reviews the annual asphalt crack sealing program and evaluates delivery alternatives to support a preservation-first road maintenance approach while improving coordination between Engineering (scope/prioritization) and Operations (execution). This proposal does not change Engineering’s role in determining where crack sealing is required through lifecycle asset management practices; it only changes how the work is delivered.

Two options are presented in this review:

- **Option A - Maintain the current contracted delivery model.**
Annual program cost is approximately \$168,900 (including Engineering staff time and operating/fleet costs).
Budget savings: None (baseline).
- **Option B - Transition to full in-house delivery**
Engineering retains technical direction; Operations executes with purchased equipment.
Budget Savings: \$17,200 - Ongoing annual cost is approximately \$151,700 (after year 1 capital purchases), representing approximately \$17,200 in annual operating savings.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option B - Transition to full in-house delivery to realize ongoing operating savings, improve scheduling control, and strengthen internal preservation capability while maintaining Engineering-led lifecycle decision-making.

Roadside Guardrail Repair

This assessment reviewed delivery options for the County's Roadside Guiderail Repair Program. Based on historical repair volumes (approximately 525 m/year) and current unit pricing, the existing hybrid model (minor adjustments in-house; major repairs contracted) is the lowest-cost approach at approximately \$115,200 annually, while also maintaining compliance with modern MASH installation standards through specialized contractors.

Three options were included in this review:

- **Option A - Maintain current hybrid delivery model**
Annual cost: \$115,200
Budget savings: \$12,800/year.
- **Option B - Expand to full contracted delivery**
Annual cost: \$128,000
Budget Savings: Increase to budget at +\$12,800/year versus the current hybrid model (higher ongoing operating cost).
- **Option C: Transition to fully in-house delivery**
Estimated annual cost: \$209,900
Budget savings: Increase to budget at +\$94,700/year versus the current hybrid model, plus additional requirements for specialized installation equipment, training, and inventory management.

The County currently maintains guiderail infrastructure through a hybrid delivery model where minor adjustments are completed internally while major repairs and system replacements are contracted to specialized installers.

Guiderail Vegetation Management

The current guiderail vegetation maintenance program relies on Operations staff performing mechanical trimming multiple times each growing season. This approach is labour intensive, exposes staff to live traffic environments, and requires repeated maintenance cycles due to rapid vegetation regrowth.

Two options are explored in this report:

- **Option A - Continue current in-house mechanical trimming.**
Estimated annual cost: approximately \$20,000-\$30,000.

Budget savings: None

- **Option B - Transition to annual contracted herbicide spraying.**

Estimated annual cost: approximately \$14,000.

Budget savings: approximately \$6,450-\$17,150 per year (about 31%-55% reduction), depending on the number of trimming cycles otherwise required.

Recommendation:

Option B, based on the combination of lower annual cost, reduced roadside worker exposure, and improved season-long vegetation suppression.

Nuisance Beaver Program

Dufferin County currently administers a nuisance beaver removal program addressing approximately 115 incidents annually across the County at a total cost of approximately \$20,000 per year. However, only approximately 10 incidents annually directly affect County-owned infrastructure, with the majority of program activity addressing impacts to municipal drains and local municipal infrastructure.

Under the Drainage Act, lower-tier municipalities are responsible for the construction, operation, and maintenance of municipal drains through their appointed Drainage Superintendent, indicating that nuisance wildlife impacts affecting those systems fall primarily within the jurisdiction of the local municipality.

Two options are explored in this review:

- **Option A: Maintain the current County-wide program model**

County continues coordinating nuisance beaver removals for both County-owned infrastructure and lower-tier municipal drains/infrastructure.

Estimated annual cost: \$19,500 (approx. \$20,000).

Budget savings: None.

- **Option B: Limit County involvement**

To include incidents affecting County-owned infrastructure only and transition responsibility for municipal drains/local municipal infrastructure to the respective lower-tier municipalities (with removal services continuing to be available through licensed private contractors).

