1. Call to Order
2. Declaration of Interest
3. Delegations
   9:45 AM  Michael Ryan and Hugh Simpson, Grey County Federation of Agriculture
            Farmland Property Tax Rate
   10:45 AM  Cristina Valente, Senior Project Planner and Greggory Hanson,
            Transportation Planner - WSP
            Draft Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan
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-07-20 Award of RFT-TS-05-20 Grey Road 9 Road Rehabilitation,
      Pulverizing and Hot Mix Paving
      That Report TR-CW-07-20 containing the tender results for RFT-TS-05-20 Grey
      Road 9 Pulverizing and Hot Mix Paving be received; and
      That the Murray Group Ltd. be awarded the Tender for a total amount of
      $2,095,961.00, excluding HST.
   b. PDR-CW-16-20 Wilder Lake Subdivision Information Report
      That Report PDR-CW-16-20 regarding an overview of proposed plan of
      subdivision application 42T-2019-04, consisting of twenty nine (29) single
      detached residential parcels and one lot containing the existing buildings
associated with the golf course on lands described as Part of Lots 2, 3 and 4, Concession 21, Township of Southgate, geographic Township of Egremont, be received for information.

c. Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee minutes dated February 12, 2020

    That the Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee minutes dated February 12, 2020 be adopted as presented.

d. Grey County – The Blue Mountains Task Force minutes dated February 13, 2020

    That the Grey County – The Blue Mountains Task Force minutes dated February 13, 2020 be adopted as presented.

e. Ministry of Labour Training and Skills Development ROMA Delegation 2020 – Sydenham Campus

    That the correspondence from the Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development regarding a brief on the Sydenham Skills Training and Innovation Hub be received for information.

f. Lake Erie Source Protection Region – Over Application of Winter Maintenance Chemicals to Protect Sources of Municipal Drinking Water.

    That the correspondence from the Lake Erie Drinking Water Source Protection Region be received for information.

6. Items For Direction and Discussion

a. CAOR-CW-03-20 Award of NFRP-EDTC-03-20 Bus Lease for Community Transportation Project

    That Report CAOR-CW-03-20 regarding bus leases be received; and

    That the lease of six Elkhart Coach buses be awarded to Overland Custom Coach (2007) for $15,234 monthly excluding taxes; and

    That the monthly lease cost be funded from the Provincial funding contained in the 2020 budget form the Community Transportation Grant; and

    That staff be authorized to proceed with this project prior to Council approval as per Section 25.6 of Procedural By-law 5003-18

b. HDR-CW-02-20 Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative

    That Report HDR-CW-02-20 regarding a proposed Investment Plan for Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative for 2020-21 be received; and
That Grey County Council approves the Investment Plan for the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative and approves the 2020-21 funding to be expensed by March 31, 2021.

c. EDTC-CW-06-20 Draft Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan

That Report EDTC-CW-06-20 and the Draft Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan be received; and

That the Draft Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan be posted on the County website; and

That staff be directed to circulate a link to the draft plan to member municipalities and interested stakeholders, and

That following a minimum 30-day period, comments will be reviewed and incorporated into a final plan and brought back to county council along with recommendations for implementation.

d. PDR-CW-09-20 Forest Management Plan

That Report PDR-CW-09-20 regarding the draft Forest Management Plan be received; and

That staff be directed to solicit input from the public, the forest industry, agencies, and municipalities on the draft Forest Management Plan; and

That following consideration of stakeholder input, a revised Forest Management Plan be presented to the Forest Management Plan Advisory Committee and County Council for its consideration.

e. PDR-CW-14-20 County Official Plan Amendment 42-03-580-OPA-148 Sarawak Quarry Expansion Merit Report

That Report PDR-CW-14-20 regarding a proposed County Official Plan Amendment be received; and
That the proposal proceeds to a Public Meeting to consider an amendment to the County of Grey Official Plan on lands designated ‘Agricultural’ and ‘Rural’, to permit the expansion of an existing quarry at Part Lot 36, Concession 2, geographic Township of Sarawak, Township of Georgian Bluffs, provided the Township is prepared to hold a joint public meeting in consideration of the necessary local amendment requirements.

f. PDR-CW-15-20 Forest Management Annual Report and By-law Enforcement Officer Appointments
   That Report PDR-CW-15-20 regarding Forest Management be received; and
   That a by-law be prepared to appoint Lee Thurston and Jason Traynor as Municipal By-law Enforcement Officers for the County of Grey; and
   That the by-law contain provisions for the appointment by the Director of Planning or his/her designate of additional Municipal By-law Enforcement Officers for the County of Grey.

g. TR-CW-06-20 Orchardville Bridge (Structure 900-272)
   That TR-CW-06-20 be received and that Grey County accept the preferred solution to have Orchardville Bridge (Structure 900-272) removed with full recording and documentation of the heritage bridge; and
   That Staff be directed to single source the bridge removal design to GM BluePlan.

h. FR-CW-04-20 2019 Year End Transfers
   That Council receive Report FR-CW-04-20 titled 2019 Year-End Transfers and approve the recommendations, as contained and estimated in Report FR-CW-04-20, regarding transfers to and from Reserve; and
   That Council approve any surplus/deficit arising in the 2019 budget be transferred to/(from) the respective departmental reserves.

i. PSR-CW-04-20 Response Time Performance Plan Results for 2019
   That Report PSR-CW-04-20 be received; and

j. Saugeen Valley Children’s Safety Village Financial Request
   Whereas a request has been received from Saugeen Valley Children’s Safety Village for $15,000 to support program delivery; and
Whereas staff have reviewed the request in coordination with the Not for Profit Grant Requests criteria as outlined in Report SSR-CW-06-19, endorsed by Council August 8, 2019, confirming Saugeen Valley Children’s Safety Village’s eligibility with the grant process;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that Grey County support the request for $15,000 from Saugeen Valley Children’s Safety Village and that this amount be funded from the One Time Funding Reserve

7. Other Business
8. Notice of Motion
9. Adjournment
Committee Report

To: Warden McQueen and Members of Grey County Council

Committee Date: February 27, 2020

Subject / Report No: TR-CW-07-20

Title: Award of RFT-TS-05-20 Grey Road 9 Pulverizing and Hot Mix Paving

Prepared by: Sharon Melville, Buyer
Matt Marck, Engineering Manager

Reviewed by: Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services

Lower Tier(s) Affected: Township of Southgate

Status: Recommendation

1. That Report TR-CW-07-20 containing the tender results for RFT-TS-05-20 Grey Road 9 Pulverizing and Hot Mix Paving be received; and

2. That the Murray Group Ltd. be awarded the Tender for a total amount of $2,095,961.00, excluding HST.

Executive Summary

On October 10, 2019 as per Resolution CC80-19, Transportation Services and Corporate Services Staff received Council approval to tender the Grey Road 9 pulverize and pave construction project.

The limits of the project are from Grey Road 109 easterly to Grey Road 23; a total length of 8 kilometers. This project includes the following:

- 2 culvert replacements
- Guiderail upgrades and replacements
- 1.25 metre paved shoulders
- Project consists of pulverize and pave rehabilitation
- The roadway will be open to traffic with intermittent alternating road closures
- The anticipated project window falls between July 20 and September 18

It is recommended to award RFT-TS-05-20 to The Murray Group Ltd. for the bid amount of $2,095,961.00, excluding taxes.
Background and Discussion

The Tender was posted on the Grey County website from January 9, 2020 until February 6, 2020. The bids received are shown below:

**RFT-TS-05-20 Tender Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name of Bidder</th>
<th>Bid Amount (excluding taxes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arnill Construction</td>
<td>$2,317,811.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cox Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$2,246,135.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$2,900,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Murray Group Ltd.</td>
<td>$2,095,961.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal and Legislated Requirements

None.

Financial and Resource Implications

**Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excluding HST</th>
<th>Net HST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Project Budget</td>
<td>$2,994,300.31</td>
<td>$3,047,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender Award Amount</td>
<td>$2,095,961.00</td>
<td>$2,132,849.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$209,596.10</td>
<td>$213,284.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tender Projected Costs</td>
<td>$2,346,134.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Surplus</td>
<td>$700,865.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ten percent contingency is being applied to cover off fluctuations in the Asphalt Cement Index, Grey County Bridge Crew upgrading guiderail connections at structures, possible Granular ‘A’ base improvements that cannot be scoped until the existing asphalt is pulverized and any unforeseen issues that may need to be addressed on this project.

The projected surplus will be set aside for potential 2020 shortfalls.

**Relevant Consultation**

- Internal
- External

**Appendices and Attachments**

Site Location Map
Site Location Map
Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-16-20 regarding an overview of proposed plan of subdivision application 42T-2019-04, consisting of twenty nine (29) single detached residential parcels and one lot containing the existing buildings associated with the golf course on lands described as Part of Lots 2, 3 and 4, Concession 21, Township of Southgate, geographic Township of Egremont, be received for information.

Executive Summary

The County has received a plan of subdivision application known as Wilder Lake (County File Number 42T-2019-04) that proposes to create a 29-lot estate residential development within the Inland Lakes and Shoreline designation. The site is to be accessed from Southgate Sideroad 26 and would follow the existing internal road to the clubhouse. The subject lands are developed as the Homestead Golf Course and Winter Resort. The intent would be to maintain the golf course use on the subject lands in conjunction with the proposed residential development. A lot which would contain the golf course buildings is also being proposed as part of this subdivision. The proposal is to service the lots with individual wells and septic systems in accordance with the Ontario Building Code requirements. Various technical reports have been submitted with the proposed subdivision application, as well as a zoning by-law amendment to the Township of Southgate. The applications and supporting studies will be circulated to prescribed agencies and the public for review and comment. Following the public
Background and Discussion

The County has received a plan of subdivision application (42T-2019-04), known as the Wilder Lake Subdivision which proposes to create 29 single detached residential lots as well as a lot that would contain existing buildings on site that are associated with the existing golf course. Three open space blocks that will contain stormwater retention ponds are also proposed as part of the development.

The subject lands are located in the Inland Lakes and Shoreline designation that is located adjacent to Wilder Lake. The subject lands are described as Part of Lots 2, 3, and 4, Concession 21, Township of Southgate, geographic Township of Egremont.

The site is to be accessed from Southgate Sideroad 26 and would follow the existing internal road to the clubhouse. Further internal roads are proposed to be constructed to provide access to the proposed lots.

The subject lands are developed as the Homestead Golf Course and Winter Resort which currently contacts a clubhouse, restaurant and rental accommodation (cottages) along the shore of Wilder Lake. The intent would be to maintain the golf course use on the subject lands in conjunction with the proposed residential development. The proposal is to service the lots with individual wells and septic systems in accordance with the Ontario Building Code requirements.

Map 1 below shows the subject lands and surrounding area, while Map 2 shows the proposed plan of subdivision.

This site is located on the western shore of Wilder Lake. Surrounding land uses include the existing golf course lands, farmland, vacant lands, and residential uses. An existing landfill site exists approximately 1km to the west of the proposed subdivision.

The proposed development also requires an amendment to the Township of Southgate’s zoning by-law.

Pre-submission consultation between the proponent, the Township of Southgate, the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority, and the County identified the submission requirements for the proposed plan of subdivision. Copies of all background reports and plans can be found at 'select link for copies of all background reports and plans'.
Map 1: Airphoto of Subject Lands

Map 2: Proposed Plan of Subdivision (Courtesy of GM BluePlan)
Analysis of Planning Issues

When rendering a land use planning decision, planning authorities must have regard to matters of Provincial Interest under the Planning Act, be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2014, and conform to any Provincial Plans or Municipal Official Plans that govern the subject lands. In this case, the County of Grey Official Plan and the Township of Southgate Official Plan have jurisdiction over the subject property. There are no Provincial Plans in place for this section of the County.

Provincial Policy and Legislation

Both the Planning Act and the PPS speak to the efficient use of land within settlement areas. The proposed plan of subdivision is within an existing settlement area (Inland Lakes and Shoreline) that will be serviced via individual wells and septic systems. While, the PPS indicates that the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas is full municipal services; there are no full municipal services near the site. The PPS does contemplate new development on private servicing within rural areas and smaller settlement areas such as this.

