1. Call to Order

2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

3. Deputations

   10:00 AM  Tanya Shute, Manager, Allied Health Services, Quality and Risk Management - South East Grey Community Health Centre

   Canadian Index of Well Being Initiative

   10:30 AM  Kathi Maskell, Launch Pad Chair and Emily Morrison, Launch Pad Executive Director

   Update of Launch Pad and Introduction of New Executive Director

   10:50 AM  Brian Zeman, MHBC Planning Limited

   Proposed Gibraltar Sand and Gravel Pit Expansion

4. Determination of Items Requiring Separate Discussion

5. Consent Agenda

   That the following Consent Agenda items be received; and

   That staff be authorized to take the actions necessary to give effect to the recommendations in the staff reports; and

   That the correspondence be supported or received for information as recommended in the consent agenda.

a. TR-CW-14-18 Road Widening Acquisition from Parks on Grey Road 2 – Town of the Blue Mountains

   That Report TR-CW-14-18 be received and that the property identified as Part of Lot 3 Concession 9, as in Instrument No. R324881 East of Part 1 16R-7290; Geographic Township of Collingwood, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey be acquired from Evelyn Grace Parks and Lyle Hughbert Parks by The Corporation of The County of Grey for road widening purposes.
b. TR-CW-15-18 Road Widening Acquisition from Rawn Estate on Grey Road 109 – Southgate

That Report TR-CW-15-18 be received and that the properties identified as Part of Lot 57 Concession 3 Egremont Part 1 16R-9102; and Lot 56 Concession 3 Egremont Except Instrument No. GS159678, Instrument No. R387752 & Part 2 16R-5390; Geographic Township of Egremont, Township of Southgate, County of Grey be acquired from the Estate of Ruth Naomi Rawn by The Corporation of The County of Grey for road widening purposes.

c. Building Task Force minutes dated February 22, 2018

That the Building Task Force minutes dated February 22, 2018 be adopted as presented.

d. Request For Support for Provincial Funding – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority

That the request from the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority for provincial funding of Conservation Authorities be supported.

e. Correspondence from Collingwood General and Marine Hospital – Municipal Forum Replaces Municipal Representatives on Hospital Board

That the County of Grey supports the transition of the Mayor’s Forum to a Municipal Forum on the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital Board.

f. Items For Direction and Discussion


That all written and oral submissions received on Official Plan Amendment Number 135 were considered and helped to make an informed recommendation and decision;

That Report PDR-CW-12-18 be received;

And that Amendment Number 135 to permit a gravel pit expansion on lands described as Part 1 RP 16R9097, Lot 6, Concession 4, Geographic Township of Collingwood, in the Town of The Blue Mountains, be supported, to re-designate the subject lands to the ‘Mineral Resource Extraction with Exceptions’ designation on Schedule B to the Plan, while remaining in the ‘Rural’ designation on Schedule A, and that a by-law to adopt the County Official Plan Amendment be prepared for consideration by County Council.

b. PSR-CW-03-18 Response Time Performance Plan Results for 2017 and Analysis of Call Volumes

That Report PSR-CW-03-18 be received for information; and
That the 2017 Paramedic Service response time performance results be submitted to the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care by March 31, 2018.

c. HDR-CW-03-18 Golden Town Residential Community

That Report HDR-CW-03-18 regarding a proposed transfer of Golden Town Residential Company assets to Grey County be received; and

That staff be directed to carry out the process to transfer such assets to the County of Grey.

d. HDR-CW-04-18 Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative Investment Plan 2018-2019

That Report HDR-CW-04-18 regarding a proposed Investment Plan for Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative for 2018-19 be received; and

That Grey County Council approves the Investment Plan for the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative and approves the 2018-19 funding to be expensed by March 31, 2019; and

That Grey County extends its agreement with Owen Sound and Area Family YMCA for funding for the Housing Prevention Program for 2018-2020.

e. Addendum to PDR-CW-39-17 Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority – Memorandum of Understanding

That the comments outlined in the Addendum to Staff Report PDR-CW-39-17 be provided to the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) in response to the revised draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for plan review and technical services that the SVCA circulated to the County and the watershed municipalities, and

That Council requests that the SVCA continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage comments for the County of Grey as part of its review of planning applications in order to maintain consistency with other conservation authorities and municipalities in Grey County, and

That when providing comments on natural hazards and natural heritage matters that the comments be provided in the context of Provincial Policy Statement as well as the County Official Plan, and local planning documents for all Planning Act applications, and

That Council supports the recommended revisions to the revised draft MoU and directs staff to circulate a copy of the Report and the revised draft MoU to the SVCA and the member municipalities within Grey County that are located within the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority watershed and to work with the SVCA to finalize an MoU for Council’s consideration.
f. TR-CW-12-18 Award of RFT-TS-01-18 Grey Road 112 Pulverizing and Hot Mix Paving

That Report TR-CW-12-18 regarding tender award recommendations for RFT-TS-01-18 be received and that the tender be awarded to Wayne Schwartz Construction Ltd. for $1,469,663.00 excluding taxes; and

That a 5% construction contingency be added to the tender price resulting in a revised estimated project cost of $1,570,305.51 net HST; and

That the project deficit of $220,205.51 will be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 capital construction budget or, if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.


That Report TR-CW-13-18 regarding tender award recommendations for RFT-TS-08-18 be received and that the tender be awarded to Wayne Schwartz Construction Ltd. for $727,133.64 excluding taxes; and

That a 15% construction contingency be added to the tender price resulting in a revised estimated project cost of $850,920.87 net HST.

h. TR-CW-17-18 Award of RFT-TS-04-18 Grey Road 17 Pulverizing, Reconstruction and Hot Mix Paving

That Report TR-CW-17-18 regarding tender award recommendations for RFT-TS-04-18 be received and that the tender be awarded to Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd. for $3,377,000.00 excluding taxes; and

That a 5% construction contingency be added to the tender price resulting in a revised estimated project cost of $3,608,256.96 net HST; and

That the project deficit of $408,256.96 will be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 capital construction budget or, if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.

g. Administration Building Addition/Renovation Update

h. Closed Meeting Matters

That the Committee of the Whole does now go into closed session to discuss:

i. Personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees pursuant to Section 239 (2) of the Municipal Act (Staffing Changes and Recruitment Update)

j. Other Business
k. Notice of Motion
l. Adjournment
Committee Report

To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council
Committee Date: March 8, 2018
Subject / Report No: TR-CW-14-18
Title: Acquisition of Road Widening Parcel from Parks on Grey Road 2 - PIN 37152-0101 (LT)
Prepared by: Lacey Thompson, Land Acquisition Specialist
Reviewed by: Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services
Lower Tier(s) Affected: Town of The Blue Mountains
Status: Recommendation

1. That Report TR-CW-14-18 be received and that the property identified as Part of Lot 3 Concession 9, as in Instrument No. R324881 East of Part 1 16R-7290; Geographic Township of Collingwood, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey be acquired from Evelyn Grace Parks and Lyle Hughbert Parks by The Corporation of The County of Grey for road widening purposes.

Executive Summary

PIN 37152-0101 is a piece of road widening which abuts Grey Road 2 South of the intersection of Grey Road 2 and 3rd Sideroad. Grey County is completing the following report to acquire and join PIN 37152-0101 to Grey Road 2.

Background and Discussion

Recently it was discovered that Evelyn Grace Parks and Lyle Hughbert Parks own a parcel of road widening along Grey Road 2. The property in question is known as Part of Lot 3 Concession 9 Collingwood as in Instrument No. R324881 East of Part 1 16R-7290; Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey.

The parcel of road widening was separated from Lot 3 Concession 9, Collingwood in 2008 when Evelyn and Lyle completed a Land Severance wherein the road widening parcel was exempted from the transfer.

The road widening parcel remains in the name of Evelyn and Lyle.
The acquisition of this parcel will result in a 30.5 m (100’) right of way width in this area of Grey Road 2 which supports the County’s long term goal in accordance with the Transportation Master Plan.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The private ownership of this road widening parcel results in the abutting landowners having no legal access to Grey Road 2 from their property.

Financial and Resource Implications

Staff has currently invested $35.00 to complete the necessary property searches in relation to this parcel. The Land Acquisition Procedure authorizes an offer of $1,000.00 to the landowner to purchase PIN 37152-0101, being a parcel of road widening containing 0.08 Hectares (0.198 acres). The legal costs to finalize the transfer are estimated to be under $500.00.

The funding will come from the Transportation Services land acquisition budget.

Relevant Consultation

☐ Internal (list)
☒ External

Evelyn and Lyle Parks have been contacted about their ownership of the road widening parcel. Mr. Parks agreed to execute the transfer documents with the understanding that Grey County will cover all legal costs and provide compensation in accordance with the Land Acquisition Procedure.

Appendices and Attachments
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Committee Report

To: Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council
Committee Date: March 8, 2018
Subject / Report No: TR-CW-15-18
Title: Acquisition of Road Widening Parcel from Rawn on Grey Road 109 – PIN’s 37288-0125 (LT) and 37289-0153 (LT)
Prepared by: Lacey Thompson, Land Acquisition Specialist
Reviewed by: Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services
Lower Tier(s) Affected: Township of Southgate
Status:

Recommendation


Executive Summary

PIN’s 37288-0125 and 37289-0153 are parcels of road widening which abut Grey Road 109 at the intersection of Grey Road 109 and Southgate Road 8. Grey County is completing the following report to acquire and join PIN’s 37288-0125 and 37289-0153 to Grey Road 109.

Background and Discussion

Recently it was discovered that the Estate of Ruth Naomi Rawn owns two parcels of road widening along Grey Road 109. The properties in question are known as Part of Lot 57 Concession 3 Egremont Part 1 16R-9102; and Lot 56 Concession 3 Egremont Except Instrument No. GS159678, Instrument No. R387752 & Part 2 16R-5390; Township of Southgate, County of Grey.

These parcels of road widening were separated from the main lots when they were specifically exempted from the transfer from the Estate of Ruth Naomi Rawn.

These road widening parcels remain in the name of the Estate of Ruth Naomi Rawn.
Legal and Legislated Requirements

Private ownership of these road widening parcels results in the abutting landowners having no legal access to Grey Road 109 from their property.

Financial and Resource Implications

Staff has currently invested $70.00 to complete the necessary property searches in relation to these parcels. The legal costs to finalize the transfers are estimated to be under $700.00.

PIN 37289-0153 also contains a portion of road widening along Southgate Road 8. Following acquisition of this PIN, a survey should be completed to outline the two separate pieces and the portion that should join to Southgate Road 8 should be transferred to the Township of Southgate. The anticipated cost for the survey and transfer is $3,000.00.

The funding will come from the Transportation Services land acquisition budget.

Relevant Consultation

☐ Internal - N/A
☒ External

Ernest McMillan, solicitor with Fallis, Fallis & McMillan in Mount Forest, and Estate Trustee for the Estate of Ruth Naomi Rawn, has been contacted regarding the Estates continued ownership of the road widening parcels. Mr. McMillan has agreed to execute the transfer documents with the understanding that Grey County will cover all legal costs.

Appendices and Attachments

Location Map
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Grey County Building Task Force – Administration Building
February 22, 2018 – p.m.
Heritage Room

Present: Chair Dwight Burley; Warden Stewart Halliday; Councillors Greenfield, Pringle, Barfoot and Hicks

Staff Present: CAO Kim Wingrove; Director Kevin Weppler; staff Rob Hatten, Aaron Whitney and Penny Colton – Recording Secretary

Regrets: Anne Marie Shaw

Call to Order
Chair Burley called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest
There was none.

Minutes of Meeting
Grey County Building Task Force – Administration Building minutes dated February 8, 2018
The minutes were reviewed.

BTF-03-18 Moved by: Councillor Hicks Seconded by: Councillor Barfoot

THAT the minutes of the Grey County Building Task Force-Administration Building dated February 8, 2018 be accepted for information purposes as endorsed by County Council on February 22, 2018.

Carried.
Flooring and Stairs Quote

Mr. Whitney reviewed the quote for the replacement of the existing terrazzo flooring with the ceramic flooring installed in the new addition, and demolition of the existing stairs for a total cost of $106,085.