Estimated annual cost (proposed): \$1,740.

Budget savings: \$17,934.

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Waste Services Division Program Review

Garbage Bag Tag Revenues

The garbage bag tag program (in place since 2013) provides residents and small/medium IC&I an option to set out more than the weekly one-bag limit, while encouraging diversion. Waste Services costs continue to rise due to CPI-related increases in collection and disposal; the report explores adjusting the bag tag fee to help offset system costs and potentially encourage better sorting.

Two options were explored in this review:

- **Option A - Maintain Current Program (Status quo):**
Maintain the current \$2 bag tag fee and existing delivery model.
Budget savings: None
- **Option B - Increase fee:**
Increase the bag tag fee from \$2 to \$3.
Budget savings: Revenue impact +\$40,000-\$70,000/year in additional revenue if sales volumes remain the same.

Recommendation:

To proceed with Option B (increase the fee from \$2 to \$3) to help offset rising Waste Services costs and encourage more diversion, with an estimated +\$40,000/year additional revenue if sales volumes remain the same (and noted potential of \$70,000 over the current budget based on recent actuals vs. budget).

IC&I Recycling Collections and Processing

This assessment reviews the County's Industrial, Commercial & Institutional (IC&I) recycling collections and processing service, which transitioned to a dedicated route on January 1, 2026 to maintain recycling diversion for small-to-medium IC&I locations under the municipal contract with GFL. The report considers service level and funding alternatives and summarizes the associated budget impacts.

Three options were explored in this review:

- **Option A: Continue the dedicated IC&I recycling program (status quo).**
Budget savings: None
- **Option B: Implement partial user-pay cost recovery to offset collection costs.**
Budget savings/revenue offset: approximately \$56,000/year if applied to all 485 locations, or approximately \$46,000/year if applied to businesses only (excluding non-profits/charities). Note: administrative effort estimated at 65–80+ hours/year and about \$4,500–\$5,400 in staff time.

- **Option C: Eliminate the IC&I recycling program.**

Budget savings: approximately \$135,000/year in contract costs (with diversion and service impacts to participating IC&I locations).

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Collections Condo Garbage Rebate Program

County has operated the Collections Condo Garbage Rebate Program since 2013 (inherited from the Town of Orangeville). The program currently serves 11 buildings (496 units) and provides an annual rebate to help offset private garbage collection costs for condo residents who do not receive County curbside garbage service; participation requires organics and recycling diversion.

This review explores three options:

- **Option A – Continue program (implement 2026 budget fee structure):**
Maintain the rebate and implement the updated 2026 structure that aligns the per-unit rebate with the single-family residential garbage curbside collection cost per stop (approximately double the historical amount; total program cost approximately \$25,000 annually). Budget savings: None
- **Option B – Continue program at historical rebate level (pre-2026 budget):**
Revert to \$25 per unit per year (approximately \$12,400 annually).
Budget savings: approximately \$9,900 (relative to the 2026 budget amount).
- **Option C – Eliminate program: Discontinue the rebate**
Budget savings: approximately \$25,000 (relative to the 2026 budget amount).

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.

Compost Giveaway Days

The Compost Giveaway Days program is a County-run outreach initiative where staff host about seven events per year (often alongside existing community events like farmers’ markets, Earth Day activities, and tree seedling sales) and provide residents with free finished compost—generally up to one blue box worth.

The program’s main purpose is to “close the loop” on composting by showing residents a tangible benefit of participating in the green bin and yard waste programs: organics and yard waste are processed into finished compost that residents can then use in their gardens/yards. County staff also use the events to engage and educate residents about organics diversion and related waste programs.