The supply of an adequate range and distribution of residential housing types is required in both Provincial documents. In this case, the proposed plan of subdivision is providing new single detached lots, which are the common form of housing in and around Wilder Lake.

Other policies in the PPS speak to connected, walkable communities, with provisions for public parkland and open space. The proposed subdivision will provide connections to adjacent roads, however based on the density of development, sidewalks are not being proposed at this time. The existing golf course surrounding the proposed subdivision would provide an opportunity for recreational space.

The protection of significant environmental features is also required through the legislation and policy. The County Official Plan does identify Significant Woodlands along the shoreline of Wilder Lake as well as an Earth Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) south of the subject lands. An Environmental Impact Study was conducted, examining the potential for impacts on these features as well as other features identified on site. A Hydrogeological Study and Servicing Options Report were also prepared to examine if the site can be serviced with private wells and septic systems without impacting the lake. These technical reports will be reviewed by agencies as part of the review process.

Following the public and agency review periods, staff will provide a more fulsome analysis of the Provincial legislation and policy.
County of Grey Official Plan

The proposed plan of subdivision is on lands designated as ‘Inland Lakes and Shoreline’, ‘Rural’, and ‘Hazard Lands’ in the County Official Plan. Inland Lakes and Shoreline designations are identified as locations which contemplates development of this nature at appropriate densities for the level of servicing available. The proposed plan of subdivision is primarily located within the Inland Lakes and Shoreline designation. The Planning Justification Report does note that portions of some of the proposed lots (Lots 18, 19 and 20) are located outside of the settlement area boundary but that the building envelopes for these lots are primarily located within the settlement area boundary. Section 9.1 of the County Official Plan indicates that the boundaries between the land use types shown on Schedule A are approximate except where they coincide with physical features such as roads, rail corridors, rivers and streams. Where such features do not exist, the exact determination of boundaries is the responsibility of the County and that the County may permit alterations from these boundaries where it is satisfied the intent of the Plan is being maintained. The Inland Lakes and Shoreline designation does not coincide with a physical feature and therefore permitting minor alteration from the boundary can be considered. The Planning Justification Report requests that the County interpret the building envelopes as wholly within the Inland Lakes and Shoreline Area designation as ‘the proposal represents a logical road and lot layout while optimizing the area for development’. County staff see merit in this request.

Schedule B of the County Official Plan does identify an Aggregate Resource Area on the subject lands which is located outside of the Inland Lakes and Shoreline designation. An Aggregate Potential Letter of Opinion was submitted with the applications.

Appendix A of the County Official Plan identifies an existing landfill site which is approximately 600 metres from the subject property and about 1 kilometre from the proposed subdivision. Studies are required for any proposed development within 500 metres of a landfill site, however given the separation a D-4 Study is not required.

The County Plan also requires the protection of cultural and archaeological resources. A Stage 1 – 2 Archaeological Assessment was conducted for this development.

Section 5.3 of the County Plan provides a similar servicing hierarchy to that found in the PPS, which has been noted above. Elsewhere in section 5 of the Plan, are policies which govern roads, transportation, and stormwater management. County Official Plan policies will be further assessed following agency review and the public process.
Township of Southgate Official Plan

The subject lands are designated as ‘Inland Lakes and Shoreline’ and ‘Rural’ in the Township Official Plan. Similar to the County Official Plan, this property is also within the settlement area boundaries in the Township Plan.

Other Official Plan policies in the Township Plan mimic those in the County Plan and the PPS. The Township Official Plan does require a Visual Impact Study to be submitted for any proposed development within the Inland Lakes and Shoreline and Visual Impact Study has been submitted with the applications. A more thorough analysis of the Township Official Plan policies will follow the agency review and the public process.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The application will be processed in accordance with the Planning Act.

Financial and Resource Implications

There are no anticipated financial, staffing or legal considerations associated with the proposed subdivision, beyond those normally encountered in processing a subdivision application. The County has collected the requisite fee and peer review deposit for this application.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Planning Staff
☒ External: The public, Township of Southgate, and required agencies under the Planning Act.

Appendices and Attachments

None
The Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee met on the above date at the Sydenham Campus at 1130 8th Street East, Owen Sound, ON, with the following members in attendance:

Present: Councillor Dwight Burley, Andrew Edgcumbe, Catherine Sholtz, Andy Underwood

Regrets: Christina Schnell and Claudia Strelocke

Staff Present: Heather Morrison, Clerk; Steve Furness, Senior Economic Development Officer; Aaron Whitney, Manager of Facilities and Operations-Housing; and Kathie Nunno, Administrative and Accessibility Coordinator

Call to Order

The Clerk called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM.

Election of the Chair and Vice Chair

The Clerk called for nominations of the Chair of the Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2020.

Moved by: Councillor Burley Seconded by: Andy Underwood

That Catherine Sholtz be nominated as the Chair of the Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2020.

On motion by Councillor Burley, nominations closed.

Catherine Sholtz accepted the nomination and was acclaimed as the Chair of the Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2020.

The Clerk called for nominations for Vice Chair of the Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2020.

Moved by: Catherine Sholtz Seconded by: Councillor Burley

That Andrew Edgcumbe be nominated as the Vice Chair of the Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2020.
On motion by Andy Underwood, nominations closed.

Andrew Edgcumbe accepted the nomination and was acclaimed as the Vice Chair of the Grey County Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2020.

Catherine Sholtz assumed the Chair.

**Declaration of Pecuniary Interest**

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

**Site Visit Sydenham Campus**

Aaron Whitney reviewed the site plan drawings with the group. The permit has been applied for with the City of Owen Sound and the drawings have been approved.

**Front Entrance**

There will be new 42" double doors installed at the main entrance which will allow a larger wheelchair or scooter. The new doors will have updated barrier-free operators with one located on the outside and inside.

The vestibule door on the inside will match the outside with two 42" doors and will also have barrier-free operators. Once through the second set of doors you will be in the hallway. There are currently barrier-free operators on one other entrance door from a prior addition.

Some of the horizontal bars at the entrance will be removed which will increase the lighting.

The front entrance flooring will be replaced with non-slip ceramic tile. Other floors are being cleaned and polished.

**Barrier-Free Washroom**

Currently there is no barrier-free washroom. There is a small washroom with a compartmentalized toilet and sink area. A new barrier-free washroom is being designed by removing the rear wall and expanding into another two rooms. The new barrier-free washroom will exceed requirements. A baby change table and adult change table will be installed. The adult change table is the same model that is in the administration building. All of the fixtures will be barrier free and will match what is in the administration building. There is an emergency-call button.
Another 10 x 8 foot room behind the current small washroom will be renovated into a barrier-free, sloped shower with a glass wall that can be rolled into and will have a barrier-free sink as well. That room will be accessible from the main hallway across from the gym. LED lights and new ceiling lights will be installed. Faucets are motion detected and there will be motion-detected switches for the light.

With the construction, the current men’s and women’s washrooms will be updated with one accessible stall in each. It is possible that the exterior door will be removed as the current partial wall would provide sufficient privacy. The current design will allow for some wheelchairs to pass through, but not all.

The Committee was asked to provide accessibility-related comments for the accessible washroom and entrance of the Sydenham Campus. The group toured the facilities and provided the following comments:

Accessibility Things to Consider when Planning the Renovation

- Low vision – no special needs were identified.
- Appropriate signage was discussed.
- The committee recommended that as a leader in a learning facility, it would be ideal if the operator for the doors would be a vertical bar as it’s easier to operate.
- Improved lighting could be considered. Aaron Whitney noted that some lighting is being replaced with new LED lights and the whole building was surveyed for new lighting through an energy grant.
- Grab bars in all washrooms would be beneficial
- Better outside lights were recommended. Mr. Whitney confirmed that the contractor suggested new LED lights as well even though it wasn’t part of the project outline.

Councillor Burley moved that the meeting be adjourned at 3:34 PM.

Catherine Sholtz, Chair
Committee Minutes
Grey County – The Blue Mountains Task Force
February 13, 2020 – 2:33 PM

The Task Force met on the above date at the Grey County Administration Building with the following members in attendance:

Present: Grey County Warden Paul McQueen; Grey County Councillors Aakash Desai, Shirley Keaveney and Scott Mackey; The Blue Mountains Councillor Rob Sampson and Deputy Mayor Potter

Regrets: Mayor Alar Soever

Staff Present: Kim Wingrove, Grey County Chief Administrative Officer; Shawn Everitt, Town of the Blue Mountains Chief Administrative Officer; Heather Morrison, Clerk; Kevin Weppler, Director of Corporate Services and Tara Warder, Deputy Clerk/ Legislative Coordinator

Call to Order

Warden McQueen called the meeting to order at 2:34 PM.

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Items for Direction and Discussion

Workplan for 2020

The Task Force discussed the minutes from the January 9th, 2020 Task Force meeting. It was noted that the minutes were circulated to taskforce members but did not come forward to the Task Force for formal adoption before being adopted by Council. The request from the Task Force was that they continue to come to the Task Force for
discussion before being put on the respective Council agendas.

The Task Force noted that the discussion surrounding county staff attending the Public Information Centre was discussed at both the October and January meetings. It was at the January meeting where the discussion was held regarding bringing forward a notice of motion requesting staff to attend the Town’s Public Information Centre in March. Staff acknowledged the oversight from the January meeting. Staff advised the Committee that regarding their advice to present a notice of motion to Council, they misspoke at the County Committee of the Whole meeting that had just concluded and would advise County Council of that error at the next Council meeting.

The January 9 minutes will be amended to reflect that staff advised the Town of The Blue Mountains to submit a Notice of Motion to County Council if they wished County staff to attend the Town’s Public Information Centre meeting.

It was confirmed that County staff will be available to attend the Blue Mountains Public Information Centre in March if requested by the Town.

Mr. Everitt will send the meeting details.

The Task Force noted that the Community Improvement Plan is in progress.

With respect to the completion of a Drainage Master Plan, the work is underway through the budget process and is moving along well.

It was noted that collaboration between the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry on a review of a tree preservation and tree cutting by-law is taking place. The Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority should be added to this action item as well.

There is advocacy work to be continued with the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) regarding the completion of a Highway 26 transportation sub-master plan. There is a meeting on March 13th, 2020 in Thornbury regarding this matter. MTO staff and surrounding municipalities will be attending.

There was a suggestion to establish short term goals to try to alleviate some of the traffic bottlenecks and to request MTO to come up with a plan soon in order to address the need.

The MTO draft plan is for four lanes and there are a couple of municipalities that will need to be bypassed and a significant amount of development that will need to be put on hold if additional lanes are to be constructed. It was also noted that there is considerable existing private property that will be impacted in The Town of The Blue Mountains if any widening of Highway 26 is implemented.
It was noted that there has been approval to hire a project coordinator to work on the Town’s 2020 Transportation Master Plan. The desire is to work collaboratively and ensure all groups are talking to one another.

Deputy Mayor Potter noted that the Town, Grey County, and local municipalities have to take the lead on the traffic issues in the municipality and determine what happens to the traffic when it gets to the Grey County/Town border rather than having a solution imposed on us.

The Task Force then discussed how issues and concerns would come forward to Committee of the Whole for discussion after the Task Force has been dissolved. There is a need to have a mechanism that everyone understands that moves concerns forward. Staff to staff discussions are critical and for issues requiring further investigations or resources a notice of motion or staff report can be brought forward.

Staff noted the positive relationships between the Town and County and the benefit of letting each respective Council know when the two organizations are working together and collaborating.

It was noted that if there is a project specific need for a task force to be established, there is nothing stopping this from occurring.

Through Report CAOR-CW-02-20, there has been a commitment to the Grey County – Blue Mountains workplan and there is a need to demonstrate that progress is being made on the workplan. Timely communication back to both Councils on the progress of these projects is important.

Councillor Keaveney left the meeting at 3:31 PM.

Other Business

There was no other business.

On motion by Councillors Mackey and Potter, the meeting adjourned at 3:37 PM.

Warden Paul McQueen, Chair
Ministry of Labour,
Training and Skills Development
Office of the Minister
400 University Avenue
14th Floor
Toronto ON M7A 1T7
Tel: 416 326-7600

Ministère du Travail, de la
Formation et du Développement
des compétences
Bureau du ministre
400, avenue University
14e étage
Toronto ON M7A 1T7
Tél.: 416 326-7600

FEB 05 2020

Ms. Kim Wingrove
Chief Administrative Officer
County of Grey
595 9th Avenue East
Owen Sound, ON N4K 3E3

Dear Ms. Wingrove:

It was a pleasure meeting with the delegation from the County of Grey at the Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA) Conference in Toronto on January 20, 2020.