Chair Burley indicated he is not in support of replacing the terrazzo flooring. There was discussion regarding the quote and the balance remaining in the contingency fund. Presentation of the contingency fund budget will be provided at the next meeting.

There will be further investigation of alternative options and request for a new quote to be provided at the next meeting.

Other Business

Mr. Whitney provided an update on the building renovations including work on the roof. Potentially staff can be moved back into their areas mid-March following Fire Alarm testing and approval.

There was discussion regarding parking availability and the group was advised there is the possibility of additional parking if the current court building is removed. The situation should improve when all access doors are again available for use.

Next Meeting Date

At the call of the Chair

On motion by Councillor Barfoot the meeting adjourned at 2:33 p.m.
Letter to
Premier Kathleen Wynne
PC Interim Leader Vic Fedeli
NDP Leader Andrea Horwath

Subject: Increase base funding to Ontario Conservation Authorities

The Council of ______________________ recognizes that there is only one taxpayer supporting all levels of government and that these are challenging times for the Province of Ontario with respect to its budget. We also recognize that transfer payment funding cuts to the Conservation Authorities were initially implemented in 1995, and have subsequently never been increased in the 22 years since, remaining at the same 1995 dollar value, with the only change being the further cut of several hundred thousand dollars directed at the two largest of the Authorities, Toronto Region and Grand River.

As a member municipality of our local Conservation Authority we followed with interest the multi-year review of the Conservation Authorities Act in which a consistent message was heard from virtually all stakeholders that there was a need for the Province of Ontario to address the chronic underfunding of the Conservation Authorities.

We wish to point out that while the base funding for Conservation Authorities comes through the MNR&F, and the MOE&CC for Drinking Water Source Protection, the work that Conservation Authorities do in partnership with those ministries also benefits other provincial ministries through the various programs and projects of the Authorities, i.e. Education; Health; Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs; Municipal Affairs and Housing; Tourism, Recreation and Culture; Infrastructure; and Community Safety.

Further, we observed that during debate on Bill 139 addressing the proposed amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act, MPPs of all parties were supportive of the work of the Conservation Authorities, and acknowledged the need to address the chronic underfunding. We also observed that the subsequent passage of Bill 139 received all party support so as to be passed in the Legislature in December of 2017, and receive Royal Assent immediately thereafter.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Council of ______________________ hereby requests that the Province of Ontario, demonstrate their all party support for Conservation Authorities and the work that they do on behalf of all our ratepayers by increasing the transfer payment allocation through reallocation of dollars from other benefiting provincial ministries, or other new revenues, i.e. Carbon Cap and Trade revenues; and

That the Council of ______________________ direct staff to forward a copy of this letter and resolution to the Ministers of Finance, MNR&F, MOE&CC, Education, Health, Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs, Municipal Affairs & Housing, Tourism, Recreation & Culture, Infrastructure, and Community Safety; local MPs and MPPs; the Association of Municipalities of Ontario; Conservation Ontario; and the member municipalities of its local Conservation Authority.
Date: March 12, 2018

***MEDIA RELEASE – For Immediate Release***

Municipal Forum replaces Municipal Representatives on Hospital Board

**CHANGE TO TOWN NAME, ON – MARCH 12, 2018** – The five municipalities of Collingwood, Clearview Township, Grey Highlands, The Blue Mountains and Wasaga Beach, along with Grey County and Simcoe County, and the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital are currently in the process of transitioning its Mayors’ Forum to a Municipal Forum, as the hospital transitions municipal representatives from the Board of Trustees effective July 12, 2018.

Following a collaborative meeting on February 15, 2018, all agreed to build upon and strengthen the current Mayors’ Forum, which has been in place for almost three years.

Moving forward, the Municipal Forum will allow the five municipalities and the two counties to continue in an advisory capacity, with open and progressive two way conversation, and where appropriate, input into the hospital’s decision making process, on issues which could impact the communities at large.

Further details are currently being refined as to the frequency of meetings and the Terms of Reference, and should be in place over the next couple of months.

-30-

“I think this is a wonderful opportunity and appreciate the collaboration of the municipalities and counties, as we transition to this new forum.” **Norah Holder, President and CEO, Collingwood General and Marine Hospital.**

Quote from each of the 5 municipalities and two counties
Recommendation

1. That all written and oral submissions received on Official Plan Amendment Number 135 were considered and helped to make an informed recommendation and decision;

2. That Report PDR-CW-12-18 be received;

3. And that Amendment Number 135 to permit a gravel pit expansion on lands described as Part 1 RP 16R9097, Lot 6, Concession 4, Geographic Township of Collingwood, in the Town of The Blue Mountains, be supported, to re-designate the subject lands to the ‘Mineral Resource Extraction with Exceptions’ designation on Schedule B to the Plan, while remaining in the ‘Rural’ designation on Schedule A, and that a by-law to adopt the County Official Plan Amendment be prepared for consideration by County Council.

Executive Summary

This report considers a proposed County official plan amendment in the Town of The Blue Mountains to permit a 13.6 hectare expansion to an existing gravel pit. Although 13.6 hectares are proposed to be licensed, the extraction area will be 10.3 hectares. Extraction in the current pit, as well as within the proposed expanded area will occur below the water table. The amendment is required because the expansion lands are primarily located outside of the County’s ‘Aggregate Resource Area’ mapping. Accompanying the County official plan amendment application, are applications for official plan and zoning by-law amendment to the Town of The Blue Mountains, and a license from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF). The subject lands would remain designated as ‘Rural’ on Schedule A to the County Plan, but would be re-designated to ‘Mineral Resource Extraction with Exceptions’ on Schedule
B to the Plan. It is recommended that Amendment Number 135 be supported and a by-law to adopt the amendment be prepared for consideration by County Council.

**Background and Discussion**

The County of Grey has received an application to amend the County Official Plan to permit a 13.6 hectare pit expansion on the subject property. The majority of the expansion lands are not in an identified Aggregate Resource Area and therefore the proposal requires County and Town official plan amendments. The lands are designated as ‘Rural’ in the County and Town plans. Aside from the Town and County official plan amendments, a zoning by-law amendment and a license from the MNRF are also required for this pit expansion.

The area proposed for re-designation is 13.6 hectares in size and the area proposed for extraction is 10.3 hectares. The pit is proposed to go below the water table, and is estimated to contain approximately 2.7 million tonnes of resource. The existing pit is licensed to extract 150,000 tonnes annually. Should the proposed expansion be granted, the cumulative total of the current pit, and the proposed pit will remain at 150,000 tonnes per year. The lands will be rehabilitated to a man-made pond and forested areas. Maps 1 and 2 below show the proposed expansion lands and licensed area.

*Map 1 – Airphoto of the Subject Lands*

The subject lands are legally described as Part 1 RP 16R9097, Part Lot 6, Concession 4, geographic Township of Collingwood, in the Town of The Blue Mountains. To the west of the subject lands is the historical hamlet of Gibraltar. The expansion lands are currently farmed and forested and are immediately east of the existing (approved) Gibraltar Sand and Gravel Pit (License No. 4945, formerly known as the Conn Pit). East of the expansion area is a large portion of publicly owned (MNRF) lands that is known as Pretty River Provincial Park. To the north, across 6th Sideroad is another licensed pit, known as the Bates Sand and Gravel...
operation. To the west of the existing pit are a series of residential dwellings. Within 500 metres of the proposed expansion site are two residential dwellings.

MHBC Planning Ltd. have submitted a Planning Justification Report in support of the proposed planning applications. A number of supporting reports and response submissions have been completed in support of this application including: a Traffic Study, a Hydrogeological Study, a Natural Environment Technical Report (NETR), an Archaeological Study and a Noise Study. Copies of all background materials can be found on the County's website at the below link.

[**Gibraltar Sand and Gravel Pit Expansion Background Materials**](#)

The County and Town of The Blue Mountains hosted a joint public meeting for the official plan and zoning by-law amendment applications on May 16, 2016.
Map 2 – Licensed and Extraction Boundaries on the Subject Lands (Courtesy MHBC Planning Ltd.)
Public and Agency Comments Received

The proposed applications generated a significant amount of public comments, questions, and concerns. The County has an extensive file on the official plan amendment application. For the purposes of this report, summaries of the comments have been provided, as the complete public record is far too lengthy to attach to this report.

The County received written or verbal comments from the following;

- Margot Allan
- Donald H. Avery on behalf of the Blue Mountain Watershed Trust
- Kevin Bambrough
- Leslie Brophy
- G.D. Butterfield
- Nathalie Butterfield
- Martha Butterfield
- Rick Clarke and Victoria Macrae
- Geordie C. Dalghish
- Chris Ferron
- Laura Ferron
- Friends of the Pretty River Valley
- Rob Grand
- Peter Grosskopf
- Elizabeth Harrison
- Mr. Holden
- Bernard Homonick
- Diane Hudson
- Gina & Alan Johnston
- Lars and Monica Londen
- Paul Luckett
- Jeanette Macdonald and Frederick Wetzel
- Angela Marritt
- Dan and Julia McCarthy
- Bryan Pady
- Neil Patrick
- Diana Prankevicius
- Giselle Seheult
- Bev Shaw, Shaw Farms Ltd.
- Ian Sinclair
- Annette and Chuck Solly
- Charles Stevens
- Thomas Michael Storey
- Kirsti Suutari and Peter Lamy
- Rand Thompson

A petition was also received in opposition to the proposed pit.
A summary of the written public comments are as follows;

- Concerns over impacts on neighbouring properties, including proximity to residential dwellings
- Concerns over impacts on natural environment and the Pretty River Park
- Concerns over tree removal
- Concerns over the impacts on wildlife and endangered species
- Preserve existing farmland / avoid loss of good farmland
- Concerns over the spread of weeds from the berms on-site
- Health impacts from the proposed pit and the haul route
- Public health and safety concerns
- Traffic concerns
- Increase in traffic/heavy truck traffic and trucks speeding
- Road safety concerns including impacts on cyclists, pedestrians, horseback riders, sightseers, and all road users
- Concerns over ongoing maintenance of roads
- Rehabilitation plan questions
- Concerns over the quality of the aggregate resource on-site
- Drinking water safety concerns / impact on wells
- Concerns about going below the water table
- Concerns over potential spills
- Concerns over the proposed hours of operation
- Concerns over phasing of extraction
- Concerns over setbacks and the need for fencing on-site, in addition to berms
- Keep the unique beauty of area intact
- Impacts on tourism and outdoor enthusiasts
- Noise impacts
- Impacts on air quality and dust impacts
- Concerns over long-term risks
- Questions over Provincial Policy Statement consistency
- Questions over Official Plan conformity
- Consider the pit application within the context of the new Aggregate Resources Act: Blueprint for Change and the Niagara Escarpment Plan Review
- Growing number of gravel pits in the area, is there a need for more
- Negative impacts on surrounding property values

A summary of the verbal public comments from the public meeting has been included in the public meeting minutes.

Written comments were received from the following agencies.

**Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC)**

In a letter dated April 12, 2016, the NEC concluded;
“It is anticipated that the proposal will not have a substantial negative impact on the adjacent lands within the Niagara Escarpment Plan and it does not conflict with the purpose and objectives of the NEP [Niagara Escarpment Plan].”

Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM)

In an email dated March 24, 2016, the HSM noted that they have ‘no objection or opposition to the proposed development including the land re-designation and rezoning’.

Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON)

The Saugeen Ojibway Nation provided peer reviews of the cultural heritage, natural heritage and hydrogeological aspects of the proposed development. On the cultural heritage and hydrogeological aspects, the reviews noted that they were in general agreement with the findings of the proponent’s technical reports. On the natural heritage component, SON’s peer reviewer noted that they focused on the deer wintering yard aspects of the proposed pit. They noted that ‘it is unlikely to have negative impacts on the local deer population, but also noted that their review was not fully informed by SON’s traditional knowledge in the area.’

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA)

A number of submissions were received from the GSCA, who initially raised concerns with respect to these applications. Most recently in a letter dated January 29, 2018 the GSCA noted that ‘MNRF has now concluded that the proposed pit is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). They further noted that there will be an overall increase in the total woodland area on the site. GSCA no longer have an objection to the proposal.’

