

## Addendum # 2 to Report PDR-PCD-05-14

**To:** Chair Wright and Members of the Planning and Community Development Committee  
**From:** Scott Taylor, Senior Planner  
**Meeting Date:** January 15, 2015  
**Subject:** Source Protection Implementation Collaborative Funding Breakdown Costs  
**Status:** Recommendation adopted by Committee as presented per Resolution PCD20-15; Endorsed by County Council per Resolution CC34-15 February 3, 2015;

### Recommendation(s)

**WHEREAS the Province of Ontario has set up a Source Protection Municipal Implementation Fund to provide one-time grant funding to offset a portion of the costs for small, rural municipalities in preparing to implement drinking water source protection plans;**

**AND WHEREAS the County of Grey has received grant funding in the amount of \$58,729.00 for eligible activities undertaken by the County, with the possibility of up to an additional \$15,000.00 for collaborating with other municipalities;**

**AND WHEREAS Council directed staff to circulate the ‘Risk Management Official / Risk Management Inspector In-A-Box’ memo to member municipalities who received Source Protection Municipal Implementation Funds as a collaborative approach towards utilizing the Source Protection Municipal Implementation Fund;**

**AND WHEREAS Bruce County and member municipalities are also partnering on the Risk Management Official / Risk Management Inspector In-A-Box project,**

**AND WHEREAS the County has received quotes for the two components of the Risk Management Official / Risk Management Inspector In-A-Box program, which are the Property Tracking System and the Administrative Support Documents for \$50,000.00 and \$33,351.85 respectively;**

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Addendum # 2 to Report PDR-PCD-05-14 be received;**

**AND THAT staff be directed to seek financial commitment from the partner municipalities within Grey for approximately \$2,500.00 each, and that the County of Grey would pay approximately \$30,000.00 with funds from the Source Protection Municipal Implementation Fund;**

**AND THAT the County of Grey is cognizant that both the \$2,500.00 municipal partner commitments, and the \$30,000.00 County commitment, may inflate or deflate slightly based on the total number of partners who contribute to the project.**

## Background

The County and a number of its member municipalities received Source Protection Municipal Implementation Funding from the Province. In Report PDR-PCD-05-14, and its Addendum, the funding, along with the collaborative 'Risk Management Official (RMO) / Risk Management Inspector (RMI) In-A-Box' approach, are laid out to maximize this Provincial funding. Copies of the aforementioned reports are linked to the in the Attachments section of this report. For development purposes the RMI-RMO In-A-Box project was subsequently broken down into two separate components; the Property Tracking System (PTS) and the Administrative Support Documents (ASD).

The PTS will build off of the two counties existing Geographic Information Systems (GIS) platforms to be utilized by future municipal RMOs and RMIs. As a result of the needed integration with the GIS platforms, and after meeting with Bruce and Grey GIS and Information Technology (IT) staff, it was determined that the PTS would be most effectively developed 'in-house' utilizing a contract staff person. County IT staff subsequently put together a quote of \$50,000.00 to develop and implement the PTS.

The ASD component of this project is comprised of the templates and risk management plan materials to be used by municipal RMOs and RMIs. The ASD was subsequently issued via a Request for Proposals (RFP), with the successful respondent coming in at a price of \$33,351.85. Links to a copy of the RFP and addenda have been included in the Attachments section of this report.

Bruce and Grey County staff initially engaged member municipalities on this collaborative approach, and received 'interest in principle' from 12 of the 17 municipalities in Bruce and Grey, in addition to the two counties. Within Grey County interest was received from the Township of Chatsworth, the Township of Southgate, the Municipality of Grey Highlands, the Municipality of West Grey and the Municipality of Meaford. Following an indication of in principle support, it noted that municipalities would have the ability to 'opt in' or 'opt out' of the project once a final price was determined.

Now that the quote has been received on the PTS, and the contract has been awarded on the ASD, it is time to go back to the municipal partners for financial commitment to the project. Staff from the two counties have created a funding formula based on the amount of funding each municipality and county received from the Province. Funding for the project has been divided into Bruce and Grey jurisdictions. Each of the counties and corresponding member municipalities would then have leeway to determine how they wanted to distribute the costs within their own jurisdiction. Of the 14 potential partners on this project, only the Municipality of Meaford did not receive any Provincial funding.