I appreciated receiving your delegation’s brief regarding the Sydenham Skills Training and Innovation Hub and applaud your efforts in bringing together partners on this initiative and developing strong partnerships based on local priorities. Ministry officials will follow up with you on some of the items we discussed.

In addition, the Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development has a variety of intake programs that can assist organizations in workforce planning and development initiatives. For more information on these and other programs, please contact Heather Cross, Regional Director, Western Region, at 647-402-3346 or heather.cross@ontario.ca.

Our Government for the People is building Ontario’s future by putting the people first in every decision that we make. We are dedicated to a thoughtful approach rooted in our core commitments to make Ontario a place to grow and protect what matters most.

Once again, it was a pleasure meeting with the delegation from the County of Grey. I look forward to working with you in the future and am committed to keeping our dialogue open.

Sincerely,

Monte McNaughton
Minister of Labour, Training and Skills Development

c: Her Worship Christine Robinson, Mayor, West Grey
His Worship Paul McQueen, Mayor, Municipality of Grey Highlands and Grey County Warden
His Worship Ian Boddy, Mayor, City of Owen Sound and Grey County Councillor
Heather Cross, Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development
January 14, 2020

Heather Morrison
Clerk, Grey County
595 9th Ave East, Owen Sound ON N4K 3E3

Dear Ms. Morrison:

RE: Support for actions to address over-application of winter maintenance chemicals to protect sources of municipal drinking water

On December 12, 2019, the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee received report SPC-19-12-02 Winter Maintenance Chemicals: Challenges and Opportunities, and passed the following resolution:

AND THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee direct staff to forward report SPC-19-12-02 to the Councils of the single, upper and lower-tier municipalities within the Lake Erie Source Protection Region, all Source Protection Committees, Ontario Good Roads Association, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, and Rural Ontario Municipal Association, to request resolutions in support of the report’s recommended actions and forward the resolutions to the Ontario Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, Ontario Minister of Transportation, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and Attorney General of Ontario.

The report (attached) provides an overview of the ongoing issue and implications of over-application of winter maintenance chemicals, highlighting trends in the Lake Erie Source Protection Region, and includes recommended actions, including changes to the liability framework, increased requirements for winter maintenance of parking lots and changes to the Clean Water Act, 2006 framework to proactively protect municipal drinking water sources.

As per the Source Protection Committee’s resolution, I am asking for municipal support of the report’s recommended actions. Please forward a copy of any resolution to: Ilona Feldmann, Source Protection Program Assistant, Lake Erie Source Protection Region (ifeldmann@grandriver.ca)

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns about the report or the request for municipal support.

Regards,

Martin Keller
Source Protection Program Manager, Lake Erie Source Protection Region
LAKE ERIE REGION SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

REPORT NO. SPC-19-12-02 DATE: December 12, 2019

TO: Members of the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee

SUBJECT: Winter Maintenance Chemicals: Challenges and Opportunities for Change

RECOMMENDATION:


AND THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee receives the Recommended Actions to Address the Over-Application of Winter Maintenance Chemicals for consideration and action.

REPORT:

Summary of Report Contents

• Introduction
• Recommended Actions to Address the Over-Application of Winter Maintenance Chemicals
• Increasing Sodium and Chloride Concentrations within Groundwater Drinking Sources in Lake Erie Source Protection Region
• Liability and Other Factors Influence the Amount of Salt Applied
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Introduction

At the October 3, 2019 Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee (SPC) meeting, members discussed the ongoing issue of salt over-application and the increasing number of sodium and chloride Issue Contributing Areas (ICAs) across the Lake Erie Source Protection Region. Following the discussion, the committee directed Lake Erie Region staff to draft a report and recommendation(s) regarding the issue for presentation at the next SPC meeting.

This report has been written in collaboration with staff from the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), City of Guelph, Region of Waterloo and Wellington Source Water Protection.

Recommended Actions to Address the Over-Application of Winter Maintenance Chemicals

To address the above concerns, the following recommendations are provided to the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee for consideration:
THAT the Province of Ontario explore ways to reduce the factors that contribute to excess application of winter maintenance chemicals on road ways and parking lots through a review of the liability framework in Ontario.

THAT the Province of Ontario work with municipalities to strengthen training programs for road agencies that apply winter maintenance chemicals on roads and sidewalks to reduce application rates without compromising road safety that would assist with mitigating risks to municipal drinking water systems.

THAT the Province of Ontario require property owners and contractors responsible for maintaining safe parking lots and sidewalks be trained and certified in the application of winter maintenance chemicals.

THAT the Province of Ontario change Prescribed Drinking Water Threats, “the application of road salt” and “the handling and storage of road salt” to “the application of winter maintenance chemicals” and “the handling and storage of winter maintenance chemicals”, and define the term in the regulation.

THAT the Province of Ontario change the Table of Circumstances related to the application of winter maintenance chemicals to differentiate between application on roads, sidewalks and parking lots to reflect the different liability issues and the nature of winter maintenance conducted for each surface type.

AND THAT the Province of Ontario amend the Clean Water Act’s Director’s Technical Rules to enable municipalities to proactively protect their municipal drinking water supplies from the application and storage of winter maintenance chemicals.

**Increasing Sodium and Chloride Concentrations within Groundwater Drinking Sources in Lake Erie Source Protection Region**

Municipal water supplies within the Lake Erie Source Protection Region (LESPR) have exhibited increases in chloride and sodium concentrations. Map 1 identifies all municipal supplies within the LESPR that are impacted by increasing chloride and sodium concentrations. Within LERSPR, approximately 150 wells are impacted by increasing concentrations of chloride and/or sodium, where 34 wells have identified chloride and/or sodium as an Issue under the Clean Water Act, 2006 and Technical Rules. Map 1 shows the ICAs for chloride and sodium, along with municipal supply wells with increasing concentrations. Issue Contributing Areas are delineated for wells with an Issue and policies apply to address the elevated contaminant concentrations.

The impacted municipal supply wells range from small rural centres (Elora, Fergus – Centre Wellington, Guelph-Éramosa, Paris – County of Brant) to medium cities (City of Guelph, Orangeville) to large urban areas (Region of Waterloo). Examples of increasing chloride and sodium concentrations at municipal supply wells within the LESPR are described below and include Wells E3 in Elora and F1 in Fergus, the City of Guelph Water Supply Wells, William Street Wellfield in Waterloo and Well G5 in Cambridge. The Town of Orangeville Water Supply System is impacted by increasing chloride and sodium concentrations and has defined ICAs that extend into the LESPR.
Map 1: Lake Erie Region Municipal Supply Wells with Elevated Chloride and Sodium Concentrations
Increasing Sodium and Chloride Concentrations at Bedrock Groundwater Wells in Wellington County

The Township of Centre Wellington monitors sodium and chloride concentrations at the nine municipal wells that service Elora and Fergus. Well Fergus F1 is screened within a bedrock aquifer with surrounding land primarily urban. Well Elora E3 is screened within a bedrock aquifer with surrounding land primarily agricultural, with a large manufacturing facility located immediately north of the well.

**Figure 1** and **Figure 2** illustrate the increasing and variable trends of chloride and sodium concentrations at Elora Well E3 and Fergus Well F1. Chloride concentrations at Elora Well E3 and Fergus Well F1 are both above and below half of the Ontario Drinking Water Standards (125 mg/L). Maximum chloride concentrations are noted at Elora Well E3 of 165 mg/L. At Elora Well E3 and Fergus Well F1 sodium concentrations are increasing, but remain below half of the Ontario Drinking Water Standards (100 mg/L). Maximum sodium concentrations are noted at Fergus Well F1 of 93 mg/L. A study completed by Golder Associates (2015) concluded that groundwater at well F1 appears to be derived mainly from the overburden and shallow bedrock aquifers, while groundwater at well E3 appears to be derived mainly from the bedrock aquifer. In both cases, the chloride source is likely from the surface (anthropogenic sources). As a result of the increasing chloride concentrations to above half of the Ontario Drinking Water Standards and the anthropogenic origin of the chloride, chloride was identified as an Issue and an ICA was delineated for both Elora Well E3 and Fergus Well F1.

![Figure 1: Chloride concentrations at Elora Well E3 and Fergus Well F1](image-url)
Increasing Sodium and Chloride Concentrations at Bedrock Groundwater Wells in the City of Guelph

Sodium and chloride concentrations are increasing at several bedrock wells within the City of Guelph. **Figure 3** and **Figure 4** below illustrate increasing chloride and sodium trends in select municipal wells within the City of Guelph. **Figure 3** shows chloride concentrations above half the Ontario Drinking Water Standard for chloride (125 mg/L) at almost all wells, with chloride concentrations approaching or at the Ontario Drinking Water Standard for chloride of 250 mg/L. **Figure 4** shows sodium concentrations above half the Ontario Drinking Water Standard for sodium (100 mg/L) at all wells, with sodium concentrations ranging from 120 to 170 mg/L in 2019.

Sodium and chloride are not identified as Drinking Water Issues at City of Guelph wells. The City of Guelph will continue to monitor sodium and chloride concentrations.
Figure 3: Chloride concentrations at select municipal wells within the City of Guelph

Figure 4: Sodium concentrations at select municipal wells within the City of Guelph
Increasing Sodium and Chloride Concentrations at Groundwater Wells in the Region of Waterloo

The Region of Waterloo has nine wellfields with elevated concentrations of chloride and sodium that resulted in the identification of issues under the Clean Water Act, 2006 and Technical Rules and delineation of ICAs. Impacted wellfields are generally within the urban areas of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. Chloride and sodium concentrations have been measured as high as 750 mg/L and 365 mg/L, respectively, at one municipal wellfield in the Region of Waterloo.

The William Street Wellfield is an example of one of the Waterloo’s wellfields that is impacted by increasing chloride and sodium concentrations. Figures 5 and 6 below illustrate the increasing chloride and sodium concentrations at the three water supply wells in the William Street wellfield. An increasing trend of chloride (Figure 5) is observed dating back to 1975. Current chloride concentrations are above the Ontario Drinking Water Standard of 250 mg/L with 2019 chloride concentrations reaching approximately 450 mg/L. An increasing trend of sodium (Figure 6) is observed dating back to 1980. Current sodium concentrations at two of the three wells are above the Ontario Drinking Water Standard of 200 mg/L with 2019 sodium concentrations reaching approximately 240 mg/L.

Figures 5 and 6 also present the results from well G5 of the Pinebush system in Cambridge and demonstrates the impacts from application of salt on parking lots. This well also shows increasing chloride and sodium trends from the 1980s. However, the concentrations dramatically increase in the middle to late 1990s, which is coincident with the construction of a large retail centre and associated large parking lots immediately adjacent to the well. Currently, chloride and sodium concentrations are higher than those in the William Street wellfield, being approximately 600 mg/L and 300 mg/L, respectively.
Figure 5: Chloride concentrations at the William Street and Pinebush Wellfields in the Region of Waterloo

Figure 6: Sodium concentrations at the William Street Wellfield in the Region of Waterloo
Implications of Elevated Sodium and Chloride in the Environment

Elevated and increasing concentrations of chloride and sodium are becoming prevalent in small rural centres, medium sized cities, and large urban areas. The application of road salt (sodium chloride) is a common activity across LESPR given winter road conditions.

The application of salt on roads (and parking lots) enters into the environment in several ways. In many cases, the snow gets plowed onto the road shoulder which either enables it to infiltrate into the groundwater or the meltwater runs off into surface water features and/or into storm water management structures. While the primary purpose of these storm water facilities is to manage wet weather flows, they also receive meltwater during the winter months. If the stormwater structures include infiltration galleries and/or Low Impact Development (LID) infrastructure, some of the salty water conveyed to them during the winter months could infiltrate into the subsurface further exacerbating impacts to groundwater based municipal drinking water systems. Ultimately, all the winter maintenance chemicals eventually enter the natural water system.