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)

The MNRF submitted multiple pieces of correspondence on the applications, but most recently in an email dated November 27, 2017 MNRF commented;

“Provincial policy supports a comprehensive and integrated approach when addressing matters of provincial interest. The PPS recognizes the interim nature of mineral aggregate resource extraction, where progressive and final rehabilitation of sites are required to accommodate compatible land uses. Further to MNRF’s letter of June 26, 2017, the Ministry has considered policy 2.1.5 of the Provincial Policy Statement and is satisfied that the removal of a small portion of the significant woodland using a phased approach will not result in a negative impact based on the mitigation and rehabilitation plan in the most recent draft site plan. Conversely, this approach will result in an overall net increase in total woodland area and establish a defined wildlife corridor that serves as a connection to the woodland to the north.”

The MNRF’s June 26th letter confirmed they had no further technical concerns with respect to the pit.

Town of The Blue Mountains

In a letter dated January 31, 2018 Town of The Blue Mountains staff noted

“Please be advised that the Town of The Blue Mountains has no objection to proposed amendment to the County Official Plan to permit the expansion of the gravel operation
onto the subject lands. The Town is currently preparing the staff report regarding the Local Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment. Council will have an opportunity to review and decide on these applications at an upcoming meeting, following the County’s decision on this matter.”

Earlier on in the application review process, Town staff determined that a haul route agreement is not required for this pit expansion. Measures have also been taken through the buffer zone, to have the trees act as a living snow fence to help with snow drifting on the road.

It should be noted that the above comments are staff comments only, and Town Council has not yet rendered a position on the matter.

Analysis of Planning Issues

In rendering decisions, planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial interest under the Planning Act and be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Decisions within the County must also conform to the County of Grey Official Plan and any local official plans or Provincial plans in force and effect. In this case, the Town of The Blue Mountains does have a local official plan, and a comprehensive zoning by-law. County staff will defer to Town staff for a detailed analysis of the Town’s Plan. The subject lands are not within the Niagara Escarpment Plan, but are adjacent to the Plan area.

Provincial Legislation - The Planning Act

Section 2 of the Planning Act provides matters of provincial interest which planning authorities must have regard for in rendering any decision under the Act. Most notable to this proposed official plan amendment are the following clauses, with some staff comments below.

(a) the protection of ecological systems, including natural areas, features and functions,

The County Plan maps a pocket of Significant Woodlands on the southeast corner of the subject lands. The Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan also maps these Woodlands as a Deer Wintering Yard. Some Butternut trees, an endangered species, were also located within the Woodlands.

A Natural Environment Technical Report was completed for the proposed pit. This report made recommendations for how the property will be cleared, extracted and ultimately rehabilitated in accordance with Provincial legislation and local policy. Butternut compensation plantings will be required and a total of 4.6 hectares of trees will be replanted on-site; an increase from the existing forest cover. Edge management plans along the edge of the woodlands will be required, and the treed setbacks to the south have been increased to 30 metres from the proposed 15 metres. Removal of vegetation will also consider both bird and bat nesting seasons. Both the GSCA and MNRF have signed off on the proposal from a natural heritage perspective.

(b) the protection of agricultural resources of the Province,

The subject property is designated as Rural on Schedule A to the County Official Plan. The subject lands would not be considered high priority for agricultural protection based on their size
(approximately 9 hectares available for agricultural production), surrounding land uses, and class 3 soils. While the County does map classes 1-3 soils as Agricultural soils, these are only done in larger pockets of contiguous lands.

Based on the existing and proposed pit expansion being below the water table, rehabilitation back to an agricultural end use will not be feasible. The rehabilitation will include a man-made pond and naturalized areas. Provincial and local policy consider this an acceptable rehabilitation plan.

(c) the conservation and management of natural resources and the mineral resource base;

Only a very small portion of the subject property is designated as ‘Aggregate Resource Area’ on Schedule B to the County Official Plan (see the orange areas on Map 3 below). The purple areas on Map 3 show the existing licensed gravel pits. The proponent has explored the resource on the expansion portions of the property, and found it to be sufficient for road construction. The resource is primarily comprised of granular B material, with some ability to produce granular A. Extraction is proposed for 10.3 hectares of the property, both within and outside of the current mapped Aggregate Resource Area boundaries.

Map 3 – Aggregate Resource Areas on the Subject Lands

(f) the adequate provision and efficient use of communication, transportation, sewage and water services and waste management systems;

The provision of effective water, wastewater, and communication systems has not been questioned for the proposed pit. The proposed pit will not be a heavy water or wastewater user, and should have no impact on communication infrastructure.
A number of concerns on the proposed pit, related to the traffic and road safety concerns have been raised. There was a Traffic Impact Study completed for the pit expansion that concluded that the existing entrance and haul route were sufficient to meet the needs of the pit expansion from a traffic and safety perspective. The entrance from the existing pit will be used for the pit expansion area, via an internal haul route.

The existing pit is licensed to extract 150,000 tonnes annually. Should the proposed expansion be granted, the cumulative total of the current pit, and the proposed pit expansion will remain at 150,000 tonnes per year. As a result, local traffic levels will not increase from the proposed pit expansion. Permitting the pit expansion will however extend the lifespan of the pit, with an estimated resource of 2.7 million tonnes in the expanded area.

As noted above Town staff have not asked for a haul route agreement, as the pit traffic will not increase. Measures will be taken on the operational plan to mitigate existing snow drifting impacts on the road.

A number of concerns were raised with respect to road safety and potential conflicts with cyclists on local roads. As noted above truck traffic will not increase as a result of the pit. Based on the Traffic Impact Study and the Town’s review, further upgrades to these roads have not been requested at this time. Signage and education with respect to all parties ‘sharing the road’ would be positive steps to ensuring safety for all road users in this area of the Town.

(k) the adequate provision of employment opportunities,

The proposed development would provide some continued employment, but it would not be considered a major employment generator. The proposed pit would support construction and growth across the County, as other pits currently do.

(o) the protection of public health and safety,

There have been a number of studies prepared in support of the application in order to ensure that the proposal meets Provincial, County and Township standards for the establishment of mineral aggregate operations. Response submissions were also prepared in response to specific concerns from neighbours living in this part of the Town. The closest dwelling to the proposed pit expansion is approximately 400 metres away.

A noise study was completed for the proposed pit expansion to ensure the operations meet provincial standards for noise emissions. Recommendations of the study include;

- hours of operation limitations,
- an acoustical audit once operations are underway to ensure the actual noise meets the predicted noise of the study, and
- the requirement for a future noise study, should any vacant residential lands be built upon

Berming is also being proposed around portions of the site, which should add both visual and acoustic screening.

County staff are satisfied that the proposed pit will adequately meet Provincial and local standards with respect to the establishment of mineral aggregate operations.

(p) the appropriate location of growth and development.
Unlike some other land uses, aggregate development has to locate where the resource is available, and should be permitted as close to market as possible. Through the supporting reports the applicant has demonstrated that the proposal will not unduly impact agriculture, the natural environment, or neighbouring land uses beyond the Provincial standards.

Subject to appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures on the license, the proposed official plan amendment has regard for matters of Provincial interest under the Planning Act.

**Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014)**

Section 2.1 of the PPS deals with natural heritage systems and features. This item has already been addressed under the discussion on the Planning Act.

Section 2.3 of the PPS contains policies on the permitted uses in prime agricultural areas. Section 2.3.6.1 of the PPS states;

“Planning authorities may only permit non-agricultural uses in prime agricultural areas for:

a) extraction of minerals, petroleum resources and mineral aggregate resources, in accordance with policies 2.4 and 2.5;”

Section 2.5.4.1 of the PPS states;

“In prime agricultural areas, on prime agricultural land, extraction of mineral aggregate resources is permitted as an interim use provided that the site will be rehabilitated back to an agricultural condition. Complete rehabilitation to an agricultural condition is not required if:

a) outside of a specialty crop area, there is a substantial quantity of mineral aggregate resources below the water table warranting extraction, or the depth of planned extraction in a quarry makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible;”

Although the subject lands are not within a prime agricultural area, this section of the PPS provides for the most prescriptive tests for permitting extractive uses (i.e. more detailed than the policy tests applied to a rural area). The proposed pit expansion would meet the above-noted tests, in that land is being removed from agricultural production for extraction, and because it will be below the water table, it will not be rehabilitated back to an agricultural end use.

Section 1.1.5.2 of the PPS notes; “On rural lands located in municipalities, permitted uses are:

a) the management or use of resources;” The PPS considers aggregate extraction within rural and agricultural areas of the Province.

Section 2.5.2.1 of the PPS notes that;

“As much of the mineral aggregate resources as is realistically possible shall be made available as close to markets as possible.

Demonstration of need for mineral aggregate resources, including any type of supply/demand analysis, shall not be required, notwithstanding the availability,
As a result, the County cannot consider the test of need when siting aggregate operations, regardless of the fact that there may be other operations within this part of the County.

Section 2.2 of the PPS provides for the protection of the Province’s water resources. Being a below the water table pit expansion, a Hydrogeological Assessment was completed in support of the proposal. This assessment reviewed the private wells in the area, which are drilled wells, with the exception of one dug well. These drilled wells get their water from a confined bedrock source. Although the pit will be below the water table, water will not be pumped out of the pit, as the pit floor will not be below the bedrock. The proposed pit expansion will also require a monitoring program using three on-site wells, and three wells within the existing Gibraltar pit. Similar to the existing pit, a well interference and response protocol is also going to be required. Within this protocol, the operator may be required to replace local water resources (wells) on a temporary or permanent basis, if the pit is found to be the cause of the water disruption. Reporting is required to MNRF and MOECC in the event of a water complaint regarding water quality or quantity. As noted above, the SON also had a hydrogeologist peer review the Hydrogeological Assessment, and this peer reviewer agreed with the conclusions of the proponent’s hydrogeologist.

Section 2.6 of the PPS requires significant built, cultural and archaeological resources to be conserved. The applicant has completed a Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment for the subject property. The recommendations of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment concluded that there was “no evidence of the existence of significant prehistoric or historic archaeological/heritage resources found within the confines of the study area.” Notes have however been added to the site plans, should any deeply buried archaeological material be found. In addition, the SON and HSM have also noted they have no further concerns with cultural heritage aspects of the proposed pit.

Subject to mitigation and monitoring measures on the license, the proposed official plan amendment is generally consistent with the PPS.

**County of Grey Official Plan**

All new development proposals within the County must conform to the purposes and policies of the Official Plan. The requirements for official plan amendments are outlined in section 6.3 of the County Plan, while the detailed Rural policies are found at section 2.3 of the Plan. The subject lands would remain designated as Rural on Schedule A to the County Plan, but would be re-designated to Mineral Resource Extraction with Exceptions on Schedule B to the Plan.

Within the County Official Plan Section 6.3 sets out criteria for amending the County Plan. Although subsection (a) requires the County to consider “the need for the proposed change”, it is clear under the PPS that the test of need can no longer be required when considering aggregate operations. The impact on other policies of the Plan, and the County’s objectives has been addressed through the materials provided, and is similar to justification provided on other pit applications.

As noted above, the subject lands are currently designated as Rural on Schedule A to the County Plan. The County’s Rural designation would support both farm and resource extraction
uses on the subject lands. Small portions of the subject property are designated within the County’s Aggregate Resource Area mapping on Schedule B to the Plan. However, because the proposed extraction area extends beyond this mapped area, an official plan amendment is required. The Aggregate Resource Area mapping is meant to protect lands for future extraction purposes. Should the applications be approved, then the extraction could occur.

Under Section 2.7 of the County Plan, the County requirements are set out for the establishment of new mineral aggregate operations. The applicant pre-consulted with the County and has submitted the necessary reports and studies, and responded to concerns through response submissions. Mitigation, including berms, vegetated buffers, noise and water monitoring, and no increase in the annual extracted tonnage, beyond what exists today should help minimize impact on neighbours. While there will be some impacts to neighbours based on this proposed pit expansion, such impacts would appear to be within Provincial and local policy guidelines.

Section 2.7.3(1) of the Plan states:

“It shall be a policy of this Plan that an applicant who wishes to undertake a mineral aggregate operation other than a wayside pit and quarry must, if requested to do so by the local municipality, enter into a Development Agreement with the local municipality. The Agreement shall be entered into prior to local Council's enactment of the implementing Zoning By-law Amendment.