Four options were considered in this review:

- **Option A – Continue program (status quo):**
Maintain 7 Compost Giveaway Days annually in conjunction with existing community events to support outreach and “close the loop” messaging on organics diversion.
Budget savings: None (ongoing annual cost maintained).
- **Option B – Reduce number of giveaway days:**
Hold fewer events beginning in 2027 (requires selecting which host communities/events would continue).
Budget savings: Partial savings dependent on the number of events reduced
- **Option C – Eliminate giveaway days:**
Discontinue the program beginning in 2027.
Budget savings: approximately \$3,750 annually
- **Option D – Alternate delivery model (e.g., bagged compost):**
Shift from bulk giveaways to bagged compost distribution.
Budget savings: None expected; may increase costs due to bagging and transporting skids to event sites.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option A - continue the Compost Giveaway Days program because the potential savings are relatively low (about \$3,750/year if eliminated) compared to the community engagement and organics-diversion education benefits the events provide.

Outreach and Education Programs

Waste Services’ outreach and education programs support the County’s Long Term Waste Management Strategy by promoting proper waste sorting and behaviour change to increase diversion and reduce landfill pressures. Current activities include outreach campaigns, staff-supported community event displays (approximately 20 events/year), zero-waste event support through lending and set-up of multi-stream waste stations, and in-school education (90 presentations reaching 2,200+ students and staff in the 2024–2025 school year).

Four options were explored within this review:

- **Option A: Maintain current service levels (status quo)**
Continue outreach campaigns, event attendance/displays, waste-station support for events (including larger events), and school presentations.
Budget Savings: None. (maintains current overtime and operating costs).

- Option B: Reduce staff attendance at community events and/or scale back displays and giveaways**

Attend fewer events and prioritize those with the highest engagement value; reduce promotional giveaways where feasible.

Budget savings: up to approximately \$14,000/year in staffing. Potential additional \$2,000/year for event materials and \$2,500–\$5,000/year for tent replacement/giveaways.
- Option C: Reduce or eliminate waste-station support for events**

Reduce the number of events supported with waste stations or discontinue the program entirely.

Budget savings: tied to reduced staff time and event-related materials.
- Option D: Reduce or eliminate school presentations; reallocate educator time**

Reduce the number of in-school presentations or discontinue them and shift staff capacity to other diversion initiatives (e.g., curbside setout studies, compliance, campaigns, customer service/admin support).

Budget savings: No direct savings (no overtime); \$16,000/year in regular staff time that could be *reallocated* to other Waste Services priorities if school programming is reduced or eliminated.

Recommendation:

Proceed with Option A – Maintain current service levels. While targeted reductions could generate limited direct savings—primarily by avoiding weekend/evening overtime for events—eliminating or substantially reducing these activities could negatively affect diversion outcomes and contribute to higher long-term disposal costs as landfill capacity tightens.

Household Hazardous and Electronic Waste Event Days

The Household Hazardous and Electronic Waste (HHEW) Event Days program provides County residents with scheduled drop-off events to safely dispose of household hazardous and electronic waste. The program operates seven days each year from spring to fall at rotating locations across the County, is delivered through contracted service partners, and is funded through a combination of producer responsibility funding and the tax base.

Three options were explored in this review:

- Option A – Reduce annual event days (7 to 5 in 2027):**

Reduce two event days to address 2027 budget pressures while continuing the current contracted delivery model.

Budget Savings: approximately \$37,000

- **Option B – Increase offsetting revenue through higher e-waste tonnage:**
Maximize electronics collection at events to increase producer-responsibility funding (\$216/metric tonne).
Budget savings: Using 2025 as an example, 35.42 tonnes generated \$7,650.72; collecting an additional 8 tonnes would add approximately \$1,728. Note: if event days are reduced, maintaining or increasing tonnage may be challenging.
- **Option C – Shift to an alternate service delivery model (e.g., depot-based HHW service):**
Continue exploring longer-term service expansion options identified through the Long-Term Waste Management Strategy Update.
Budget Savings: None - expected to increase program costs

Recommendation:

For the consideration of Council.