Climate change is resulting in more extreme weather patterns with generally milder winters and increased frequencies of precipitation freeze/thaw cycles predicted, resulting in increased use of chemicals for winter road and parking lot maintenance. If left unmanaged, chloride and sodium from road salt will continue to contaminate drinking water sources.

A summary of negative impacts of road salt use for winter maintenance can be described as follows:

- increased concentrations of chloride and sodium in surface water and groundwater drinking water sources impairs the water taste and poses a risk to persons with high blood pressure and sodium restricted diets;
- premature wear to concrete sidewalks and structures (bridge decks, overpasses) which reduces overall life of such infrastructure and results in increased capital costs to maintain them on the order of $250-$480 per tonne of salt applied (Environmental Commissioner of Ontario, 218). and,
- damage of animal and plant cells’ ability to carry out key ecological processes, changes to the weight of lake water to block the normal mixing process, which is essential for oxygen mixing, and harm to soil, gardens, vegetation and trees, which are necessary for shade as summers get hotter.

The only treatment process available to remove sodium and chloride from water is by reverse osmosis (desalinization) which is very expensive, energy intensive and creates a large volume of concentrate waste brine that must be discharged back into the environment. Accordingly, the only way to minimize the impacts from road salt on water resources and the environment is to reduce the amount being used.

Liability and Other Factors Influence the Amount of Salt Applied

In 2001, Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) completed an assessment of the impacts of road salt and concluded that high releases of road salts were having an adverse effect on freshwater ecosystems, soil vegetation and wildlife. This assessment initiated the risk management process to address the risks posed to the environment by road salt. Subsequently, a Code of Practice was developed by ECCC and a parallel Synthesis of Best Practices document was created by the Transportation Association of Canada. The synthesis is a detailed resource on winter maintenance practices and supplements the recommendations made within the Code.

The two main recommendations of the Code are the development of salt management plans and implementation of best management practices. The Code is voluntary, only applies to road
organizations that use more than 500 tonnes of salt per year, and does not apply to application on parking lots or sidewalks. The ECCC assessment report concluded that application of salt on parking lots represents less than 10% of the total amount of salt being applied across the country. However, the contribution of parking lots in urban areas is much greater due to the increased density of paved surfaces and the higher potential application rates needed to address private property liability concerns. Specifically, in parts of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, salt loading to groundwater from parking lots is equal to or greater than the loading from roads.

Several pieces of legislation provide the legal context for application of winter maintenance chemicals. For roads, municipal transportation agencies are required under Section 44 of the Municipal Act to maintain roads in a “reasonable state of repair” and to maintain them in accordance with the Minimum Maintenance Standards. For building owners and managers, the Occupier’s Liability Act requires a duty of care to maintain “reasonably” safe conditions for persons while on their premises. However, unlike for roads, the definition of what is reasonably safe is not stipulated and there are no standards. For parking lots, what is reasonable is determined through awareness of legal case studies, which are not too frequent, as most slip and fall claims arising from winter maintenance on parking lots are settled out of court. In addition, for private contractors, a settlement made by their insurance company often results in increases in insurance costs and/or loss of insurance completely. To ensure on-going viability of their businesses, most contractors will err on the side of caution and over apply salt.

These two pieces of legislation provide a framework for over-application of salt that is condoned by the public as necessary to ensure the protection of the travelling public. There is little recognition that this over-application may not be necessary as protection from liability is paramount. This framework is further facilitated by the following:

- the Ontario Environmental Protection Act exempts salt from being considered a contaminant if it is used “… for the purpose of keeping the highway safe …” meaning that applicators of salt do not have to be concerned about any environmental impacts by the amount they use;
- weather is difficult to predict and the weather that arrives can vary from that forecasted, which means that applications are often higher than needed in case the conditions are worse than forecasted;
- the science behind how salt works is poorly understood (i.e. it is the brine that breaks down ice, not rock salt itself, or that rock salt is not effective in temperatures below -10°C) or is ignored due to liability concerns;
- there is increasing societal demand to maintain black asphalt in southern Ontario at all times and conditions, provide alternate forms of travel with associated high winter maintenance requirements, and addressing accessibility concerns in winter for accessibility-challenged persons; and
- rock salt is on the order of 40% cheaper than the next cheapest winter de-icing chemical, forcing most municipalities and private contractors to default to this chemical even though other chemicals may improve winter maintenance performance with less environmental impact.

All of the above factors contribute to the public’s perception that salt does not affect the environment and creates a “laissez-faire” attitude towards the presence of salt on paved surfaces.

Factors Influencing Winter Maintenance on Roads

As noted above, the obligations to maintain roads arise from the Municipal Act and Minimum Maintenance Standards. These provide some level of liability protection against municipalities in
the event of vehicle accidents or slip and fall claims on roads. However, the capacity of each municipal agency to adopt new and/or implement sophisticated practices varies and many municipalities have budget pressures which may limit the introduction of these practices. In addition, the impact of joint-and-several liability often results in municipalities paying the majority of the costs resulting from an accident even if their contribution to the fault is minimal, further exacerbating the financial challenges for municipalities. Finally, most municipalities set a single performance standard for each road class and segment and most if not all municipalities are not willing to change the standard if the road comes in and out of a vulnerable drinking water protection area. These issues coupled with the voluntary nature of the ECCC Code could force municipalities to minimize adoption of practices to meet the Code or not participate at all.

Application on roads also differs from that on parking lots for the following reasons:

- most winter maintenance on roads are performed by municipal staff and/or larger contracted companies (e.g. province of Ontario) which provide stable working conditions that can attract long term employees ensuring consistency in approach reducing the need to train revolving staff;
- there are a relatively modest number of road agencies compared to hundreds and possibly thousands of private contractors; and
- the passage of cars on roads assists in the break down of the solid winter maintenance chemicals into the liquid brine needed to break the bond between snow/ice and the underlying surface, resulting in the need for less salt to be applied.

All of these factors can help reduce the amount of salt applied on roads compared with that applied on parking lots.

Many road authorities have made considerable improvements in technology, operational approaches and training to help improve application and reduce impacts to the environment. However, further changes will be difficult to achieve in part due to the risks associated with liability. In addition, the benefit of these reductions could be off-set by changes in climate, e.g. more freezing rain events, which will necessitate changing the approach to winter maintenance on roads. Further, the expansion of the Minimum Maintenance Standards to sidewalks in 2018 could result in an overall increase in the amount of salt being applied to the road network. This will exacerbate the impact to municipal drinking water supply sources. In Ontario, several organizations are promoting changes to the liability framework including the following:

- the Association of Municipalities of Ontario submitted a letter to the Ontario Attorney General requesting reform of the joint and several liability framework in Ontario as it relates to municipalities;  
  [https://www.amo.on.ca/AMO-Content/Policy-Updates/2019/AMOSubmitsReporttoAttorneyGeneralonLiabilityandIns].

- a combined working group representing the Ontario Good Roads Association and Conservation Ontario submitted a letter to the Ontario Attorney General requesting a review of the liability related to application of winter maintenance chemicals (Appendix A); and

- the World Wildlife Federation provided comments on the Province of Ontario’s Environmental Plan as posted on the Environmental Registry advocating for review of the liability framework in Ontario.  
  [http://assets.wwf.ca/downloads/ero_roadsalt_final_signon.pdf]
These letters highlight the challenges with the liability framework in Ontario and support the discussion contained in this report. Undertaking this review in addition to strengthening training programs for road agencies to reduce winter maintenance chemical application rates without compromising road safety would assist with mitigating risks to municipal drinking water systems.

Factors Influencing Winter Maintenance on Parking Lots

As persons responsible for parking lots do not have standards or guidance to follow, the approach to winter maintenance for a particular event is based primarily on their experience which results in inconsistent application rates and/or levels of service for each parking lot. In most cases, building parking lots and sidewalks are maintained by private winter maintenance contractors and the nature of the winter maintenance services is determined by the contract with the property owner. These contracts often contain an unrealistic level of service requirements, e.g. maintain bare pavement at all times, which the contractor addresses through over-application of salt and/or chemical "plowing" which uses excessive amounts of salt to melt all the snow. The contracts often attempt to assign the liability to the contractor, which is very difficult legally, and may have pricing structures that financially incentivize the application of salt on the property.

Much of the private winter maintenance contracting industry is performed by small and medium sized businesses. As a result, and because of the tendering process to compete for clients, they are less likely to invest in best practices/advanced technologies as part of their operation in order to make them profitable. The individual contracting company is also trying to maintain their insurance coverage, have high staff turnover rates which reduces the incentive to invest in staff, and the competition/bid process results in little sharing of management practices within the industry. In addition, as contractors are a for-profit business, they will also attempt to maximize the number of contracts they have which forces them to over apply to meet the contract requirements in recognition that it could be many hours until they are able to service the property again. All of these factors contribute to excess application.

The primary purpose of most buildings and properties is not for winter maintenance but rather for some other manufacturing, service or retail operation. So winter maintenance is seen as a cost of doing business. For most building owners or tenants, the winter maintenance contract is awarded to the lowest cost bid which does not encourage contractors to consider alternate practices as these would require capital investments for new technologies and/or approaches. In addition, even if the owner/operator were interested in reducing application rates, they would be exposed to liability in the event of an injury if they had directed the contractor to apply the salt at a lower rate.

The liability framework and challenges noted above prevent Risk Management Officials from negotiating Risk Management Plans (RMPs) that require reductions in application rates. Some of the ways these barriers present themselves have been observed through the implementation of salt application RMPs in the Region of Waterloo where approximately 1,600 RMPs will need to be negotiated in chloride and/or sodium ICAs in the current approved Source Protection Plan and expanding to over 3,000 existing properties in the October 2019 proposed amended plan. These include the following.

- The approach taken by the Region of Waterloo to negotiate salt application RMPs is to use a collaborative, education approach in order to secure buy-in and achieve a more self-sustainable/self-regulating model of enforcement. This is needed because most persons involved in the negotiation have little to no experience in winter maintenance. This approach necessitates a greater time commitment as part of the negotiation as a level of education is required to raise the general knowledge on the impacts of salting to the point where risk mitigation practices can be implemented effectively.
Currently, the RMPs for parking lots focus on contractor training and certification, i.e., Smart about Salt program, winter maintenance record keeping, and minimizing ice formation through site assessments. As in many cases these measures do not represent a drastic shift from current practices and because application rates cannot be stipulated in the RMP, only a minor amount of reduction in salt loading is likely to occur from these properties. This is much less than is needed to mitigate the impacts to the Region’s wells with chloride impacts. Region of Waterloo staff have assessed the reduction in application rates needed to reduce and or stabilize chloride concentrations based on the amount currently observed in their supply wells. This amount is on the order of a further 10 percent reduction in application on roads above and beyond the 25 percent reduction achieved through advances in technology, and 30 to 50 percent reduction in application rates on parking lots at four of its well systems. This amount does not include the salt already in the groundwater that hasn’t made it to the supply wells and will not reach the wells for a further 10 to 20 years.

Since application rates cannot be specified in the RMP, it is difficult to require changes in operational methods and procedures. Examples of more effective practices may include pre-wetting, liquid application, and/or standardizing application rates. These practices have been adopted by many road agencies and may represent the most effective opportunity to achieve salt reduction targets.

As noted for roads, changes to the liability framework would provide building owners and contractors to consider the impacts to the environment and their assets in addition to liability considerations. However, unlike road agencies that are meeting ECCC’s Code of Practice, there is no mechanism to ensure private contractors consider the environment in the determination of winter maintenance chemical application rates. The Smart About Salt Council has created the Smart About Salt program that encourages contractors to take training courses to improve their winter maintenance operations and to become certified demonstrating that they are implementing the program. And while this is helping to educate property owners and contractors, many of the recommended practices in the Smart About Salt program are not implemented by contractors due to the liability issues discussed above.

Opportunities for Liability and Training/Certification Program Changes

Several states in the US including Illinois and New Hampshire have changed the liability framework to help address the impacts to water resources due to the over-application of salt and as noted above several organizations are advocating a review of the liability framework in Ontario. Several other US states including Wisconsin have implemented various training, certification and/or education programs to help changes in the winter maintenance approach.

