

Memorandum to the Council of Corporation of the Municipality of Temagami

Subject: Council Meeting Location and Audio System Options

Memo No: 2025-M-123

Date: May 8, 2025

Attachment: None

Prepared By: John Shymko - Economic Development Officer

Recommendation

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council receives Memo 2025-M-123 as presented;

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council selects one of the following options for future Council meeting arrangements:

- Option A: Retain the existing Council Chamber and equipment (status quo);
- Option B: Remain in the current Council Chamber and upgrade to wireless lavalier microphones;
- Option C: Relocate Council meetings to the community theatre with minimal equipment upgrades;
- Option D: Relocate Council meetings to the community theatre with full audio and equipment upgrades;

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED THAT if Council selects Option C or Option D, staff be directed to return with a follow-up report outlining:

- Estimated costs for replacing Council desks with mobile or theatre-suitable alternatives;
- Operational impacts and logistics of holding Council meetings in a shared facility.

Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	2
2. Background	2
3. Overview of Options	3
4. Comparative Analysis.....	4
5. Financial Implications	5
6. Conclusion.....	5

1. Executive Summary

This memorandum presents four options for improving the Municipality of Temagami’s Council meeting environment. Options range from maintaining the current Council Chamber (Option A), to enhancing audio capabilities (Option B), or relocating to the community theatre with varying levels of equipment investment (Options C and D). Key considerations include accessibility, public capacity, audio quality, and operational logistics. No specific recommendation is made at this time; Council direction is requested.

2. Background

The current Council Chamber are functionally equipped but face limitations in sound clarity and public seating. Recent advances in audio technology and the potential use of the community theatre have prompted a reassessment of the most effective long-term venue for Council meetings. This review was initiated in response to a notice of motion from a member of Council requesting that staff evaluate alternative meeting locations and explore audio system improvements to enhance the overall accessibility and effectiveness of Council proceedings.

3. Overview of Options

3.1. Option A: Current Council Chamber (Status Quo)

Retains all existing infrastructure including seven cameras, stationary microphones, a digital video switcher, and a PA system. Accessibility is fully compliant. Limitations include HVAC noise and microphone proximity issues, which affect sound clarity.

3.2. Option B: Current Chamber + Lavalier Microphones

Upgrades sound by adding 12 wireless lavalier microphones. The total equipment cost is \$1,850. Conference microphones are removed. Council will need to manage microphone discipline, and staff will handle battery charging and maintenance.

3.3. Option C: Theatre Relocation (Minimal Upgrade)

Moves meetings to the community theatre. This option provides increased public seating (100), improved acoustics, and professional lighting. Equipment setup cost is approximately \$1,100 for camera rewiring, cabling, and monitor installation. Existing Council desks must be moved in and out for each meeting. Accessibility is limited to the top tier.

3.4. Option D: Theatre Relocation (Full Upgrade)

Combines relocation with the lavalier microphone system. Adds wireless microphones (\$1,600), battery charging station (\$250), and monitor installation (\$400), for a total of \$2,250 in known equipment costs. Requires approximately 12 hours of staff labour. Desk movement and accessibility limitations remain.

4. Comparative Analysis

Feature	Option A (Status Quo)	Option B (Chamber + Lavalier Mics)	Option C (Theatre – Minimal)	Option D (Theatre – Full)
Location	Council Chamber	Council Chamber	Community Theatre	Community Theatre
Public Seating	40	40	100 (fixed seating)	100 (fixed seating)
Accessibility	Fully Accessible	Fully Accessible	Top Tier Only	Top Tier Only
Audio System	Stationary Mics	Wireless Lavalier Mics	Theatre Audio via Snake	Wireless Lavalier Mics
Camera Rewiring	No	No	Yes	Yes
Desk Movement	No	No	Yes	Yes
Monitor & Cabling	\$0	\$0	\$400	\$400
Mic System Cost	\$0	\$1,600	\$0	\$1,600
Battery & Charging	\$0	\$250	\$0	\$250
Labour Estimate	0 hours	0 hours	8 hours	12 hours
Total Known Cost	\$0	\$1,850	\$1,100	\$2,250
Ongoing Challenges	HVAC noise, mic proximity	Mic discipline	Desk movement, limited access	Mic discipline, desk movement, limited access

5. Financial Implications

- Option A incurs no new costs.
- Option B requires a one-time equipment cost of \$1,850.
- Option C requires \$1,100 in equipment, plus approximately 8 hours of staff time.
- Option D requires \$2,250 in equipment, plus approximately 12 hours of staff time.
- Both Option C and Option D may require further capital investment for suitable Council desk solutions if relocation is pursued.

6. Conclusion

Option A is the most cost-effective but continues to present challenges with audio clarity and limited public space. Option B offers a modest technical upgrade with minimal disruption. Options C and D provide expanded public access and improved acoustics but introduce operational and accessibility constraints.

Should Council express interest in relocating meetings to the theatre, staff recommend returning with a follow-up report addressing furniture alternatives, accessibility accommodations, and setup logistics.