



Office of the Warden

County of Middlesex, 399 Ridout Street North, London Ontario N6A 2P1
mwilkins@middlesex.ca

June 12, 2018

Joanne Vanderheyden, Chair
Middlesex London Board of Health
50 King Street
London, Ontario N6A 5H4

Dear Chair Vanderheyden:

I am writing today to request your assistance in receiving a response to a series of questions that were presented by the County of Middlesex to Mr. Mackie some time ago in regard to the likely impact of the MLHU's 30 year lease on County residents. For your review, I have provided a copy of the questions and I look forward to a response at your earliest opportunity. I would also appreciate it if you would provide Council with an update on how your financing efforts for the new facility including the costs associated with relocation and new equipment will affect the County's Annual Repayment Limit.

In addition to a written response, I would also like to schedule the MLHU for a discussion in regard to the pursuit of a safe-injection site. To date, County Council has received very little information in regard to the proposed sites and I want to make sure that County Council has adequate time to review your request for consent to an acquisition or holding of real property in accordance with Judge Morrissette's decision and the legislated requirements of the HPPA. Our next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 26, 2018 or July 17, 2018 and I would be pleased to provide you and your colleagues from the MLHU a delegation opportunity for this purpose. Please make arrangements with Kathy Bunting, County Clerk prior to the agenda posting.

Yours truly,

Marigay Wilkins
Warden
Attachment



Office of the Chief Administrative Officer

399 Ridout Street North, London, Ontario, N6A 2P1

519-930-1000

cao@mdlsx.ca

COPY

April 9, 2018

VIA FACSIMILE (519-663-9581)

AND E-MAIL (Christopher.Mackie@mlhu.on.ca)

Attention: Dr. Christopher Mackie

Middlesex-London Health Unit

50 King Street

London, ON N6A 5L7

Dear Dr. Mackie:

RE: Middlesex-London Health Unit – S. 52 Consent

As you know, on March 6, 2018, County Council did not provide consent at that time for the Middlesex-London Health Unit ("MLHU") to acquire property rights through a proposed 30 year lease, as Council determined that a number of its questions/concerns on behalf of its constituents were either not answered or not answered to its satisfaction. While you are aware from the meeting of the remaining service, cost, and timing concerns of Council as a funder and on behalf of its constituents, the below particulars await the Health Unit's address:

Services

1. Why did the MLHU not consult with County Council and discuss that service delivery may potentially require acquisition of new property rights with in advance of February, 13 2018 and in advance of issuing an RFP?
2. If the MLHU was concerned about deficiencies with its existing London facility, why did it never provide a list of deficiencies in accordance with the procedure set out in the lease and discuss same?
3. What steps were taken to involve funder stakeholders (County, City, Aboriginal and Province) prior to signing the letter of intent?
4. How will the new space identified impact the MLHU service of County residents over the next 30 years?
5. You stated that the impact on County residents was not studied in advance and that such study would occur after the acquisition of property interest. How is County Council able to know the impact on its residents and opine on the impact as a funder if they study is being done later?
6. Why would the MLHU study the needs of County residents after such a major commitment?
7. Shouldn't the cost & service model and implementation plan for these needs be considered in conjunction with the capital service plan of the MLHU?

8. Why not complete a review of County service delivery prior to making a 30 year property right acquisition decision to ensure that any new facility in London is adequately serving the needs of County residents and all residents in the service area?
9. You stated at the February 13, 2018 Committee meeting that the MLHU performed a study on the needs in the City of London. Council would like to know why the MLHU performed a service study excluding the County, the efficiency and accountability of same, and whether or not that been done before for the service area?
10. Why wouldn't the MLHU complete a service review for the entire service area community to ensure that the new space in London is adequately serving the needs of County residents and all residents of the service area, as opposed to committing the bulk of its resources within the City of London without study of entire service area?
11. County residents are required to travel large distances to receive health services. Would a decentralized service model serve County citizens better than a consolidated approach? Isn't decentralization consistent with the Provincial Expert Panel on Public Health's recommendations?
12. Why did the MLHU not examine service opportunities when the opportunity to build onto comprehensive libraries in the County was brought to your attention several years ago?
13. Is the MLHU making use of the most current real-time communication technology?