Specifically, the approach taken in New Hampshire is worth noting because the approach includes a combination of liability reform and training/certification. New Hampshire has introduced changes to the liability framework and developed a training/certification program to address the over-application of salt. This approach was required to gain permission to extend a state highway because a nearby lake had elevated chloride and sodium levels due to winter maintenance chemicals. The legislation requires contractors to undertake a one-day training program and become certified. In exchange, road and parking lot contractors would be provided partial protection against slip and fall and/or traffic accidents. This approach provides the liability relief and knowledge needed to change winter maintenance practices to minimize impact to water resources.
Changes Needed to the Source Water Protection Director’s Technical Rules

The current Director’s Technical Rules under the *Clean Water Act, 2006* provide significant drinking water threat (SDWT) thresholds based on road density or impervious surfaces. In many parts of the province, the thresholds did not trigger a SDWT for road salt application, despite a number of municipal drinking water wells that have increasing sodium and chloride concentration trends. As such, the original technical approach failed to recognise areas where trends were present that may result in an ICA. This problem was identified by the Region of Waterloo and an alternate approach to assessing the threat of road salt application was prepared and implemented for the Region of Waterloo. These changes were not implemented elsewhere in LESPR.

Similarly, road salt storage thresholds are currently set at 5,000 tonnes outside storage. This volume far exceeds typical storage volumes found at small to medium municipalities or private contractors. As a result, there are no known documented SDWTs for road salt storage outside of an ICA within LESPR. This is despite the fact that there are many municipal and private road salt storage facilities within wellhead protection areas of lesser volumes.

The practical result of these shortcomings in the Technical Rules is that the prescribed threats for road salt application and storage only get flagged as significant drinking water threats (SDWTs) when water quality data for a municipal drinking water system documents an increasing trend in chloride concentrations and the municipality declares the well as having an issue as defined by the Technical Rules. Since ICAs are only identified and delineated when there is a demonstrated water quality concern in a municipal well, this approach to protecting water quality in municipal drinking water systems becomes reactive rather than proactive.

Another concern is that the current Director’s Technical Rules and Ontario Regulation 287/07 – General pursuant to the *Clean Water Act, 2006* lists the prescribed drinking water threat as “the application, handling and storage of road salt”. Although road salt is a common term used for winter maintenance chemicals, the term can be misleading. The term road salt is used interchangeably with rock salt. Salt application at parking lots or on walkways can be more of a concern due to over-application than application on roadways. Additionally, road salt commonly refers to sodium chloride; however, there are many alternative products that are also chloride based, for example, calcium chloride or magnesium chloride. Strict interpretation of the wording may lead some readers to consider only salt applied to roads and that is sodium chloride based is a prescribed drinking water threat pursuant to the *Clean Water Act, 2006* and Source Protection Plans. A simple solution could be to rename the prescribed drinking water threats to application, handling and storage of winter maintenance chemicals and then define the term in the regulation.

A complementary change to the above would be to make application of winter maintenance chemicals on roads, parking lots and sidewalks different circumstances in the Table of Circumstances to reflect the different approach to winter maintenance, the legislative and liability framework, and the mitigation measures possible associated with each surface type. This would also help highlight that it is more than just application of winter maintenance chemicals on roads that is affecting drinking water supply sources.

Since 2017, the Province has been considering changes to the Director’s Technical Rules to address the shortcomings noted above. Recently, the Province held technical engagement sessions at the end of November 2019 to consult on proposed changes. Details at the time of preparing this report are limited, but we understand that the Province intends to lower the thresholds for the activities and circumstances that result in a significant drinking water threat for the handling and storage of salt and the application of salt. A summary of the proposed changes to road salt storage and application are presented in Table 1. Lake Erie Region staff and municipal representatives have participated in the stakeholder engagement sessions and there will be
opportunity for staff to comment on the proposed rule changes directly with Provincial staff and through the more formal Environmental Registry process later on.

Table 1: Phase II Technical Rules Project: Proposed Amendments to Road Salt Storage and Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Current Approach</th>
<th>Objective of the Amendment</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Drinking Water Threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Salt Application</td>
<td>Thresholds for impervious areas that identify significant risks are 80% in WHPAs scored 10 and 8% in IPZs scored 10.</td>
<td>Use an improved scientific approach to better identify areas where the application of road salt and storage of road salt may cause impairments to the quality of drinking water sources.</td>
<td>Thresholds for impervious areas that identify significant risks will be: 30% for WHPAs scored 10; 6% or greater for IPZ scored 10 and; 8% or greater for IPZ scored 9 to 10.</td>
<td>New thresholds were developed based on the analysis conducted in consultation with municipalities and SPAs/SPCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Salt Storage</td>
<td>Volumes that identify significant risk are: 500 tonnes for IPZs scored 10; 5000 tonnes for IPZs scored 9 or greater, or WHPAs scored 10 for uncovered storages; covered storage can not be a significant risk.</td>
<td>Using same scores of IPZs and WHPAs, proposed volumes are: (1) Any quantity for uncovered storages; (2) 100 kg or greater for covered storage excluding engineered facilities, (3) 500 tonnes or greater for engineered facility or structure.</td>
<td>Using same scores of IPZs and WHPAs, proposed volumes are: (1) Any quantity for uncovered storages; (2) 100 kg or greater for covered storage excluding engineered facilities, (3) 500 tonnes or greater for engineered facility or structure.</td>
<td>Engineered facilities: permanent building anchored to a permanent foundation with an impermeable floor and that is completely roofed and walled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Actions to Address the Over-Application of Winter Maintenance Chemicals Report Recommendations

To address the above concerns, the following recommendations are provided to the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee for consideration:

THAT the Province of Ontario explore ways to reduce the factors that contribute to excess application of winter maintenance chemicals on road ways and parking lots through a review of the liability framework in Ontario.
THAT the Province of Ontario work with municipalities to strengthen training programs for road agencies that apply winter maintenance chemicals on roads and sidewalks to reduce application rates without compromising road safety that would assist with mitigating risks to municipal drinking water systems.

THAT the Province of Ontario require property owners and contractors responsible for maintaining safe parking lots and sidewalks be trained and certified in the application of winter maintenance chemicals.

THAT the Province of Ontario change Prescribed Drinking Water Threats, “the application of road salt” and “the handling and storage of road salt” to “the application of winter maintenance chemicals” and “the handling and storage of winter maintenance chemicals”, and define the term in the regulation.

THAT the Province of Ontario change the Table of Circumstances related to the application of winter maintenance chemicals to differentiate between application on roads, sidewalks and parking lots to reflect the different liability issues and the nature of winter maintenance conducted for each surface type.

AND THAT the Province of Ontario amend the Clean Water Act’s Director’s Technical Rules to enable municipalities to proactively protect their municipal drinking water supplies from the application and storage of winter maintenance chemicals.
Appendix A:
Letter from Ontario Good Roads Association and Conservation Ontario to the Ontario Attorney General requesting a review of the liability related to application of winter maintenance chemicals
November 1, 2019
The Honourable Doug Downey
Attorney General of Ontario
McMurtry-Scott Building, 11th Floor
720 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 2S9

Dear Attorney General Downey,

Re: Municipal Liability and Insurance Costs

The excessive use of road salt has been shown to impact our environment including aquatic life and drinking water sources, and also our infrastructure. In Ontario, several drinking water sources are identified under the *Clean Water Act* as being impacted by elevated levels of chloride, a chemical found in road salt.

In 2016, the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) and Conservation Ontario (CO) established a multi-stakeholder ‘Salt Vulnerable Areas’ working group, that developed a road salt best practices guidance document in 2018 for consideration by municipalities of varying capacities and budgets. In 2019, the OGRA and CO established the ‘Ontario Road Salt Management Advisory Committee’ in order to further the discussions around the broader policy and legislative framework related to the use of road salt, and to provide recommendations to help find the balance between environmental considerations and road safety.

The following recommendations are provided for the consideration of the Attorney General of Ontario:

**Address excessive liability issues for municipalities**

Ontario municipalities follow a Council approved Level of Service to ensure the safety of the travelling public, and they proactively work with government agencies and others in order to optimize the amount of road salt usage that balances public road safety with environmental concerns. However, excessive liability issues severely impact municipalities (and other road operation authorities) and in many cases may limit their ability to further adjust the application of road salt in order to meet environmental legislation that protects water resources.

Therefore it is recommended that the applicable liability framework be reviewed, such that road operation authorities can continue to ensure road safety while also supporting a further reduction in the amount of road salt applied.

**Establish standards and address excessive liability issues for private contractors**

There are many others that also use road salt besides municipalities, such as private contractors maintaining privately or municipally owned parking lots. The private sector often uses excessive amounts of road salt, in order to avoid liability claims. Training programs such as ‘Smart about Salt’ are available to the private sector to help them optimize road salt usage, but these programs are not mandatory.
Therefore, it is recommended that standards for road salt application and storage be established for the private sector to help reduce road salt reaching our water bodies. Further, it is recommended that the applicable liability framework be reviewed, such that private contractors can continue to ensure safety during the winter while also supporting a significant reduction in the amount of road salt applied.

In summary, steps to address liability, combined with standards (where they do not exist) for road salt application, can help preserve our precious natural resources.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Please feel free to contact Chitra Gowda (cgowda@conservationontario.ca) at CO or Fahad Shuja (fahad@ogra.org) at OGRA if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Joe W. Tierney
Executive Director
Ontario Good Roads Association

Kim Gavine
General Manager
Conservation Ontario

Sent via email to: doug.downeyco@pc.ola.org; magpolicy@ontario.ca
Recommendation

1. That Report CAOR-CW-03-20 regarding bus leases be received; and

2. That the lease of six Elkhart Coach buses be awarded to Overland Custom Coach (2007) for $15,234 monthly excluding taxes; and

3. That the monthly lease cost be funded from the Provincial funding contained in the 2020 budget from the Community Transportation Grant.

4. That staff be authorized to proceed with this project prior to Council approval as per Section 25.6 of Procedural By-law 5003-18.

Executive Summary

On Tuesday January 28, 2020 Grey County released a Negotiated Request for Proposal for the leasing of buses for community transportation. Grey County sought six leased vehicles. Two leased vehicles to operate along Highway 10 from Owen Sound to Orangeville, two leased vehicles to operate along Highway 26 from Owen Sound to Blue Mountains, and one leased vehicle to operate along Highway 6 from Owen Sound to Wiarton. Additionally, Grey County sought one leased vehicle to operate as a spare when needed. All vehicles were required to accommodate at least 24 passengers’ seats or 18 passengers plus two PMD (personal mobility device) seats.
Background and Discussion

NRFP-EDTC-03-20 was posted on the Grey County purchasing portal on January 28, 2020 until February 14, 2020. Submissions were received from the following companies: Damera Bus Sales Canada Corp., Overland Custom Coach (2007) Inc., and City View Bus Sales & Service LTD. After careful review of each proposal and scores accumulated against the stated criteria, the recommendation from staff is to award this project to Overland Custom Coach (2007) Inc.

The evaluation team consisted of the following individuals. This team was thoughtfully selected to ensure all aspects of the Grey Transit Route were considered.

- Kim Wingrove
  - Chief Administrative Officer, Grey County
- Mike Alguire
  - Purchasing Manager, Grey County
- Steven Dollimer
  - Maintenance Manager, Grey County
- Paul Brown
  - Shop Manager, First Student
- Stephanie Stewart
  - Manager, Community Transportation, Grey County

The evaluation criteria included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Profile/Facility Details</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Descriptions</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasing Services References</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lease Agreement</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Price</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Company Profile/Facility Details criteria were developed to gain a better understanding of the bidder. Bidders were asked to describe their company profile and their experience delivering leased transit vehicles. Bidders described, the number of employees, administrative and maintenance support, number of years in business, transit industry award and/or certifications, office and garage locations, fleet size, service bays and parts storage. Overland Custom Coach’s company profile was reviewed by the Grey County evaluation team, the team felt Overland was well equipped to handle the needs of GTR. Overland Custom Coach has been in business for 38 years and has been awarded in excess of 10 top dealer awards. Overland Custom Coach has been vetted through the Metrolinx Transit Procurement Initiative and supplies six transit agencies with vehicles.