Such an Agreement may include:

(i) Capital arrangements regarding improvements beyond the boundary of the applicant’s land, as they may be required by reason of the operation of that extractive industry, e.g. widening and improving roads; and

(ii) Routes to be used by trucks carrying aggregate.”

As noted earlier in this report, Town staff are not requiring a haul route agreement, based on there not being an increase in annual extraction rates as a result of the expansion.

Section 5 of the County Plan deals with transportation matters, and it has been discussed above in the review of the Planning Act.

The proposed official plan amendment would generally conform to the goals and objectives of the County Official Plan provided the mitigation measures and monitoring attached to the license are implemented, as per the technical background studies.

The subject Official Plan Amendment application would appear to have regard for matters of Provincial Interest under the Planning Act; be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement; and conform to the goals and objectives of the County Official Plan, and can therefore be supported by County staff. Furthermore, Town of The Blue Mountains staff have not flagged any concerns with respect to the Town Official Plan.

Other Considerations beyond Legislation and Policy

One of the primary concerns for neighbours to the proposed pit was the potential for negative impact on their property values. Residents have raised concerns with respect to potential for
property value reduction. County staff have also seen information to suggest there is no impact on property values. In either case however, property values are not something a County Planner can consider under the existing legislative and policy framework. Although staff can certainly understand why this is of primary concern to any landowner, it is not something that staff can factor into our recommendations on development applications.

Similarly, impacts on tax rates within the County, or within a particular municipality, are not something that can be factored into recommendations on development applications. Staff acknowledge that new development can have impacts on property taxes, including increasing assessment, generating new employment, creating increased infrastructure needs, or in some cases decreasing assessment (e.g. allowing for a conservation easement on a piece of land). However, Planning staff cannot make recommendations based on what generates the most assessment growth. Throughout the development application process, and through legislated tools such as Development Charges, staff works to ensure that adequate infrastructure is in place to support development, with minimal impacts on the existing tax base.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

There are no anticipated legal considerations associated with the proposed official plan amendment, beyond those normally encountered in processing an amendment. Should the application be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board additional legal resources may be required. However, it should be noted that if County Council approves Amendment 135, and that decision is appealed, then the County would not be a party to the hearing, unless otherwise directed by Council to do so.

Financial and Resource Implications

There are no anticipated financial or staffing considerations associated with the proposed official plan amendment application, beyond those normally encountered in processing such applications. The County has collected the requisite application fees for this application.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Planning Staff
☒ External: Town of The Blue Mountains, required agencies under the Planning Act, and the public

Appendices and Attachments
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Executive Summary

The County of Grey Paramedic Service is committed to continuous improvements in performance and this is reflected in the response time targets that are developed and implemented annually. The County sets the response time performance targets in October for the upcoming calendar year. The County is required to report annually to the Ministry of Health by March 31st each year on the response time performance achieved under the previous year’s plan.

For the 2017 calendar year the County was under the response time targets set for CTAS 2 and Sudden Cardiac Arrest call types. This is the second year in a row that the County was under the response time target for CTAS 2 call types.

In 2017 the total patient call volume increased 9.8% with code 4 emergency calls increasing by 11.4%. The 2017 service volume for patient carrying calls now matches the number of calls being completed when the original response time targets were developed for the County in 2012. To meet response time targets in the setting of continual yearly increases in call volumes will require additional resources, changes in targets or system service delivery.

By maintaining balanced emergency coverage, reducing responses to non-emergency calls, spreading of resources from days to nights and incremental increases in staffing the service has
been able to reduce and maintain response times to code 4 emergency calls in the area of the 15 minute mark 90% of the time over the past 10 years.

The Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC) is embarking on a journey to enhance and modernize the province’s emergency health services (EHS) system. The province is investing in a new medical dispatch system that will help triage and prioritize 911 calls for paramedic services. Recent updates to the Ambulance Act will allow paramedics to assess patients and make decisions to manage those patients in new ways, under appropriate medical delegations and where deemed safe and appropriate to do so.

Background and Discussion

The County of Grey Paramedic Service is committed to continuous improvements in performance and this is reflected in the response time targets that are developed and implemented annually. This report provides the results of the County’s 2017 response time performance as well an additional analysis of response times by Lower Tier Municipality, increasing call volumes and the service’s response time performance over the past 10 years.

The County sets the response time performance targets each October for the upcoming calendar year. The County is required to report annually to the Ministry of Health by March 31st of each year on the response time performance achieved under the previous year’s plan. In 2012 the County determined the original response time performance targets based upon response times that the paramedic service was achieving at that time.

Percentile Response Time Measurement

An important measurement of how a paramedic system is performing is indicated in the time in which it responds to emergencies. The response time is measured from the time crew is first notified until the paramedic radios that they arrived at the scene of the emergency. A percentile response time measurement is the percentage of calls where paramedics arrive at the scene of an emergency in a specified time frame. For example if the response time performance plan was to arrive on scene within 15 minutes 90 % of the time and it was measured against 1000 calls, 900 calls would have to be under 15 minutes to meet the target.

Response Time Performance 2017

The 2017 response time performance for the County of Grey Paramedic Services is identified in the chart below. The chart also indicates an average of the yearly reported response times for the previous 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Type</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Response Time Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
<th>2017 Performance</th>
<th>5 Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudden Cardiac Arrest</td>
<td>Community Defibrillator or Paramedic Response</td>
<td>Six (6) minutes or less</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38.33%</td>
<td>46.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the 2017 calendar year the County was under the response time targets set for CTAS 2 and Sudden Cardiac Arrest call types. This is the second year in a row that the County was under the response time target for the CTAS 2 call type. In 2015 due to the previous above target performance the County improved the response time targets for arrival at CTAS 1 calls in 8 minutes from 50% to 60%. For CTAS 3 to 5 the response time commitment was also improved by reducing the time to respond from 30 minutes to 20 minutes 90% of the time.

**Challenge of Meeting Targets in Rural Ontario**

Across the Province call volumes for high priority life threatening calls (CTAS 1) make up a small portion of the overall call activity for paramedic services. Response to Sudden Cardiac Arrest and CTAS 1 calls make up less than 2% of the total call volumes performed by Grey County Paramedic Services. Provincial targets are designed for a 4 to 5 minute travel time to a sudden cardiac arrest call and a 6 to 7 minute travel time to a CTAS 1 call. The low population density and large geography makes it difficult to meet response time target criteria outside of the urban areas where the ambulances are located.

The following chart details the 2017 response time performance broken down by Lower Tier Municipalities within the County of Grey.
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<th>SCA 6 Min - 40%</th>
<th>CTAS 1 8 Min - 60%</th>
<th>CTAS 2 15 Min 90%</th>
<th>CTAS 3 20 Min 90%</th>
<th>CTAS 4 20 Min 90%</th>
<th>CTAS 5 20 Min 90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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It is recognized by staff that The Township of Chatsworth’s overall response times are consistently lower than the other Lower Tier Municipalities within the County. It is anticipated that the building of the new Chatsworth Base will help reduce response times however, the occupancy will not occur until the late summer of this year. The full realization of improved response times will occur in 2019. In the interim to help reduce response times the service will be performing mobile coverage in the Chatsworth area on weekends and holidays throughout the summer.

### Increasing Emergency Call Volumes

It is important to recognize that call volumes have been increasing at an average of 6.6% for code 3 and 4.9% for code 4 calls annually over the past 10 years. In 2012 the total volume for non-emergency and emergency calls peaked at a total of 11,372. Non-emergency call volumes at that time were 2,790. Since 2012 paramedic services has concentrated its ability to respond to emergency calls while reducing its ability to respond to non-emergency calls. In 2017 the non-emergency call volume was 323 while the emergency call volume was 11,030 for a total of 11,353 calls. In 2017 the total patient call volume increased 9.8% with code 4 emergency calls increasing by 11.4%. The 2017 service call volume now matches the number of calls when the original response time targets were developed for the County in 2012. To meet response time targets in the setting of continual yearly increases in call volumes will require additional resources, changes in targets or system service delivery.
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In 2004 when the County assumed the direct delivery of the paramedic service there were 12 ambulances on shift during weekdays, 9 ambulances on weekend days and 5 ambulances on nights. The response time reported to the Ministry of Health from September to December of that year was 17:00 minutes. To improve response times the service instituted guidelines for minimum emergency coverage and balanced emergency coverage. Over the years the service also reduced its ability to complete non-emergency calls and concentrated on its core responsibility of responding to emergency calls. In 2011 due to increasing call volume an additional 12 hour ambulance was added in The Town of The Blue Mountains on weekends and holidays during ski season. In 2013 an 8 hour per day ambulance was taken off of the Monday to Friday shift and with the addition of 2 FTE paramedics a 12 hour night ambulance was added to Dundalk. In 2015 an additional 8 hour per day ambulance was combined with two additional FTE paramedics to add an additional 12 hour night ambulance to Craigleith. Today there are 10 ambulances on shift during the day Monday to Friday, 9 ambulances on weekend days and 7 ambulances on nights. By maintaining balanced emergency coverage, reducing responses to non-emergency calls, spreading of resources from days to nights and incremental increases in staffing the service has been able to reduce and maintain response times to code 4 calls in the
Addressing Increasing Call Volumes and Response Time Performance

Enhancing Emergency Services Ontario

The Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC) is embarking on a journey to enhance and modernize the province’s emergency health services (EHS) system. The purpose is to improve and sustain quality coordinated care across the patient’s journey to accessing care.

The province is investing in a new medical dispatch system that will help triage and prioritize 911 calls for paramedic services. This new system is expected to be in place in the first site by March 2018. This system will better prioritize calls based on patient need and redirect low acuity patients to locations other than emergency departments in instances where it would be safe and appropriate to do so.

Recent updates to the Ambulance Act will allow paramedics to assess patients and make decisions to manage those patients in new ways, under appropriate medical delegations and where deemed safe and appropriate to do so. Options include providing some forms of treating and referring the patient to continuing care (e.g., primary, home and/or community-based) or releasing the patient, without the need for transport to the emergency department.

Consideration can also be given in the use of vehicles other than ambulances, for instance “emergency response vehicles”, for use by services to respond to low acuity calls in a Treat & Refer/Treat & Release model where patient transport is not deemed required. Previously,
Paramedics were bound by law to transport patients to hospital facilities only. Providing more flexibility will allow patients to receive the most appropriate care while reducing unnecessary trips to emergency departments. This approach will also assist in having ambulances available to respond to emergencies by not having their services tied up on low acuity calls.

Staffing Considerations

Once operational the Chatsworth base will be staffed utilizing a 12 hour shift from the Owen Sound base as well an 8 hour shift from the Durham base. This will allow for 124 hours of staffing at this location each week. To allow for full 24 hour coverage 7 days a week at the Chatsworth base it would require an additional 44 hours of staffing (4576 hours annually).

The community paramedic program is currently staffed 5 days a week on a 12 hour shift. The primary role of this position is to treat patients with chronic diseases within their home. If the community paramedic is the closest vehicle to an emergency call they will first respond in the capacity of a primary care paramedic until an ambulance arrives. Once the Chatsworth base is operational the community paramedic will work out of that base allowing for first response at the beginning and end of each shift. An option to increase first response coverage is staffing the community paramedic vehicle 7 days a week. Staff will continue to work with the Southwest LHIN to advocate for funding of the community paramedic program for 7 days a week coverage.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

Land Ambulance Response Time Standard Reg 257/00 Part VIII

Financial and Resource Implications

None

Relevant Consultation

☐ External:
☒ Internal: CAO, Finance

Appendices and Attachments

None
Executive Summary

Golden Town Residential Community is a non-profit housing provider that provides rent-g geared-to-income and market rent housing to 63 families and 46 seniors in Meaford. After over 30 years of providing affordable housing the Board and staff of this non-profit corporation are retiring in September of 2018 and have asked that the County take over ownership and operations of Golden Town.

The non-profit corporation is in good financial position and provides much needed rent-g geared-to-income housing. The transfer of the corporation’s assets to Grey County ensures the housing remains in the Grey County portfolio to count towards our required service delivery standards and provides opportunity for expanded services to tenants and the possibility of more affordable units for seniors in Meaford.