Bruce County, along with the member municipalities within Bruce, will be paying slightly more than half of the total costs of the project based on the amount of funding they collectively received, and the number of partners involved. Bruce County has now sent correspondence out to their municipal partners asking for their financial contributions to this project.

At the June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Planning and Community Development Committee meeting, the Committee suggested that it may be appropriate for the County to absorb a higher share of the costs for this project, based on the lower implementation needs at the county versus the municipal levels. In accordance with the Committee's direction, County staff have proposed that the County pay 'more than its share' in order to minimize the amount needed to be paid by member municipalities within Grey. County staff are also recommending that the County budget a slightly higher amount of its funding to the project, to account for any possible cost overruns on the PTS or the ASD. As a result, County staff are recommending that each of the participating member municipalities within Grey be asked to contribute approximately \$2,500.00, while the County would contribute approximately \$25,000.00 - \$30,000.00 towards this project. The approximations are needed at this stage due to uncertainty over the total number of partners involved.

Based on this collaborative project, the two counties, along with the member municipalities, with the exception of Meaford who was not eligible for the funding, have each applied for the \$15,000.00 collaboration funding. Based on discussions with Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change staff the County expects to hear whether or not the collaboration funding application was successful or not by late-January 2015.

## Financial / Staffing / Legal / Information Technology

### Considerations

The funding of the PTS and the ASD is being drawn entirely from the Provincial Source Protection Municipal Implementation Funding, and therefore will be no impact on the tax

levy. Should the Planning and Community Development Committee agree with the staff recommendation, then the County's entire \$30,000.00 contribution can be drawn from the \$58,729.00 which has been received from the Province. However, by participating in this collaborative project, the County may be eligible for the additional \$15,000.00 collaboration funding from the Province.

Although the County could cover the entire Grey County and member municipal 'share' towards this project; by doing so it would potentially make the municipalities ineligible for the collaboration funding. Consequently, the County is requesting that each partner municipality contribute approximately \$2,500.00 towards this project to ensure the collaborative approach.

From a financial perspective, because Grey both issued the RFP, and will be hiring an IT contract staff person, Grey will be the 'banker' for this project. Once the final financial partners have been determined, Grey will invoice each of the partners for 50% of the total cost 'up front', and the remaining 50% will be invoiced upon completion of the project. In invoicing in this manner it will minimize the staff time needed by the County's Finance department.

From staffing and IT consideration perspective, it will require IT to hire a contract IT staff person to either develop the PTS, or to 'back-fill' an existing IT position while the PTS is being developed. However, based on the need to integrate this system with the GIS platforms of Grey and Bruce, it was determined that this was the most efficient way to do so. Although the contract staff person would be a Grey County employee, they would be working closely with Bruce County to ensure that the system will work for their purposes as well.

It should be further noted that Grey County Planning and IT staff are also investigating using this same contract person to develop the Planning Application Tracking Software (PATS) for which there is already money in the Grey County budget. The skillset needed for the PTS and the PATS would be very similar and there could certainly be some synergies between the two projects.

## Link to Strategic Goals / Priorities

A collaborative project of this nature fall under both goals 4 and 5 of the County's Corporate Strategic Plan. By working together, the County and member municipalities are both maximizing the use of the funding, but also avoiding duplication of efforts. The local Drinking Water Source Protection groups will also be engaged as key stakeholders in this project.

## Attachments

[PDR-PCD-05-14 Source Protection Implementation Funding Agreement](#)

[Addendum to PDR-PCD-05-14 Source Protection Implementation Funding](#)

[RFP-PCD-14-14 Drinking Water Source Protection Administrative Support Documents](#)

[RFP-PCD-14-14 Drinking Water Source Protection Documents Addendum 1](#)

[RFP-PCD-14-14 Drinking Water Source Protection Documents Addendum 2](#)

[RFP-PCD-14-14 Drinking Water Source Protection Documents Addendum 3](#)

Respectfully submitted by,

Scott Taylor, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Planner

Director Sign Off: *Randy Scherzer*