Vehicle Description was developed through market research, stakeholder engagement and by examining the needs of the GTR service. The evaluation team was pleased with the vehicles proposed by Overland Custom Coach. During the operation of GTR five buses will always be in operation, while one bus acts as a spare, each route will operate with the same bus model. This is advantageous for Grey County as the proposed vehicles will all be identical, this will help to reduce maintenance costs and delays in attaining replacement parts. Staff recommend these buses as they are equipped with a variety of features that will ensure the safe and comfortable transportation of all GTR riders. Each bus will consist of the following design, features and amenities:

- Ford E450 Chassis
- Capacity of 21 riders plus standees
- 2 Personal Mobility Device Seats
- AODA Compliance
- 6.8L Gasoline Engine
- Automatic Transmission
- 225-amp alternator
- (2) 770 CCA Amp batteries
- LT225/75R16 Tires
- 55 Gallon Fuel Tank Capacity
- Driver Air Bags
- Available Air Conditioning and Heat
- Ramp Capacity 1000lb lift
- 5 year / 160,000 km limited warranty on Bus body. OEM Ford Warranty on chassis is (5) Year / 100,000 km Powertrain, (3) year / 60,000 km Basic
- AUTOMATIC Passenger Voice Announcement System with Next Stop request system
- Fiberglass exterior body skin
- LED Lighting
• Full Steel Cage Passenger Safety Structure System
• Front and Side Electronic Destination Sign
• Overhead Grab Rails powder coated yellow, Parallel entry grab rails powder coated yellow
• Driver and passenger side stanchion with modesty panel
• Electric Entry Door
• Upgraded Rear Suspension to Mor/Ryde,
• Heated Mirrors
• Unlimited Kilometers

Additional features are available at a supplementary cost, staff recommend the purchase of bike racks, fare boxes and two-way radios. Staff will seek sponsorship for bike racks. AVL/ITS technology, GPS and Cameras are aftermarket features that could be added later.

  o Bike Racks $3500 per bus
  o Fire Suppression $3340 per bus
  o Fare Box $2380 per bus
  o Two Way Radio $910 per bus
  o GPS $1850 per bus
  o AVL/ITS Technology (after year one fees) $3934.50 per bus
  o Cameras $1500 per bus

It is important to note that vehicles will require a 90-120 delivery window.

Leasing References, staff contacted the references provided by Overland Custom Coach and received positive feedback from all references.

Bid Table, Overland Custom Coach has provided Grey County with two lease options. One with a higher monthly cost but a lower residual at the termination of the lease, while the second option has a lower monthly cost but a 20% residual at termination. Staff have determined that it is financially responsible to lease buses and consider the buyout at the conclusion of the lease. At this time, it is the recommendation of staff to lease buses as opposed to purchase to keep the initial cost down while ridership data is gathered.
Legal and Legislated Requirements

Upon County Council direction, staff will finalize the lease agreement

Financial and Resource Implications

Upon County Council direction, staff will finalize the lease agreement with Overland Custom Coach. The leasing cost can be accommodated within the provincial grants received by Grey County and the Township of Southgate. A future report with route options and the MOU with Southgate will be brought forward for Council consideration.

Relevant Consultation

☐ Internal

Grey County Legislative Services
Grey County Purchasing Department
Grey County Finance Department
Grey County Transportation Services

☐ External (list)

First Student Canada

Appendices and Attachments
Recmmendation

1. That Report HDR-CW-02-20 regarding a proposed Investment Plan for Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative for 2020-21 be received; and

2. That Grey County Council approves the Investment Plan for the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative and approves the 2020-21 funding to be expensed by March 31, 2021.

Executive Summary

The County receives funds from the Province through the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) to deliver local homelessness and homelessness prevention programs. This report provides details on the programs and services for 2020-21.

Background and Discussion

The Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative 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 2019-20*
### Program Funding Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Annual Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing with Related Supports</td>
<td>680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Housing Benefit</td>
<td>475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHA Outreach Worker</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Homeless Prevention Program</td>
<td>211,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Housing Program</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Response Table</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Enhancement Program</td>
<td>92,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>188,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CHPI Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,888,303</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing with Related Supports

Grey County funds four housing with related supports providers; Ayton Residential Lodge, Kent Residential Homes, Inglewood Villa, and Second Avenue Lodge. This housing provides services such as medication management, laundry services and meals. This program provides housing with supports for an average of 70 residents of Grey County per month or over 25,000 nights of accommodation.

Increased allocation this year due to a proposed per diem increase effective April 1, 2020 from $51.89 to $54.25 in order to assist with the providers increasing costs. The most recent per diem increase was provided on January 1st, 2018 over 2 years ago.

Grey County will enter into a new agreement with each housing provider for the increased per diem.

### 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. SHB provided financial assistance in the amount of $478,667 to 890 households in 2019. SHB covers last month’s rent, utility arrears and rental arrears.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>Households Assisted</th>
<th>Amount Issued ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beds/Appliances</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Costs</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>107,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Month's Rent</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>244,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CMHA- Grey County Housing Outreach Worker

Housing has hired an outreach worker through the Canadian Mental Health Association to assist tenants in maintaining their housing, providing supports and making referrals to community agencies. The Outreach Worker will build more partnership opportunities with Grey County Housing and CMHA.

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.

Y Emergency Housing Program

Since 2008, Grey County has partnered with Y Housing for the provision of emergency shelter services. The Y finds suitable lodgings for those who find themselves without shelter for the night. A 24-hour service is available in cold winter months in partnership with 211. This service provided emergency accommodation for 456 people/households in 2019.

Homelessness Response Table

Grey County Housing is working with Canadian Mental Health Association, Grey Bruce Health Services, Bruce County and local homelessness prevention services to implement a homelessness outreach system. Funds will go towards initiatives that will assist in the creation of a coordinated access system. The Coordinator will implement the creation of a By-Name list to better track and support people experiencing homelessness.

The outreach worker will identify people having repeated episodes of homelessness and work with community partners to provide wrap around services. A pilot project using transitional units from our existing stock to provide housing with supports to people experiencing chronic homelessness that are participating in the homelessness response table will start this April.

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 such as Beaver Valley Outreach, Safe N Sound, O Share and other local community groups.

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 which was reviewed and updated this year. The plan identifies four key strategic areas:

- Create More Affordable Housing
- Preserve Existing Stock
- Reduce Chronic Homelessness
- Increase Supportive Housing

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

Financial and Resource Implications

$1,888,303 in provincial funding will be provided to the County of Grey for the fiscal year of April 2020 to March 2021. 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: 10 year Housing and Homelessness Plan
☐ External:
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Committee Report

To: Warden McQueen and Members of Grey County Council
Committee Date: February 27, 2020
Subject / Report No: EDTC-CW-06-20
Title: Draft Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan
Prepared by: Bryan Plumstead, Pat Hoy, Randy Scherzer
Reviewed by:
Lower Tier(s) Affected: All
Status: Recommendation

1. That Report EDTC-CW-06-20 and the Draft Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan be received; and

2. That the Draft Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan be posted on the County website; and

3. That staff be directed to circulate a link to the draft plan to member municipalities and interested stakeholders, and

4. That following a minimum 30-day period, comments will be reviewed and incorporated into a final plan and brought back to county council along with recommendations for implementation.

Executive Summary

In 2018, Grey County received funding from the Province of Ontario’s Municipal Commuter Cycling (OMCC) Program to develop a Cycling and Trails Master Plan, along with other projects. The Master Plan was founded on past county projects and initiatives which outlined the need for a long-term guiding document to identify and prioritize opportunities to enhance cycling, trails and other non-motorized forms of recreation and travel within Grey County and its local municipalities.

The draft master plan has been developed with input and involvement from County staff, local municipal staff and elected officials, local stakeholders, tourism
representatives, public health officials, residents and decision makers. The plan is informed by existing processes and meant to adapt to future opportunities as a means of advising decision making, communications and coordination among those who will be responsible for its implementation.

The Draft Plan is presented to County Council and the public, and over the next 30 days, input and feedback are sought from the public, stakeholders and member municipalities. All comments and feedback will be reviewed by the consultant and staff and incorporated into a final plan. Staff will also work on an implementation plan and recommendations to bring back to county council.

Background and Discussion

In 2018, Grey County received funding from the Province of Ontario’s Municipal Commuter Cycling (OMCC) Program. The OMCC Program was created to provide funding and support for the implementation of cycling infrastructure and projects across Ontario. As part of the OMCC Program, Grey County received $530,652 to:

– Develop a Cycling and Trails Master Plan (required);
– Implement 22 kilometers of paved shoulders on County roads; and
– Purchase five bike counters.

In addition to this funding, Grey County partnered with Regional Tourism Organization (RTO) 7: BruceGreySimcoe to provide funds to support the Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan. A project steering committee was formed composed of Director of Transportation Services Pat Hoy, Director of Planning Randy Scherzer, Manager of Tourism Bryan Plumstead and Jason Weppler, Heath Promoter, Grey Bruce Health Unit. After a procurement process, the County retained WSP Canada Group Limited (WSP) to undertake the master plan.

The development of the County’s Cycling and Trails Master Plan was founded on past projects and initiatives, such as Ontario’s Provincial Cycling Strategy (#CycleON – 2013), the County’s Transportation Master Plan (2015) Grey County’s Official Plan update (Re-colour Grey 2018) and Grey County’s Recreational Trails Master Plan (2019.). These plans have outlined the need for a long-term guiding document to identify and prioritize opportunities to enhance cycling, trails and other non-motorized forms of recreation and travel within Grey County and its local municipalities.

What is a Master Plan?

A master plan is a long-range planning document that recommends infrastructure improvements to guide future growth and development for the area in study. Master
plans can provide a broad framework to help establish the needs and rationale for specific projects in a municipality.

A robust public and stakeholder input process through consultation and engagement is a critical component when developing a master plan. Providing multiple opportunities for citizens and stakeholders to discuss and provide feedback on the future of their community can foster public buy-in, build support and ensure the recommendations included in a master plan reflect the needs and trends of the area and its residents.

A master plan is not a commitment to projects; it should be used as a tool to inform decision making, budgeting and communications. To clearly set the expectations for the Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan, the following assumptions should be reviewed and taken into consideration:

What the plan is:  What the plan is not:
• A long-range blueprint;
• A tool to facilitate implementation;
• A communications tool; and
• A guide for future policies.
• A schedule of capital projects;
• A feasibility study for specific projects;
• A prescriptive policy document;
• A commitment to costs and funding.

Grey County Cycling & Trails Master Plan (Draft)

At a high-level, the Cycling and Trails Master Plan is intended to reflect the guiding principles and objectives found in policies at all levels of government that support enhanced mobility, increased quality of life and healthy communities.

The master plan has been developed with input and involvement from County staff, local municipal staff and elected officials, local stakeholders, tourism representatives, public health officials, residents and decision makers.

The master plan is informed by existing processes and meant to adapt to future opportunities as a means of advising decision making, communications and coordination among those who will be responsible for its implementation. It is intended to be flexible; as such any future changes to the master plan should be reviewed and documented by County staff in consultation with local municipal staff, stakeholders and residents.
Cristina Valente and Greggory Hanson of WSP will present an overview of the plan to County Council.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Chapter one provides background for the plan, who it is for, how the plan was developed and how the public and stakeholders were involved. Existing initiatives and facilities and routes are detailed, results of the public survey summarized, and the plan principles, vision and objectives outlined.

Chapter 2 – The Network

Four steps were undertaken to create the draft network; existing conditions including routes & trails were catalogued, gaps and candidate routes were evaluated according to a set of criteria, field investigations were done with photography linked to google mapping, selection of network routes and facilities was made using Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18. This resulted in a draft network map with recommended facilities ranging from signage to paved shoulders and other facilities.

Chapter 3 – Network Components

This chapter provides resources on planning, design and implementation of the network and its facilities. This includes facility design, travel lane widths, trail crossings, signage and wayfinding, user types and user trips (eg. commuter, recreational or tourism) and network considerations (partial paved shoulders, road surface and risk management and liability.)

Chapter 4 – Implementing the Plan

Implementation of the Cycling and Trails Master Plan require strategic recommendations that are realistic, consistent with the County’s existing processes and flexible enough to respond to future opportunities. These recommendations are not intended to be prescriptive nor commit the County and its member municipalities to future funding or a schedule of projects. Phasing and costing for capital projects for 2020-2029 are given, along with suggestions for programming, partnerships and implementation management. Based on input and feedback from the public and member municipalities, staff will bring back recommendations around an implementation plan and how to prioritize recommendations such as signage.