Background and Discussion

Golden Town Residential consists of three developments:
Golden Town Manor

Golden Town Manor is a federally funded building and has 18 one bedroom apartments and 3 two bedroom apartments. The 21 seniors’ only units were built in 1985 through a federal program. Of the 21 units, 15 are market rent units and six are rent-geared-to-income. This agreement is due to end in 2020 and Golden Town is no longer expected to provide rent-geared-to-income housing after the agreement expires.

Albert Place

Albert Place is a seniors’ only building consisting of 17 one bedroom apartments and 8 two bedroom apartments. This building was built through a Provincial program in 1991. The building is brick has an elevator and utilities are included. At this time only six units are rent-geared-to-income.

Victoria Village

Victoria Village consists of 63 family units of housing made up of 33 two bedroom townhouses and 30 three bedroom town houses known as Victoria Village. Victoria Village has a playground on site, a school within two blocks, coin laundry on site and a family resource centre modeled after Alpha Street Resource Centre. The townhouses are brick, no basement, electric heat and utilities are not included. All units are rent-geared-to-income.

Service Delivery Standards

Grey County has provincially set service delivery standards for the number of rent-geared-to-income housing units Grey County is to maintain. Grey County’s service delivery standard of 1251 units of housing includes Grey County Housing and Non Profit Housing Providers. For this reason and due to the need for affordable housing in Grey County, the Golden Town units are required to remain as social housing units.

Golden Town is still under an agreement with Grey County to provide rent-geared-to-income housing and therefore needs the County’s approval to proceed with any plans regarding the transfer or sale of the 109 units.

Overview of Golden Town Residential Community

Finance reviewed financial statements from December 2016. The audited statements show Golden Town to be in good financial position for capital investments and operating funds. Golden Town’s year end is December and is currently working on the 2017 audit. This audit will also be reviewed by finance staff once received.

Golden Town relies on a subsidy from Grey County in the amount of $637,320 for the 2017 year for all three complexes. The majority of the subsidy is levy dollars.

Facilities staff looked at the 2014 Building Condition Assessment, Golden Town’s capital expenditures and future plans and did a tour of all three sites and determined the buildings are well maintained. Golden Town has funds for the capital needs identified in the BCA’s and by staff for the next 10 years and beyond.
Options Explored for Golden Town

Currently Golden Town Residential Community is governed by a Board of Directors and has two staff, an office manager and a custodian. There are board members still on the board from the original build in 1985 and the office manager has been involved with the non-profit since 1985.

The Board of Directors did approach another non-profit to transfer ownership and operating of the non-profit but the proposal was declined as the non-profit is currently expanding. There is no other non-profit in Grey County that has the capacity to take on another 109 units of housing at this time. The Board of Directors then approached the County with the same proposal.

The County offered to assist Golden Town in recruiting and training a new board but there was no interest in this option.

Grey County is faced with two options for this non-profit. Grey County can take over ownership and day to day operations of Golden Town permanently or Grey County can take over temporary ownership of Golden Town and look to recruit and train a Board and staff.

If Grey County assumes ownership and operations, there is potential for savings as a full time custodian would be needed but not a project manager. Current staff positions would be absorbed into our current tenant services, facilities and administration.

A full time custodian would be needed at a cost of $78,000 for salary and benefits. Currently the County subsidizes $110,698 in salary and benefits to Golden Town so there are a potential savings of $32,698 to the County. There is also potential savings in insurance, snow removal, life safety systems and other contracted services as the units would be included in bulk pricing.

Golden Town has 35 market units some of which can be transferred to other Grey County Housing units to improve profitability of other buildings in our portfolio and increase the amount of rent-geared-to-income housing in Meaford. Currently Golden Town offers only 11 of the 33 seniors units as rent-geared-to-income. Meaford has a waitlist of 30 seniors waiting for housing.

There are benefits for the tenants as Grey County has access to community relations workers to assist with any needs to remain housed or age in place. Both seniors’ buildings are attached to the Meaford Long Term Care Centre. There may be future opportunity for partnerships for more affordable housing units.

If the County wishes not to become owners and operate these units, the County would still have to enter into ownership for at least a year until a Board and staff members can be recruited and trained. This would require at least a part time staff person for a year and extra legal fees. This option can also happen at any time if there are concerns with the ownership of Golden Town Residential Community. Other concerns with this option are that a new board could decide to sell or no longer provide rent geared to income housing with the seniors units once operating agreements end.

Housing is entering into a time of change and as housing providers come to the end of their mortgages in the next 2-10 years, housing providers will have a choice to remain housing providers or offer market rent units only. If a provider decides to continue offering affordable housing they must enter into an accreditation process in order to become part of a registry that will have access to funding. This will put many of our small non-profits at a disadvantage. Literature from the United Kingdom and Ireland that have implemented similar programs have
noted outcomes such as: some non-profits deciding to become for profit and smaller non-profits amalgamating with other small non-profits for economies of scale. Either way, Grey County is responsible for maintaining a service delivery standard of 1251 units of rent-geared-to-income housing.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

Notification of the transfer to the Province

Legal fees for transfer of asset

Financial and Resource Implications

Savings of $32,698 in staffing and potential savings in insurance, snow removal, life safety systems and other contracted services.

Operating and Capital funds added to County Portfolio for the maintenance and operating of Golden Town.

Golden Town has remaining mortgages on all three buildings with a principal amount of $3,719,117 as of the end of December 2017. Currently Grey County pays the mortgages as part of the subsidy flowed to Golden Town Residential Community. This liability will therefore will also need to be transferred and assumed by the County. Currently non-profit mortgages are bundled with the Province for low interest rate mortgages. This option is available for Grey County as well.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Finance, Facilities Staff in Housing
☒ External: Town of Meaford
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Lower Tier(s) Affected: County-wide initiative
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Recommendation

1. That Report HDR-CW-04-18 regarding a proposed Investment Plan for Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative for 2018-19 be received; and

2. That Grey County Council approves the Investment Plan for the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative and approves the 2018-19 funding to be expensed by March 31, 2019; and

3. That Grey County extends its agreement with Owen Sound and Area Family YMCA for funding for the Housing Prevention Program for 2018-2020.

Executive Summary

The County receives funds from the Province through the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative to deliver local homelessness and homelessness prevention programs. This report provides details on the programs and services for 2018-2019.

The County provides a number of programs such as Sustainable Housing Benefit, Emergency Housing and outreach for people experiencing homelessness. The investment plan for programs requires approval from council.

An agreement for service delivery with the Owen Sound and Area Family YMCA is due for renewal from 2018-2020. The Y provides emergency housing, homelessness prevention services and a homelessness outreach worker.

Background and Discussion
The Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) aims to prevent, address and reduce homelessness by improving access to adequate, suitable and affordable housing. Under CHPI, Service Managers have the flexibility to use funding to meet local needs and priorities within the guidelines set by the Province. To meet local needs the following programs are planned over the next year.

**Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative 2018-2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Annual Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing with Related Supports</td>
<td>620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Housing Benefit</td>
<td>580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Grey Bruce Outreach Worker</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Homeless Prevention Program</td>
<td>136,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Housing Program</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Outreach Worker</td>
<td>70,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>47,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Enhancement Program</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>181,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CHPI Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,816,494</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing with Supports**

Housing subsidized under the former Domiciliary Hostel program is included in this category. The County of Grey continues to fund Ayton Residential Lodge, Kent Residential Homes, Inglewood Villa, and Second Avenue Lodge. The Housing with Supports operators invoice Grey County monthly for the number residents using this service. Hostel inspections and resident income are verified annually. This program provides housing with supports for an average of 70 residents of Grey County per month.

**Sustainable Housing Benefit**

The Sustainable Housing Benefit (SHB) provides financial aid to individuals at risk of homelessness or currently homeless to find or maintain affordable housing. Accommodation costs must be sustainable to qualify for this benefit. SHB provided financial assistance in the amount of $457,248 to 713 households in 2017. SHB covers last month’s rent, utility arrears and rental arrears.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of households</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Utility Arrears &amp; Deposits</td>
<td>$152,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Rental Arrears</td>
<td>$73,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Last Month’s Rent</td>
<td>$211,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hope Grey Bruce Outreach Program

This is the second year of this pilot project. The pilot aims to offer one-on-one intensive services and group sessions for tenants to ensure they remain housed. The project also provides education sessions and support to staff of Grey County Housing and other nonprofit housing providers on mental health and housing. The program has been very successful in Owen Sound and is extending to buildings outside Owen Sound in 2018.

Y Homelessness Prevention Program

The County of Grey partners with Y Housing to provide services and supports to vulnerable or at risk clients with immediate housing needs. The Y Homelessness Prevention Program includes a resource centre for clients and assistance with finding or maintaining affordable housing.

Service Delivery Agreement

Attached to this report is an agreement to continue services with Y housing for homelessness prevention services and the addition of a homelessness outreach worker. The agreement is for two years, as CHPI funds are only know for the next two years.

Y Emergency Housing Program

Since 2008, Grey County has partnered with the Family Y Owen Sound Grey Bruce for the provision of emergency shelter services. The Y finds suitable lodgings for those who find themselves without shelter for the night. The Y also partners with other community services such as Safe n Sound for the delivery of this service. This service provided 950 nights of accommodation in 2017.

Homelessness Outreach Worker

New to Grey County this year is a Homelessness Outreach Worker. This position will be necessary as Grey County has its first homelessness enumeration this year. Grey County is working with local homelessness prevention services to implement a homelessness outreach system. Grey County will introduce a by-name list as part of its homelessness enumeration. A homelessness outreach worker will work with people identified on the list and other community partners to provide wrap around services for permanent housing. Grey County will work with other community partners to look at services required to prevent and provide housing for this priority population.
Transitional Housing

Funds are set aside to explore opportunities with Grey Bruce Health Services and local non-profits to provide transitional housing for people discharged from hospital. People accessing emergency housing program are reporting as experiencing homelessness following transition from a provincially funded institution.

Community Enhancement Program

CHPI funds support local nonprofit initiatives to provide services for those at risk of homelessness or experiencing homelessness through the Community Enhancement Funds. Grey County has a large geographic area and accessing programs which are offered only in centralized areas is sometimes difficult for individuals. Often these individuals rely on local organizations such as churches, nonprofits and volunteer groups. Local initiatives supply meals, transportation, good food box, heating funds, furnishings and other needs. These funds strengthen local initiatives.

Links to 10 Year Housing and Homelessness Plan

The CHPI funding assists Grey County in providing services to fulfill goals of the Grey County 10 Year Housing and Homelessness Plan. The plan identifies four key strategic areas:

- Sustain and Create Affordable Housing
- Homelessness Prevention
- Transitional Housing
- Service Coordination and Collaboration

Related goals include:

- Initiate a system to identify individuals experiencing homelessness and focus on supports for those individuals with long term homelessness
- Work with community partners to enhance existing support services through case management and focused collaboration
- Subsidies to maintain and access sustainable housing
- Enhance and support supportive housing

Financial and Resource Implications

$1,816,494 in provincial funding provided to the County of Grey for the fiscal year of April 2018 to March 2019. This program has a neutral impact on the County, as no levy funds are required. There is the ability to move funds between programs to ensure maximum usage

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal:

☒ External:
Appendices and Attachments
Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative Agreement
THIS AGREEMENT made this _______ day of _____________________, 2018
between:

The Corporation of the County of Grey

A municipality within the meaning of the Municipal Act, 2001 (hereinafter referred to in this Agreement as “the County”),

-And-

“Y.M.C.A. of Owen Sound Grey-Bruce

(hereinafter referred to in this Agreement as “YMCA”

WHEREAS the Ministry of Housing provides Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) funding to the County for housing support, homelessness prevention and emergency shelter services;

AND WHEREAS in the past, the County has had an agreement with the YMCA for the delivery of its Housing Support Program, including homelessness prevention, since September 1999, and an agreement for the delivery of emergency Shelter Services since January 2008;

AND WHEREAS the County is desirous that the YMCA shall continue to provide housing support, homelessness prevention and emergency shelter services;

NOW THEREFORE in consideration of the mutual covenants herein set out, the County and the YMCA each agree as follows:

1.0 Definitions

In this Agreement:

1.1 “CHPI” means the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative. The intent of the CHPI is to address and decrease homelessness through improved access to satisfactory, appropriate, and affordable housing that is connected to adaptable support services based on individual client and household needs. The CHPI provides funding for a number of provincial homelessness-related programs, including the Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program and the Emergency Hostel (Emergency Shelter) Services previously funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services under a single policy and accountability framework. CHPI is funded and administered by the Ministry of Housing.