Costs

14. The MLHU has stated that consolidation is a primary component of its capital decisions:
 - a) How will the service delivery model for the County be impacted by the desire to consolidate facilities?
 - b) How can decisions be made about the appropriate capital in the County in isolation of your Middlesex-London consolidation of services?
 - c) Why would the MLHU predetermine the capital decisions for Middlesex-London prior to doing a service review in the County?
15. What is the cost of the new property right? The answer provided by the MLHU to County Council was that it would cost more than the current costs. You were not able to identify for Council how much more. Council would like to know that.
16. With respect to increased costs, what is the amount that the Province would be contributing compared to the municipal contribution? Council would like to know this and needs to know this to determine the cost impact.
17. How specifically will cost savings be achieved by the new property acquisition? At the Committee meeting, you stated that there would be lots of efficiencies up to 15%. What is that based on? What is the efficiency? Does the MLHU have any data or business plan to demonstrate that the strategy would certainly work or even be likely to work? What specific evidence is there of cost savings reductions in other jurisdictions for consolidation or service delivery in a centralized urban environment? None were presented.
18. In his presentations to Committee and Council, you placed a strong reliance on what was stated to have worked in the City of Hamilton without going into any detail, studies, data or evidence. Does the MLHU have data showing if the Middlesex-London Service Area is like/has the same needs as in Hamilton? Does the MLHU have data showing if such efficiencies have in fact worked or not in Hamilton? Council would like to see such data.

19. You stated that multiple reserves already exist to fund the cost of the property acquisition. County Council continues to object to the creation and utilization of reserves created with 100% municipal funds. Why does the MLHU believe it was appropriate for surplus to be returned to municipal funders in ever year with the exception of 2013?
20. How does the property right acquisition help getting us closer to 75-25% funding levels agreed to by the MLHU and the County? There was a time when a Provincial Policy directive/goal for Health Units to achieve a 75% provincial dollars and 25% municipal dollars split was in place. During that time, the municipal funders of the MLHU agreed to contribute more than 25% in the short term in return for the promise for the MLHU to reduce municipal costs to 25% as quickly as possible. With that Provincial Policy no longer in place, legitimate accountability expectations of Health Units continue to exist for Health Units to reduce municipal contributory costs. The County expects the MLHU to fulfill its particular promise independent of the Provincial Policy. How does ramping up and saving of reserves at 100% municipal dollars for a property acquisition and the property acquisition itself contribute to addressing the disparity between municipal and provincial contributions both during the time when the 75%/25% Policy goal was in place and thereafter? Should such funds by not have been used to deal with the disparity in costs between municipal and provincial contributions?
21. With the proposed new property acquisition, will the MLHU have money left to address new capital needs that are identified in the County of Middlesex?
22. What are the specific costs associated with moving the MLHU locations and new furniture?
23. Does non-free parking for staff decrease costs to funders?

Timing

24. The Expert Panel Report on Public Health has made a number of recommendations in regard to MLHU restructuring in Ontario. Council would like to know and evaluate:
 - a) The wisdom and cost implications of making a thirty-year location/space needs decision in the middle of this review when such will have an important impact on service recipients in the County?
 - b) The wisdom and cost implications of making a thirty-year financial commitment to one location when the Expert Panel has already opined that restructuring and decentralization is appropriate and the MLHU in the near future could cover an area as large of an area as Bruce through to Elgin Counties?
 - c) Would it not make more sense for the sake of the provincial tax payer to wait and examine the service delivery model in the context of the Review?
25. This lease creates a long-term liability for the funders. Please quantify the risk associated with this long-term liability?

The County looks forward to the Health Unit addressing of the above through the democratic process.

Yours truly,



Bill Rayburn