Next Steps

County staff and WSP Canada are hosting a public information session February 27, 2020 from 11:30 – 1:30 pm at the Grey County building to review the draft plan with stakeholders and members of the public. Member municipalities will be provided with a
link to the draft plan and county staff are available to make presentations to staff and or councils as requested. Comments and feedback are requested within a 30-day review period. All comments and feedback will be reviewed by the consultant and staff and incorporated into a final plan. Staff will also work on an implementation plan and recommendations to bring back to county council.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The development of the County’s Cycling and Trails Master Plan is consistent with Master Plan Approach #1 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) process, which considers Phases 1 and 2.

Financial and Resource Implications

Cost of this plan was $53,000 and was funded by Grey County ($27,000), OMCC ($16,000) and RTO7 ($10,000). Staff from the tourism department, planning, transportation services, and GIS staff in IT all contributed significantly to work with the consultants, and to be available for public consultation and communicate with stakeholders and the public.

Recommendations regarding acceptance and implementation of this plan will be brought back to county council following consultation with member municipalities, stakeholders and the public. Any financial implications of the plan will be included in future budgets for consideration.

Relevant Consultation

☐ Internal: Economic Development, Tourism and Culture, Planning, Transportation Services, IT

☐ External Grey Bruce Health Unit (Stakeholders, agencies, member municipalities and interested members of the public have been consulted throughout the preparation of this plan and are invited to provide comments on the Draft Plan for a minimum 30 day period.)
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Draft Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan

Appendix A – Policy Summary
Appendix B – Consultation Summary

Appendix C – Signage Considerations

Appendix D – Network Database

Appendix E – City of Owen Sound Official Plan Schedule D
Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-09-20 regarding the draft Forest Management Plan be received; and

2. That staff be directed to solicit input from the public, the forest industry, agencies, and municipalities on the draft Forest Management Plan; and

3. That following consideration of stakeholder input, a revised Forest Management Plan be presented to the Forest Management Plan Advisory Committee and County Council for its consideration.

Executive Summary

The Forest Management Plan describes how the County Forests are to be managed over a 20-year period. The current Forest Management Plan was adopted by County Council in 2003 and requires updating.

A Forest Management Plan update has been completed by Grey Sauble Conservation Authority staff in consultation with County staff and the Forest Management Plan Advisory Committee. This draft Plan is now ready for public consultation, subject to any further feedback from the Committee of the Whole. Following public, stakeholder and agency input, a revised draft of the Plan can be prepared for consideration by the Forest Management Plan Advisory Committee, and later County Council.
Background and Discussion

The Forest Management Plan (FMP) applies to the management of Grey County’s approximately 8,400 acres of forest over a 20-year period. It has no bearing on privately owned forests. Since the approval of the 2003 FMP the County Forests have become certified under the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) through the Eastern Ontario Model Forest. FSC requires an advisory committee to be established to provide input into a Forest Management Plan or update.

A key component of the FMP is ensuring that the County Forests can be harvested sustainably, such that they generate some income, while also ensuring the long-term health of the Forests. The County’s Forests are an asset to the County, not only in terms of income, but much more so for the recreational and environmental benefits they offer.

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the contracted manager of the County Forests, is working closely with Grey County staff on an update to the FMP in consultation with a Forest Management Plan Advisory Committee (FMPAC). A large portion of the work is updating the forest inventories in each of the County Forests which has been completed by Grey Sauble staff over the past couple of years. The FMPAC was established to provide input and advice into the completion of the updated FMP. Staff report PDR-CW-12-19 (link included in the Attachments) established the terms of reference for the FMPAC.

Based on the feedback from FMPAC, Grey Sauble and County staff completed a draft FMP in January 2020. A summary of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats as it relates to the County Forests are listed below.

Strengths

Grey County is currently about 40 to 45% forested and therefore supports a strong local forest economy. The County Forests are an integral part of the overall forest cover and help to contribute to the local forest economy. This Forest Management Plan will ensure that the County Forests are managed using good forestry practices which will be aimed at maintaining or enhancing all values within a forest stand. The values associated with healthy County Forests include not only monetary values, but also social values such as employment and recreation opportunities, and other ecosystem service values such as carbon sequestration, water quality and quantity management, and wildlife habitat. Properly managing the County Forests will ensure that these benefits can be enjoyed for generations to come.
Weaknesses

Historically, forests have been managed around economics rather than through an ecosystem approach. This has led to depleted resources not only in Grey County forests but in fact around the world. This updated Forest Management Plan will ensure that the health of the forests are returned to an ideal state and will leave the County’s forests in better overall health at the end of the planning period.

Existing signage, property identification (fencing), and access (gates, roads, trails, etc.) may need to be improved to prevent illegal activities in some of the County’s forests. This is something that has also been flagged as part of the Recreational Trails Master Plan.

Opportunities

Grey County Forests provide wildlife with natural sources of food, water, shelter, lifecycle habitat and travel corridors. These significant woodland areas provide long-term certainty that portions of the core green areas and linkages in the County’s Official Plan will exist in perpetuity for the benefit of the County and its residents.

Healthy diverse forests are more resilient to the effects of climate change more than unhealthy (unmanaged) forests and therefore it is important that forests are properly managed.

Tending activities including tree girdling in hardwood stands and pruning in plantations were historically done by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) to improve the quality of forests or to control insect or disease problems. MNRF had the staffing and financial resources to tend the forest up until 1995. Since 1995, tending has not been undertaken due to available resources. We want to explore partnership opportunities including the possibility of sharing resources and sharing best practices when it comes to managing forests. This could include further partnership opportunities with conservation authorities, municipalities, and neighbouring counties.

Opportunities to purchase properties to expand the County forest landholdings as the funds and the properties become available should be explored.

Expansion of trails on existing logging roads and establishing parking facilities are all opportunities that will be explored further as recommended by the Recreational Trails Master Plan.

Threats

As noted previously, Grey County has approximately 40 to 45% forest cover which can support a strong local forest economy. However, the last decade has seen the loss of
hardwood sawmills. In fact, only one commercial hardwood mill remains in the County. We want to work with our economic development staff to see if there are further opportunities to promote and enhance our local forest industry.

Regardless of the plan that we make there will always be the unknown aspects of dealing with this type of resource including the long-term effect of disease or invasive species. Invasive species are anticipated to increase due to the impacts caused by climate change. Part of the work done by Grey Sauble Conservation Authority was to document any invasive species within each of the forest tracts. We will utilize this information to develop an invasive species management plan using recommended best practices.

County Forests can also be impacted by natural disasters or destruction from trespass or vandalism. Natural disasters are difficult to prevent, however destruction caused from trespass or vandalism can be better managed using fencing, gates and other barriers to prevent illegal access. We also want to work with our local law enforcement to explore further opportunities.

Consultation

Following Council review, staff will release the draft for review by the public, stakeholders, agencies, and municipalities. A public meeting will be scheduled for late March or April. The commenting period for this draft is anticipated to end in June, unless any feedback necessitates the need for a longer comment period. A final draft FMP will come to FMPAC and later Council for consideration. Attached to this report is the draft FMP.

The FMP is not to be confused with the recent Recreational Trails Master Plan (RTMP), which was approved by Council in 2019. The FMP is a very technical document that governs how the County manages our County Forests through selective harvests (e.g. which County Forests will be harvested each year, and to what extent). The RTMP provides guidance on the recreational aspects (e.g. hiking, cycling, snowmobiling, etc.) of the County’s Forests, as well as the Canadian Pacific (CP) Rail Trail. The two plans are coordinated but have different focuses and audiences.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The Forest Management Plan outlines environmental best practices for managing the County Forests. County Planning and Legal Services staff, in addition to Grey Sauble Conservation Authority staff, will ensure that the Plan meets all legislative and Forest Stewardship Council certification requirements.
Financial and Resource Implications

This project is being completed by Planning and GSCA contract staff with a total budget of $60,000 which has been spread over a 3-year period. Most of the expense for this project was updating the forest inventory data for each County Forest tract which has been completed by GSCA staff and commenced in 2017. Once the FMP has been finalized and approved by Council, there will not be any further costs anticipated beyond the regular budgeted forest maintenance as part of the existing contract with Grey Sauble Conservation Authority. Through the discussions with FMPAC, the need for sustainable harvest practices has been prioritized, while also trying to ensure that stable income is provided to offset forest maintenance costs.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal – Clerk’s, Legal Services, Transportation Services, Tourism, Economic Development, Finance

☒ External – Municipalities, First Nations, Metis, Conservation Authorities and agencies will be consulted as part of this review. Interested public members and groups will also be engaged including those that have participated in the process to date.
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Draft Forest Management Plan V1.2

Current Forest Management Plan

PDR-CW-12-19 Forest Management Plan Advisory Committee Report
Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-14-20 regarding a proposed County Official Plan Amendment be received; and

2. That the proposal proceeds to a Public Meeting to consider an amendment to the County of Grey Official Plan on lands designated ‘Agricultural’ and ‘Rural’, to permit the expansion of an existing quarry at Part Lot 36, Concession 2, geographic Township of Sarawak, Township of Georgian Bluffs, provided the Township is prepared to hold a joint public meeting in consideration of the necessary local amendment requirements.

Executive Summary

A proposed County official plan amendment application (42-03-580-OPA-148) has been submitted to amend the mineral resource extraction policies to permit the expansion of an existing quarry operation on lands designated ‘Agricultural’ and ‘Rural’. Schedule B of the County Official Plan does not identify the subject lands as an ‘Aggregate Resource Area’. County Official Plan aggregate resources and mineral resource extraction land use types policies require an amendment to the plan where a new or expanded pit operation is proposed outside of an Aggregate Resource Area. This amendment application would also involve a zoning by-law amendment application to the Township of Georgian Bluffs.

Background and Discussion
The County has received an application from Dave Munro (representing 660341 Ontario Inc. c/o Harold Construction Ltd.) to amend the Grey County Official Plan. The amendment would allow the expansion of an existing quarry operation onto lands that are not designated as an 'Aggregate Resource Area'. The existing quarry operation – Sarawak Quarry - is currently owned and operated by Harold Sutherland Construction Ltd. The subject lands are 32.5 ha (80.3 acres) in size. The proposed licensed area will apply to 15.55 hectares and only 14.4 hectares of this area is proposed for extraction.

The proposed development also requires an amendment to the Township of Georgian Bluffs zoning by-law.

The subject lands are located at Part Lot 36, Concession 2, geographic Township of Sarawak, Township of Georgian Bluffs. Map 1 illustrates the subject lands and the lands to be licensed.

Map 1: Airphoto of the Subject Lands

The subject property is designated ‘Agricultural’ and ‘Rural’. The lands to be licensed are designated ‘Agricultural’. The reason for this amendment is that Schedule B of the County Official Plan does not identify the subject lands as an ‘Aggregate Resource Area’ and Section 5.6.4 of the County Official Plan requires an official plan amendment for all new or expanding quarry operations that are proposed within the County except for those proposed within the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area. The subject lands were previously used for cash-crop purposes. Alternative locations were considered and reviewed for the proposed quarry expansion on lands that were not classified through the Canada Land Inventory Classes as Class 1,2,3 lands. Reasoning has been provided by the applicant explaining why the subject lands are well suited for the proposed quarry expansion.
The existing Aggregate Resource Act License for the operating quarry immediately to the north is a class A license, licensed to extract on an annual basis 400,000 tonnes. Including the proposed expansion, the cumulative extraction will remain 400,000 tonnes. This will limit the possibility of increasing traffic flow to and from the subject site. Haulage routes will continue to utilize the existing entrance located off Grey Road 1 for the expansion. The subject quarry expansion will be a below the water table operation.

The surrounding lands to the subject site are a mix of residential and agricultural uses. There is a residential subdivision located to the southeast of the subject lands along Ishwar Drive. The lands to the south and west are used primarily for agricultural purposes. The lands immediately to the north is the applicant’s existing quarry.

The noise impact assessment and blast impact assessment identified 5 sensitive receptors (residential properties within 500 metres of the proposed licensed area). These sensitive receptors (residential) range approximately between 225 and 340 metres from the proposed expansion lands.