1.2 “Housing and Homelessness Plan” means a 10 year plan that the County is required to have under the Housing Services Act, 2011, and the Ontario Housing Policy Statement for January 1 2014. The County’s Plan encompasses the entire housing continuum including homelessness prevention, transitional and emergency housing, supportive housing, rent
geared to income housing, private rental housing and affordable home ownership.

1.3 Housing Support Program means various services and supports provided through the Ministry of Housing to assist vulnerable or at-risk clients with immediate relief or assistance to obtain housing including information, referral and coordination with other community services. For further information, refer to page 12 of this Agreement, within Schedule “A”.

1.4 “MoH” means the Ontario Ministry of Housing.

1.5 “Operators” means organizations with the resources to provide at least some of the “Services”.

1.6 The “Services” means housing support, homelessness prevention, and emergency shelter services, as further described in Schedule “A”, attached hereto.

1.7 “Schedule “A”” means the appending document entitled “Provision of Housing Support, Homelessness Prevention, and Emergency Shelter Services under the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative” which shall assist in governing how the Services are provided, providing Ontario CHPI program guidelines, principles, objectives and outcomes as well as setting out financial and performance measurement, operational cost reporting requirements and provision of service definitions.

2.0 Term

2.1 This Agreement shall be effective as of January 1, 2018, and run for a period of two (2) years and 3 months until March 31, 2020 (the “Term”).

3.0 Responsibilities of the YMCA

3.1 The YMCA shall provide the Services in accordance with the Ontario CHPI program guidelines, principles, objectives and outcomes as described in the attached Schedule “A”. It is recognized that the content and format of Schedule ‘A’ may change from time to time, and the County shall notify the YMCA of any such changes. The parties agree that such changes shall not necessitate that a new agreement be negotiated.

3.2 The YMCA agrees to provide financial and performance measurement reports to the County in the format and frequency described in the attached Schedule “A” for the Services.

3.3 The YMCA shall maintain records of operational costs and shall supply the same to the County within 30 days of the end of the Term of this Agreement, pursuant to Schedule “A”.
3.4 The YMCA shall agree to and cooperate with a program review audit at the conclusion of the agreement term to be completed by the County, at the sole discretion of the County. Such audit would be with respect to the January 1 2018 – March 31 2020 provision of the Services under this Agreement.

3.5 The YMCA shall provide the Services in accordance with all Municipal, Provincial and Federal laws.

3.6 The YMCA shall ensure that Operators contracted pursuant to Section 5.2 adhere to the terms of this Agreement.

4.0 Responsibilities of the County

4.1 The County shall provide funding to the YMCA for the Services as per Schedule “A”.

4.2 At the discretion of the County, it may perform a program review audit at the conclusion of the agreement term as referred to in Section 3.4.

5.0 Acknowledgement of Other Operators

5.1 The County may enter into similar agreements with Operators other than the YMCA to provide the Services if in the opinion of the County such agreements are needed to provide the Services to the community.

5.2 The YMCA may enter into service agreements with other Operators to provide the Services after business hours and on weekends when the YMCA offices have closed. The YMCA shall ensure that such Operators will provide the Services subject to the conditions of this Agreement and the Attached Schedule “A”.

6.0 Financial Arrangements

6.1 The accountable advance of $1,000 provided in January 2008 to the YMCA by the County with the intended use of initiating the (former) emergency shelter service shall be carried forward for the continuation of the Services under the CHPI funding and as described in the attached Schedule “A”.

6.2 The County is only obligated to provide funding to the YMCA as established in the attached Schedule “A”. The YMCA is solely responsible for any existing or future capital or operating losses incurred by the YMCA as a result of providing the Services.

7.0 Indemnification
7.1 The YMCA shall indemnify and hold harmless the County, its officers, elected officials and employees from and against any and all liabilities, claims, demands, losses, expenses, costs, damages, actions, suits, or other proceedings by whomsoever made, directly or indirectly arising out of this Agreement attributable to bodily injury, sickness, disease or death or to damage to or destruction of tangible property caused by any acts or omissions of the YMCA, its officers, agents, servants, employees, customers, invitees, or licensees, and as a result of activities under this Agreement.

8.0 Insurance

8.1 The YMCA shall, at its expense, obtain and keep in force during the term of this Agreement, Commercial General Liability Insurance satisfactory to the County. Proof of this insurance shall be provided to the County prior to execution of this Agreement and upon all policy renewal periods within the Term of this Agreement, including the following underwritten by an insurer licensed to conduct business in the Province of Ontario:

   a) A limit of liability of not less than $5,000,000/occurrence;
   b) The County shall be named as an additional insured;
   c) The policy shall contain a provision for cross liability in respect of the named insured;
   d) Non-owned automobile coverage with a limit of at least $2,000,000 including contractual non-owned coverage;
   e) Products and completed operation coverage (Broad Form), and with an aggregate limit not less than $5,000,000;
   f) Abuse coverage in an amount not less than $2,000,000;
   g) 30 days prior notice of an alteration, cancellation or material change in policy terms which reduces coverage shall be given in writing to the County.

9.0 Health and Safety/WSIB

9.1 The YMCA confirms that it has Health and Safety policies and procedures in place with respect to the performance of the specific services which it is responsible to perform under this Agreement, and agrees to provide those policies and procedures to the County upon request.

9.2 The YMCA is responsible for all costs associated with its workplace accidents and all premiums or assessments owing to the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board (WSIB), or insurance company if applicable for its own employees. The YMCA shall, throughout the Term of the Agreement, provide
the County with evidence of coverage for itself, its employees, subcontractors and subcontractors’ employees under the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act or insurance policy.

9.3 The YMCA shall comply with the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* (Ontario), the *Workplace Safety and Insurance Act* (Ontario), the *Human Rights Act* (Ontario), and applicable regulations under such legislation as well as the County’s workplace health and safety policies and all other legal obligations with respect to worker health, safety and treatment and the YMCA hereby agrees to indemnify and hold the County, its elected officials, officers, employees, representatives and agents harmless from and against any and all liabilities, claims, demands, suits, losses, fines, surcharges, damages, costs and expenses (including legal fees and disbursements) arising out of the YMCA’s failure to comply with such laws, regulations, policies and obligations.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**

9.4 All information provided to the YMCA by the County and all information provided to the County by the YMCA is provided on a confidential basis for the purpose of administering the programs outlined in Schedule “A”.

9.5 The YMCA will treat as confidential and will not, without the prior permission of the County, publish, release, disclose or permit to be published, released or disclosed, either before or after the expiration of this Agreement, private or confidential information supplied to, obtained by, or which comes to the knowledge of the YMCA as a result of the Agreement except insofar as publication, release or disclosure is necessary, in the reasonable opinion of the YMCA, to enable the YMCA to fulfill its obligations under the Agreement, or as required or permitted by law.

9.6 The YMCA and the County acknowledge that any personal information that is provided for the purpose of creating records is given to the YMCA in confidence and is protected by applicable privacy legislation. The County undertakes that personal information in records delivered to it by the YMCA will be used for the limited purposes intended and allowable. The County further acknowledges that any personal information obtained from the YMCA for such purposes will be protected under the terms of applicable privacy legislation. Sections 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3 shall survive the termination of this Agreement.

**10.0 Termination**

10.1 Notwithstanding Section 2, in the event of a breach by the YMCA of any provision of this Agreement, the County may terminate this Agreement.
immediately and without provision of advance Notice. In such case, the YMCA shall return any unspent funds, including those described in Section 6.1.

10.2 In the event that the CHPI funding is discontinued by the Province before this Agreement is discharged, it is understood by both parties that this Agreement shall be terminated. Notice of such termination shall be provided by the County to the YMCA pursuant to Section 12.

11.0 Notice

11.1 Any notice required to be given, served or delivered must be in writing and sent to the other party at the address indicated below, or to such other address as may be designated by Notice provided by either party to the other.

For the County:

County Clerk
County of Grey Administration Building
595 9th Ave E
Owen Sound, ON N4K 3E3
Fax Number: 519-376-8998
Email: countyclerk@grey.ca

For the YMCA:

Attention: Sue Seifert
YMCA of Owen Sound Grey-Bruce
1450 1st Avenue West, Suite 4A
Owen Sound, ON N4K 6W2
Email Address: sseifert@ymcaowensound.on.ca

12.0 Force Majeure

12.1 Neither the County nor the YMCA shall be held responsible for any damage or delays as a result of war, invasions, insurrection, demonstrations, or as a result of decisions by civilian or military authorities, fire, flood, human health emergency, strikes and generally as a result of any event that is beyond the reasonable control of the County or the YMCA.

12.2 The County and the YMCA agree that in the event of a disaster or Force Majeure, they will both co-operate and the YMCA will make all reasonable efforts to provide temporary replacement service until permanent service is completely restored.
13.0 No Waivers

13.1 No waiver of any reach of this Agreement shall operate as a waiver of any similar, subsequent breach, nor of the breach of any other provision of this Agreement.

13.2 No provision of this Agreement shall be deemed to be waived and no breach excused, unless such waiver, or the consent excusing the breach, is in writing and signed by the party that is purported to have given such waiver or consent.

13.3 No delay or omission on the part of any party to this Agreement to avail itself of any right it may have under this Agreement shall operate as a waiver of any such right.

13.4 No waiver of failure to ensure any of the provisions of this Agreement shall in any way effect the validity of this Agreement or any part thereof.

14.0 Governing Law

14.1 This Agreement shall be governed by and construed and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the laws of Canada applicable therein. The parties hereby irrevocably attorn to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of Ontario with respect to any matter arising under or related to this Agreement.

15.0 Severability

15.1 Each of the provisions contained in this Agreement is distinct and severable and a declaration of invalidity or unenforceability of any such provision or part thereof by a court of competent jurisdiction shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provision hereof, which shall remain in full force and effect.

16.0 Entire Agreement

16.1 This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the provision of the Services and supersedes all prior agreements, understandings, negotiations and discussions, whether written or oral. There are no conditions, covenants, agreements, representations, warranties or other provisions, express or implied, collateral, statutory or otherwise, relating to the provision of the Services, except as provided in this Agreement and the attached Schedule “A”.
17.0 Amendment of Agreement

17.1 None of the terms, conditions or provisions of this Agreement shall be held to have been changed, waived, varied, modified or altered by any act of statement of either party, their respective agents, servants or employees unless done so in writing signed by both parties.

18.0 Successors and Assigns

18.1 This Agreement shall enure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties hereto and their respective successors and permitted assigns.

18.2 Neither party may assign all or any part of this Agreement without the written approval of the other party.

19.0 No Partnership

Nothing in this Agreement gives rise to a partnership or joint venture between the County and the YMCA or to an employment relationship between the County and the employees or volunteers of the YMCA in the provision of service under this Agreement.

20.0 Dispute Resolution

20.1 A dispute between the parties relating to the interpretation or implementation of this Agreement will be addressed though good faith negotiation, with or without the assistance of a mediator. The parties agree that in the event that they are not able to reach a resolution of all the matters in dispute after mediation, then the matters remaining in dispute will be finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Arbitrations Act.

20.2 The location for any such arbitration hearing will be within the County of Grey at a location to be determined by the County.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF THE PARTIES hereunto attested by the hands of the proper officers duly authorized in that behalf as of the day and year first written above.

The Corporation of the County of Grey

________________________________________
WARDEN: Stewart Halliday

________________________________________
DEPUTY CLERK: Heather Morrison
Y.M.C.A. Of Owen Sound Grey-Bruce

_____________________________
Gayle Graham, C.E.O.

I/We Have The Authority To Bind The YMCA
Schedule “A”

Provision of Housing Support, Homelessness Prevention, and Emergency Shelter Services under the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative

Introduction

The intent of the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) is to address and decrease homelessness through improved access to satisfactory, appropriate, and affordable housing that is connected to adaptable support services based on individual client and household needs.

The CHPI provides funding for a number of provincial homelessness-related programs, including the former Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program (CHPP) and the emergency Hostel (Emergency Shelter) services previously funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) under a single policy and accountability framework. CHPI is funded and administered by the Ministry of Housing (MOH).

CHPI Vision

The CHPI vision is to transition from reactive responses to homelessness to a proactive and permanent service delivery model. The following service principles have been established to meet that vision:

Housing First: Housed people are better able to move forward in their lives than homeless people. Therefore, people who are homeless are to be assisted to obtain and maintain permanent and affordable housing; those at risk of homelessness are to be assisted to remain housed.

People-Centered: Housing services and supports are to be based on a people-centered approach focusing on positive results for individuals and families which are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Partnership Based: Strong partnerships between service providers, local government housing providers and those who require housing and homelessness related supports contribute to healthy, sustainable, and inclusive communities.

Locally Driven: Housing and homelessness services must be relevant to the community and based on peoples’ needs.

Inclusive: Services are to reflect the needs, experiences and input of those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Fiscal Responsibility: Housing and homelessness services are to meet the intended purpose and outcomes of the program considering the local economy as well as being efficient and effective.

Outcome-Focused: Services are to be provided with the outcome of the affected individual and family in mind; such parties are to be informed of these service principles.

CHPI Outcomes
The two key outcomes of CHPI which will measure performance and ensure accountability are:

- People experiencing homelessness obtain and retain housing; and
- People at risk of homelessness remain housed.

**CHPI Glossary of Terms**

**At Risk of Homelessness:** Includes individuals and families that have difficulty maintaining appropriate housing that is safe, adequate, affordable and secure. Housing security can be at risk due to: low income, health issues/illness (including mental illness), substance abuse, incarceration or legal issues, hospitalization, family breakdown, violence, discrimination, inadequate and/or unsafe housing.

**Emergency Shelter:** Short-term accommodation intended for 30 days or less for individuals experiencing homelessness. Emergency shelter services provide sleeping arrangements with varying levels of support to individuals.

**Fiscal Year:** The provincial fiscal year spans from April 1 of one year to March 31 of the following year.

**Homelessness:** The condition of being without long-term accommodation.

**Household:** Applies to a person or group of persons who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada or abroad. The dwelling may be either a collective dwelling or a private dwelling. The household may consist of a family group such as a census family, or two or more families sharing a dwelling or a person living alone.

**Imminent Risk:** Risk of losing housing within the month.

**Long-Term Housing:** Housing that is available in the longer term; e.g. houses, apartments, boarding and lodging, housing with supports. It does not include transitional housing.

**Service Manager:** Describes Services Managers as designated under the Housing Services Act, 2011.

**Street Homelessness:** People living in public or private spaces without consent or contract and places not intended for habitation.

**Transitional Housing:** Housing that is provided for less than one year, which includes the provision of on- or off-site support services to help individuals move towards independence and self-sufficiency.

**CHPI Housing and Homelessness Services**

1. **Emergency Shelter Solutions** include services and supports that provide relief or protect people who are homeless or at risk of imminent risk of homelessness.
2. **Homelessness Prevention** includes services that assist households at risk of homelessness to retain their housing, including landlord mediation/assistance, re-housing, eviction diversion, etc.

Other Housing Services and Supports include various services and supports to assist vulnerable or at-risk clients with immediate relief or assistance to obtain housing including information, referral and coordination with other community services and programs which may
assist in preventing homelessness (e.g. energy assistance, income support, substance abuse, mental health, etc. programs).

**Funding**

As per Section 6 of the Agreement, the CHPI funding for housing support, homelessness prevention, and emergency shelter services is provided to the County by the Ministry of Housing. Funding for housing support and homelessness prevention services shall be flowed from the county to the YMCA in monthly payments. Monthly financial statements shall be forwarded to the County within 15 days of the ending of each month by the YMCA. Funding for emergency shelter services shall continue to be issued on a reimbursement basis upon receipt of a monthly invoice. Each spring the County shall provide a funding letter to the YMCA to advise them of the funding amount for the next fiscal year based on the CHPI funding to be received from the Ministry of Housing. An annual Cost of Living (COL) increase shall be considered. This funding shall be subject to final approval of the budget by Grey County Council.

**CHPI Performance Indicators**

The CHPI requires reporting on the two program outcomes. The extent to which:

- People experiencing homelessness obtain and retain housing; and
- People at risk of homelessness remain housed.

The YMCA shall provide the performance measurement data to the County within 15 days of the end of each month in the following 2 outcome measurement formats:

**Outcome #1**: People experiencing homelessness obtain and retain housing. This category is used to report the number of households experiencing homelessness who were supported in obtaining housing (e.g. moving people to more stable housing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street to Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>Number of households that have moved from street to emergency shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street to Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Number of households that have moved from street to transitional housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street to Long-Term Housing</td>
<td>Number of households that have moved from street to long-term housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter to Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Number of households that have moved from emergency shelters to transitional housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter to Long-Term Housing</td>
<td>Number of households that have moved from emergency shelters to long-term housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing to Long-Term Housing</td>
<td>Number of households that have moved from transitional housing to long-term housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports and Services</td>
<td>Number of supports or services provided to households experiencing homelessness that contribute to a positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome #2: People at risk of homelessness remain housed. This category is to be used to report the interventions aimed at housing loss prevention, retention and to re-house households at risk of homelessness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(households experiencing homelessness)</td>
<td>change in housing status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Loss Prevention</td>
<td>Number of households at imminent risk of homelessness that are stabilized (includes assistance with rental and energy arrears)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Retention</td>
<td>Number of households that were successful in retaining their housing at three –month follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Housing to Long-Term Housing</td>
<td>Number of households living in long-term housing that are at risk of homelessness that are supported in accessing alternative long-term housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports and Services (at risk households)</td>
<td>Number of supports or services provided to households at risk of homelessness that allow them to maintain or retain their housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

1. That the comments outlined in the Addendum to Staff Report PDR-CW-39-17 be provided to the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) in response to the revised draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for plan review and technical services that the SVCA circulated to the County and the watershed municipalities, and

2. That Council requests that the SVCA continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage comments for the County of Grey as part of its review of planning applications in order to maintain consistency with other conservation authorities and municipalities in Grey County, and

3. That when providing comments on natural hazards and natural heritage matters that the comments be provided in the context of Provincial Policy Statement as well as the County Official Plan, and local planning documents for all Planning Act applications, and

4. That Council supports the recommended revisions to the revised draft MoU and directs staff to circulate a copy of the Report and the revised draft MoU to the SVCA and the member municipalities within Grey County that are located within the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority watershed and to work with the SVCA to finalize an MoU for Council’s consideration.

Executive Summary

In July 2017, the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) circulated a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) that would govern the plan review and technical services
that SVCA would provide to municipalities within their watershed. A revised draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been prepared by SVCA which addresses some of the comments and concerns expressed previously in Staff Report PDR-CW-39-17. The revised draft MoU still does not include the option for SVCA to provide natural heritage comments on planning applications. SVCA staff have indicated that if a municipality wishes SVCA to provide these services that a motion be passed by Council that clearly indicates that the County/municipality wishes for these services to continue. SVCA staff have noted that the cost for this service will increase slightly and these costs have been reflected in the attached revised MoU under Appendix A – Schedule 3(a). It is recommended that SVCA continue to provide review and technical services for both natural hazard and natural heritage matters for all applications. County staff have suggested revisions to the revised MoU as attached to this Report which are recommended to be forwarded to SVCA for their consideration as well as forwarded to local municipalities within the SVCA watershed.

Background and Discussion

On July 5, 2017, the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) circulated a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) that would govern the plan review and technical services that SVCA would provide to municipalities within their watershed. The initial draft MoA indicated that SVCA would only provide comments on natural hazard matters and that they only wanted to be circulated on applications within the regulated/screening areas. Staff Report PDR-CW-39-17 identified some concerns and suggested revisions to the MoA to ensure consistency with planning review provided by conservation authorities throughout Grey County. Following Council’s approval of PDR-CW-39-17, a meeting was held with SVCA staff, County staff and staff from each member municipality within the SVCA watershed. At the meeting there was general consensus amongst the County and municipal staff of the importance for SVCA to continue to provide natural heritage review and technical services in order to be consistent with other conservation authorities and to avoid confusion as to which agency provides these services. There was also good discussion on the importance that the review and technical comments for natural hazards and natural heritage matters not only be reviewed in the context of the Provincial Policy Statement but also under the context of County/local planning documents (e.g. official plans, zoning by-laws, etc.). Based on the comments raised in PDR-CW-39-17 as well as the discuss at the meeting with SVCA and local municipal staff, it was recommended that a revised MoA be prepared and circulated to the municipalities for further review and comment.

A revised draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been circulated by SVCA. Some of the suggested revisions were incorporated into the revised draft MoU, however it still does not include the option for SVCA to provide natural heritage comments on planning applications. SVCA staff have indicated that if a municipality wishes SVCA to provide these services that a motion be passed by Council clearly indicating that the County/municipality wishes for these services to continue and then the SVCA Board will consider it. It is recommended that a motion be passed indicating the County’s desire for SVCA to continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage review for all applications. County staff are also recommending some further revisions to the revised MoU to assist with clarifying roles and responsibilities. The following is a summary of the recommended revisions identified in PDR-CW-39-17 and an update on whether these have been addressed within the revised MoU. A summary of the
suggested revisions to the revised MoU are also highlighted below and can be found in further
detail in the attached revised MoU.

1. Appendix A, Schedule 1 – it was recommended that this list reflects the
development/planning applications that the County will be circulating to the SVCA for
review and comment (i.e. Subdivisions, Condominiums, County Official Plans and
County Official Plan Amendments). This list has been revised by SVCA as
recommended. County staff continues to recommend that Minor Exemptions (clear-cut
permits) under the County’s Forest Management By-law be added to this list. The
current process for Minor Exemptions requires these to be circulated to conservation
authorities for review and comment. A suggested review fee has also been included in
Appendix A – Schedule 3(a) which can be discussed with SVCA. Previously it was
recommended that infrastructure projects (e.g. major works on County roads/trails
located within regulated/screening areas) be included on this list, however these are
captured under the current conservation authority regulations and permit review process
so there is less of a need to add these to the list.

2. It was previously recommended that additional wording be added to the MoU with
respect to making other arrangements to provide the application review and/or technical
review services (i.e. peer reviews). There may be times where a matter is beyond the
necessary resources or expertise of SVCA staff or where there is a difference in opinion
between the conservation authority and the applicant’s consultant which may require a
peer review. SVCA has added Section 2(b)(v) which address the comments raised
previously.

3. County staff previously recommended that clarification be included in the MoU regarding
pre-submission consultation including the importance of involving SVCA staff as part of
the pre-submission consultation process. It was also recommended that wording be
included to indicate that any pre-submission consultation fees required by SVCA be
collected by SVCA directly from the applicant. SVCA has included wording in section
2(c)(ix) to address these comments.

4. The one major change that was recommended in the previous MoA provided by SVCA
was to only provide comments on natural hazards within SVCA’s regulated area or
within SVCA’s screening area and that they only wanted to be circulated on applications
within these areas. This is a major departure from the current process as the County
and municipalities are required to circulate conservation authorities on all applications
within the conservation authority watershed as per the Planning Act. Conservation
authorities, including SVCA, also currently provide natural heritage comments and
technical review for planning applications within their respective watersheds. It was
recommended that SVCA provide the option for the County and the municipalities to
circulate them on all applications regardless of whether it is within the
regulated/screening area or not. It was also recommended that SVCA provide the
option to the County and the municipalities to have SVCA provide comments on natural
heritage matters as well.

At the meeting with SVCA and local municipal staff, it was recommended that in order to
maintain consistency with the level of services provided by the other conservation
authorities and to avoid confusion over which agency provides these services, it was
recommended that SVCA continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage
review for all applications and to review this in the context of not only the Provincial
Policy Statement but County/local municipal planning documents as well. The revised MoU circulated by SVCA did not include language about providing natural heritage review and technical services nor did it indicate that the review of natural hazards would also be for all applications. SVCA staff did indicate that if the County or municipalities want SVCA to continue to provide these services that a motion be passed by Council clearly indicating this.

The County currently relies on the conservation authorities to provide technical review on both natural hazards and natural heritage matters. Should SVCA no longer provide this service, the County and/or municipalities would need to hire environmental experts/staff to provide this technical review as the County and municipalities currently do not have the expertise to review these matters. This could also lead to an increase in peer reviews being required for technical reports which could increase costs for applicants and could cause delays in the application process.

County staff recommend that for the reasons noted above as well as from a consistency standpoint that SVCA continue to provide both natural hazard and natural heritage review for all planning applications within the SVCA watershed. There are a number of suggested revisions identified in the attached revised MoU which reflects this recommendation (i.e. clarifying that the review and technical services are for all applications and for both natural hazards and natural heritage matters). County staff have also included some proposed wording with respect to reviewing these matters in the context of the PPS as well as County/local municipal planning documents.

5. It was recommended that a section be included indicating that the SVCA provide the County and local municipalities with mapping related to natural hazards including natural hazard mapping, regulated area mapping and screening area mapping. County staff have suggested revised wording in Section 2(c)(vii) to reflect this.

6. It was also recommended that wording be added to indicate that SVCA will conduct site visits to subject properties as required. County staff have suggested revised wording in Section 2(c)(iii).

7. It was recommended that the MoU include a communications and issue resolution protocol. SVCA has included this in Appendix A – Schedule 4.

8. It was recommended that a schedule be included in the MoU which identifies the role of SVCA in various matters as it relates to regulatory authority, watershed resource management, Planning Act commenting agency and delegated provincial responsibilities. A similar schedule has been included by the NVCA in their MoU’s with municipalities and the intent is to assist with clarifying roles and responsibilities. County staff have added a suggested chart which clarifies the various roles and responsibilities and have included this in Appendix A – Schedule 5 of the attached revised agreement.

County staff continues to see merit in entering into MoU’s with conservation authorities as it will help to clarify roles and responsibilities and will provide a consistent review process for both natural hazards and natural heritage matters throughout Grey County.

County staff reached out to Bruce County and Wellington County to discuss the revised SVCA MoU and to determine what approach is being taken. For Bruce County, their Council has asked staff to explore options for hiring environmental experts to provide the technical review and comments on natural heritage matters for all planning applications. Last update was that
staff were preparing a request for proposal to determine the costs for this service and report back to Bruce County Council. Wellington County has 5 conservation authorities within their area. They have recently entered into updated MoU’s with 4 out of the 5 conservation authorities save and except for SVCA. The updated MoU’s with the other 4 conservation authorities continue to provide natural hazard and natural heritage review for all planning applications.

Legal and Legislated Requirements
Conservation Authority Act and applicable regulations
Planning Act
County Official Plan and Local Official Plans

Financial and Resource Implications
The County currently relies on the conservation authorities to provide technical review and comments on both natural hazards and natural heritage matters for all planning applications. Should SVCA no longer provide this service, the County and/or municipalities would need to hire environmental experts/staff to provide this technical review as the County and municipalities currently do not have the expertise to review these matters. This could also lead to an increase in peer reviews being required for technical reports which could increase costs for applicants and could cause delays in the application process. SVCA staff have indicated that SVCA could continue to provide these services subject to the County and local municipalities passing a motion requesting as such. SVCA has indicated that this will increase the review costs slightly which typically range in an increase of $100 to $200 per application. The cost for the County to hire environmental expert(s)/staff is anticipated to be considerably more than the slight fee increases being put forward by SVCA should they continue to provide these services.

Relevant Consultation
☒ Internal – Planning Staff, CAO
☒ External – SVCA staff, member municipalities within the SVCA watershed, Bruce County, Wellington County

Appendices and Attachments
For an accessible version of the below agreement, please contact the Clerk’s Department.

Revised Memorandum of Agreement with Recommended Revisions
Recommendation

1. That Report TR-CW-12-18 regarding tender award recommendations for RFT-TS-01-18 be received and that the tender be awarded to Wayne Schwartz Construction Ltd. for $1,469,663.00 excluding taxes; and

2. That a 5% construction contingency be added to the tender price resulting in a revised estimated project cost of $1,570,305.51 net HST; and

3. That the project deficit of $220,205.51 will be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 capital construction budget or, if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.

Executive Summary

The tender for the reconstruction, pulverizing and hot mix paving of Grey Road 112 was posted on the Grey County website from January 25, 2018 until February 15, 2018.

It is recommended to award RFT-TS-01-18 to Wayne Schwartz Construction Inc. for the bid amount of $1,469,663.00, excluding taxes.
Background and Discussion
The project design includes a cross section consisting of 3.50 m lanes and 0.50 m paved shoulders.

The parameters for the tender are as follows:

- pulverizing and paving of a 5.25 km section of Grey Road 112 from Highway 26 northerly to the 4th Canadian Division Training Centre
- guiderail installation and upgrades
- culvert replacements

Bids received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name ofBidder</th>
<th>Bid Amount (excl. taxes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Aecon Construction &amp; Materials Ltd.</td>
<td>$1,661,799.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Arnill Construction Ltd. o/a Seeley and Arnill</td>
<td>$1,536,346.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Cox Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$1,976,725.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$1,484,097.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Wayne Schwartz Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$1,469,663.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal and Legislated Requirements
None

Financial and Resource Implications
The funding chart below identifies the total tender costs.

Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excluding HST</th>
<th>Net HST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Project Budget (Grey Road 112)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded Tender Amount</td>
<td>$1,469,663.00</td>
<td>$1,495,529.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$74,776.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tender Projected Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,570,305.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This project does not require the standard 10% construction contingency since it is not as complex as most, therefore, a 5% construction contingency was deemed reasonable and is slated to compensate for any unforeseen quantity overruns and possible fluctuations in the Asphalt Cement Price Index.

The project deficit can be attributed to:

- Increase in asphalt costs for 2018
- Increase in granular material costs for 2018

Staff recommends that the shortfall for this project be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 Capital construction budget, or if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.

### Relevant Consultation

- **Internal (list)**
  
  Committee of the Whole for Grey County by way of this report

- **External (list)**

### Appendices and Attachments

- Project Limits Map
Project Limits Map
Recommendation

1. That Report TR-CW-13-18 regarding tender award recommendations for RFT-TS-08-18 be received and that the tender be awarded to Wayne Schwartz Construction Ltd. for $727,133.64 excluding taxes; and

2. That a 15% construction contingency be added to the tender price resulting in a revised estimated project cost of $850,920.87 net HST.

Executive Summary

The tender for the replacement of structures 10-590 and 10-900 on Grey Road 10 was posted on the Grey County website from January 25, 2018 until February 15, 2018.

It is recommended to award RFT-TS-08-18 to Wayne Schwartz Construction Inc. for the bid amount of $727,133.64, excluding taxes.

Since the structures are located on the Grey-Bruce County boundary, the project costs will be split 50/50 between Grey County and Bruce County.

The parameters for the tender are as follows:

- Remove two (2) existing concrete culverts
- Install two (2) new concrete box culverts constructed from precast sections
- Close Grey Road 10 to traffic for the duration of the project, (a detour route will be provided).
Background and Discussion

Two structures crossing Grey Road 10, sharing the same watercourse, approximately 325 m apart, are overdue to be removed and replaced. The watercourse originates on the Bruce County side of Grey Road 10, then flows easterly beneath Grey Road 10 at structure 10-900; then flows parallel to Grey Road 10 for approximately 325 m where it turns westerly to flow under Grey Road 10 again at Structure 10-590.

Three (3) construction options were considered:

1. Realign the watercourse to the west side of the road to eliminate both structure crossings; since the majority of the watercourse is in Bruce County.
2. Remove the concrete box culverts and replace with multiple smaller circular plastic culverts and leave the watercourse as is.
3. Remove and replace both structures with similar concrete structures and leave the watercourse as is.

It was determined that option 3 was the most technically practical for the following reasons:

- High water events of 2017 demonstrated that the existing larger culvert sizing was required to accommodate high water flows.
- Realigning the stream would require Bruce County to purchase property and extensive investigation by the Conservation Authority. This process would take additional time, and given the poor condition of the structures, it was determined that replacement must occur in the 2018 construction season.
- Installing multiple smaller pipes, while less expensive, would not accommodate the water flows as witnessed during high water events of 2017.
Bids received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of Bidder</th>
<th>Bid Amount (excl. taxes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Arnill Construction Limited o/a Seeley and Arnill</td>
<td>$1,187,823.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Moorefield Excavating Ltd.</td>
<td>$859,831.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>South Shore Contracting of Essex County Inc.</td>
<td>$737,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ultimate Construction Inc.</td>
<td>$1,642,727.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>W.G. Kelly Construction</td>
<td>$1,177,894.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Wayne Schwartz Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$727,133.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal and Legislated Requirements
None

Financial and Resource Implications
The funding chart below identifies the total tender costs.

Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excluding HST</th>
<th>Net HST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Project Budget (Grey Road 112)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000.00 ($600,000.00 - split 50/50 with Bruce County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded Tender Amount</td>
<td>$727,133.64</td>
<td>$739,931.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$110,989.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tender Projected Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$850,920.87 ($425,460.43 Grey County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td>$349,079.13 ($174,539.57 Grey County)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 15% construction contingency is recommended to compensate for the following:

- Unforeseen challenges encountered during excavation, de-watering, and waterway control.
- Delays caused by inclement weather affecting concrete cure time.
- Repairs to the proposed detour route.
- Extra work charged by the contractor due to the low bid amount.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal (list)
Committee of the Whole for Grey County by way of this report

☒ External (list)
Jerry Haan, Operations Manager, Bruce County

Appendices and Attachments

Project Location Map
# Committee Report

**To:** Warden Halliday and Members of Grey County Council  
**Committee Date:** March 8, 2018  
**Subject / Report No:** TR-CW-17-18  
**Title:** Award of RFT-TS-04-18 Grey Road 17 Pulverizing, Reconstruction and Hot Mix Paving  
**Prepared by:** Dennis Dalton, Senior Engineering Technologist  
**Reviewed by:** Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services  
**Lower Tier(s) Affected:** Georgian Bluffs  
**Status:**

## Recommendation

1. That Report TR-CW-17-18 regarding tender award recommendations for RFT-TS-04-18 be received and that the tender be awarded to Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd. for $3,377,000.00 excluding taxes; and

2. That a 5% construction contingency be added to the tender price resulting in a revised estimated project cost of $3,608,256.96 net HST; and

3. That the project deficit of $408,256.96 will be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 capital construction budget or, if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.

## Executive Summary

The tender for the reconstruction, pulverizing and hot mix paving of Grey Road 17 was posted on the Grey County website from February 1, 2018 until February 22, 2018.

It is recommended to award RFT-TS-04-18 to Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd. for the bid amount of $3,377,000.00, excluding taxes.
Background and Discussion
The project design includes a cross section consisting of 3.50 m lanes and 1.25 m paved shoulders.

The parameters for the tender are as follows:
- pulverizing and paving of a 9.15 km section of Grey Road 17 from Highway 6 easterly to the Hamlet of Wolseley
- 1.28 km of reconstruction of sub-standard vertical and horizontal geometry (a three week road closure will be required with detour routes provided)
- culvert replacements (a two day road closure will be required with detour routes provided)

Bids received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of Bidder</th>
<th>Bid Amount (excl. taxes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$3,377,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Wayne Schwartz Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$3,496,277.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal and Legislated Requirements
None

Financial and Resource Implications
The funding chart below identifies the total tender costs.

Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excluding HST</th>
<th>Net HST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Project Budget (Grey Road 112)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded Tender Amount</td>
<td>$3,377,000.00</td>
<td>$3,436,435.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$171,821.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tender Projected Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,608,256.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Deficit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$408,256.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This project does not require the standard 10% construction contingency since it is not as complex as most, therefore, a 5% construction contingency was deemed reasonable and is slated to compensate for any unforeseen quantity overruns and possible fluctuations in the Asphalt Cement Price Index.

The project deficit can be attributed to:

- Increase in asphalt costs for 2018
- Increase in granular material costs for 2018

Staff recommends that the shortfall for this project be funded from any surplus realized from within the 2018 Capital construction budget, or if a surplus is not available, from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal (list)
Committee of the Whole for Grey County by way of this report

☒ External (list)
Georgian Bluffs – Detour route selection

Appendices and Attachments

Project Limits Map
Project Limits Map