Ron Davidson, a land use planning consultant has submitted a Planning Justification Report in support of the proposal. The following background information has also been provided as part of the overall submission: site plans, combined level 1 & 2 hydrogeological study, natural environment technical report: level 1 & 2, noise impact assessment, blast impact assessment, karst hazard assessment, and a stage 1-2 archaeological assessment.

There are proposed amendments to the Aggregate Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards under the Aggregate Resources Act on the Ontario’s Regulatory Registry for review and comment by March 30th, 2020. Staff have not yet reviewed and provided comment on the proposed changes to the Act but will account for any effects these changes may have with respect to the subject application.

Dave Munro (representing Sutherland Construction) has also processed the Quarry License Application under the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA). There are no outstanding objections or concerns from any of the agencies or the general public. A copy of the report and background materials can be found at the below link:

Link to Background Materials

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 in this case the Township of Georgian Bluffs local official plan, and any Provincial plans in force and effect.

A detailed planning analysis has not been undertaken at this stage. Following the public process, and agency comments, a thorough analysis and staff recommendation will be provided. Key Provincial and County policies have been flagged below for consideration.
Provincial Legislation – The Planning Act

Most notable to this proposed official plan amendment are the following clauses from the Planning Act, which will need to be considered.

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

There are significant woodlands identified on the subject lands along the east and southern portions.

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

The subject lands are designated ‘Agricultural’ and ‘Rural’ as per Schedule A of the County Official Plan. The licensed area for the quarry operation will be entirely located in the lands designated ‘Agricultural’. As outlined by the Provincial Policy Statement and County Official Plan, specific policy provisions are required to be met prior to establishing a quarry operation on lands designated as ‘Agricultural’.

(e) the supply, efficient use and conservation of energy and water,

A combined level 1 & 2 hydrogeological study has been submitted as part of this application.

(o) the protection of public health and safety

The accompanying studies submitted (noise impact assessment, blast impact assessment, hydrogeological study) as part of this application aim to assess public health and safety matters in this proposal.

Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014)

Section 2.3.6.1 of the PPS outlines that non-agricultural uses in prime agricultural areas may only be permitted for extraction of minerals, petroleum resources and mineral aggregate resources. Part of the proposed licensed area lands are designated Agricultural.

Furthermore, section 2.5 details criteria for mineral aggregate resources and the extraction process. There is general support for mineral resource extraction. Subsection 2.5.4 specifies criteria required to review should resource extraction take place in prime agricultural areas. Complete rehabilitation to an agricultural condition is not required under certain circumstances. The proposed quarry expansion will be a below the water table operation, making the rehabilitation to a pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible.

County of Grey Official Plan

Section 5.6.4(1)(c) of the County Official Plan requires an amendment to a proposed mineral aggregate extraction expansion beyond the areas identified as an ‘Aggregate Resource Area’ on Schedule B.

Section 5.6.4(2) also indicates that new or expanded pit operations proposed for areas outside of the ‘Aggregate Resource Area’ require an official plan amendment.

Section 7 (Natural Grey) of the County Official Plan is also considered as part of the review of this application in order to account for any potential disturbances to the natural environment. A
more thorough review of the natural environment features on and adjacent to the subject lands shall be provided through a review of the ‘Natural Environment Technical Report’.

As noted above, following the public and agency processes, a thorough planning analysis and staff recommendation will be provided. Staff will also review the comments from agencies that were submitted as part of the Aggregate Resource Act (ARA) process.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The application will be processed in accordance with the Planning Act.

Financial and Resource Implications

There are no anticipated financial, staffing or legal considerations associated with the proposed official plan amendment, beyond those normally encountered in processing an amendment. The County has collected the requisite application fee and peer review deposit for this application.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Planning Staff
☒ External: Township of Georgian Bluffs, required agencies under the Planning Act, and the public

Appendices and Attachments

None
Committee Report

To: Warden McQueen and Members of Grey County Council

Committee Date: February 27, 2020

Subject / Report No: PDR-CW-15-20

Title: Forest Management Annual Report and By-law Enforcement Officer Appointments

Prepared by: Sarah Johnson

Reviewed by: Randy Scherzer

Lower Tier(s) Affected: All local municipalities

Status: Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-15-20 regarding Forest Management be received;

2. That a by-law be prepared to appoint Lee Thurston and Jason Traynor as Municipal By-law Enforcement Officers for the County of Grey; and

3. That the by-law contain provisions for the appointment by the Director of Planning or his/her designate of additional Municipal By-law Enforcement Officers for the County of Grey.

Executive Summary

The County contracts our forest management and lands management to Grey Sauble Conservation Authority. They provide a number of services including by-law enforcement as it relates to our Grey County Forest Management By-law, maintenance and management of forest properties and the CP Rail Trail, expertise on harvesting and related construction projects, administration of harvesting or clearing permits, as well as many other matters. This report provides a comparative overview of forest harvesting permits issued from 2017-2019, as well as some of the significant activities that occurred in the forests or on the CP Rail Trail this timeframe.

The Report also recommends the appointment of current By-Law Enforcement Officers and provides consideration for a substitute in the absence of both the primary and alternate officers.

Background and Discussion
In previous years, a monthly report on forest harvesting activity was provided to the Planning and Community Development Committee, and more recently it was presented quarterly to the Committee of the Whole. Given the nature of the content and the frequency that Committee was presented with this information, it was difficult for Council to get a complete picture on forest management within the County. Through new annual reporting, staff will present the information to give a more complete picture of the activity within the County, including comparisons to previous years, such that there can be a greater comprehensive understanding.

To provide some context on forestry, it is estimated that currently Grey County has approximately 40-45% forest cover. These forests are a mixture of both public and privately-owned lands. This level of forest cover sets Grey County apart from most other municipalities in southwestern Ontario. Forests across the County serve as a major attraction to both residents and tourists, while improving our mental and physical health, and contributing to the local economy. Aside from the human-centric benefits, the natural functions these forests perform as part of our larger eco-system, is also not to be undervalued.

In the recent and coming months, there are and have been a few forest related projects occurring within the County, these include the;

1. update to the County’s Forest Management By-law (see Report PDR-CW-06-20),
2. County’s new Draft Forest Management Plan (see Report PDR-CW-09-20), and
3. passing of the Recreational Trail Master Plan (see Report PDR-CW-44-19).

Links to the above-noted staff reports have been included in the Attachments section of this report, and a brief summary of each project is included below.

1. The Forest Management By-law law applies to the entire County and is intended to regulate the management of forest areas in both public and private ownership. It requires harvesting to be done in a sustainable way that will promote forest health. The process is overseen by the County’s Forest Management By-law Enforcement Officer.
2. The Forest Management Plan is a document that outlines how the County Forests are to be managed over a 20-year period. Grey County’s properties provide wildlife with natural sources of food, water, shelter, lifecycle habitat and travel corridors. The large forested tracts of land also provide forest-dependent wildlife with forest interior habitat. In addition, the County’s Forests serve as recreational amenities to both local residents and tourists. Grey County Forests (GCF) are comprised of 46 separate properties totaling 3,394 hectares (8,383 acres), spread across Grey County. The productive forest cover is approximately 2,784 hectares (6,877 acres) or about 82% of the forest area.
3. The Recreational Trails Master Plan is a strategic document providing direction on recreational activities occurring or proposed within the GCF properties and the CP Rail Trail (e.g. hiking, cycling, snowmobiling, etc.) as well as improvements that can be done to better support and promote these recreational activities.

These three projects are all intended to preserve the health and sustainability of both County-owned and privately-owned woodlots for generations to come.

The County is also undertaking a Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP), wherein staff expect that the forestry assets will be highlighted as a significant contributor to the health and sustainability of the natural environment. Within the CCAP the concept of ‘climate forests’ may also be considered. A climate forest is a forest that is deliberately managed to fight climate change. This
is done by centering the management of the forest around the capture and storage of additional carbon. The primary products of the type of climate forestry are carbon offset credits.

**Forestry Activities within the County**

One of the many roles of the By-law Enforcement Officer/Forest Manager is providing staff with a monthly report on the number of permits (Intents to Cut) and activities associated with the County Forest Management By-law. These permits enable selective harvests that are classified as good forestry practices. Permits are sent to the respective municipality when they are received, so that if there are corresponding municipal processes, then the municipality will have enough time to obtain that information. Municipal knowledge of these cuts is also crucial as it relates to any impacts on the municipal road network, or questions about tree cutting activity from local landowners.

Table 1 below provides a summary of Intent to Cut permits issued for good forestry management activities on both public and private lands from 2017-2019. Intents to Cut permit numbers have remained relatively stable over this time period, with a slight increase in 2019.

Daily activities done by the Forest Manager are significant and these monthly reports help the Forestry-Trails Coordinator to understand the volume of work that is being required of the position in order to manage time and resources effectively. It also assists staff to handle enquiries from the public or municipalities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Blue Mountains</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatsworth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian Bluffs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Highlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Sound</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Grey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Good Forestry Harvest Permits Issued 2017-2019
The second type of permit/application administered through the Forest Management By-law is the Minor Exemption. These applications are more complex and are when a landowner wishes to clear more area than the by-law permits, and can result in clear-cutting a portion of woodlot. Under certain circumstances Minor Exemptions are possible, provided a number of criteria are met. In some cases, Minor Exemption applications can require the completion of an environmental impact study. Since 2012, when the Planning department began administering the By-law, the number of Minor Exemption applications has increased. Table 2 below shows the number of applications that were received from 2012-2019 and whether or not the application was approved, denied, withdrawn or further information was requested. Also, in the last category there were three applications where staff did a preliminary review and indicated that even with supplemental information the application could not be supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Minor Exemption Applications Received</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Information Requested/Not Supported by staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Minor Exemption Applications (2012-2019)

During this same time period, Grey County also tendered harvests in our own GCF properties. Grey County Forests managed were:

- 2017 – Forest #1 Normanby, Forest #29 Lily Oak and Forest #45 Chatsworth,
- 2018 – Forest #30 Sunken Lake, Forest #27 Berkeley, Forest #4 South Welbeck, Forest #3 North Welbeck, Forest #20 Dornoch and Forest #6 Collingwood 19, and
- 2019 – Forest #43 Sullivan Klondyke, Forest #31 Copper Kettle, Forest #2 Artemesia/Euphrasia Townline, Forest #21 Camp Oliver and Forest #19 Camp Oliver.

Over this three-year period the County received $257,298 in revenue from the above-noted harvests.

In addition to issuing permits, there are other on-going forestry-related activities that occur across the County on public and private lands. These include ongoing marking for the harvesting schedule and verification, numerous site visits both at time of operations and post-harvest inspections, invasive species tracking and investigation, species at risk identification, as well as investigating possible violations and issuing tickets and stop work orders when necessary. In recent years, County staff have seen an increase the number of Forest Management By-law infractions. This increase has resulted in more time spent by the By-law Enforcement Officer, as well as Planning and Legal Services staff, on investigations and laying charges under the By-law. As a result, County and Grey Sauble Staff have also been working to educate landowners on the By-law through the Call Before You Cut campaign. This education will continue as part of the County’s update to the by-law.
Appointment of a By-law Enforcement Officer and Alternates

The By-law Enforcement Officer position is fulfilled by Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) staff through a contract. This contract was recently renewed for another five-year period (see Staff Report PDR-CW-45-19 in the Attachments section of this report). The GSCA contract is crucial to supporting the management of our forest and trail properties, as well as the implementation and enforcement of the Forest Management By-law. The current By-law Enforcement Officer is Lee Thurston, who filled this role after the retirement of Carl Sadler.

The County By-law that names the Officer needs to be updated to reflect that Lee has assumed this role and also needs to name an alternate. The County Lands Manger position, responsible for County trails and forests, is the other major role that GSCA staff provide for us and currently in that position is Jason Traynor. Jason also has the forestry background and provincial certification to act as a back-up to Lee in filling the By-law Enforcement Officer role.

Through this by-law, staff are recommending the appointment of Lee and Jason as Municipal By-law Enforcement Officers for the County. Staff are also seeking flexibility for County staff to appoint other duly credentialed enforcement officers, should both Lee and Jason be unable to perform their duties (e.g. illness, vacation, etc.). There are times when the nature of the By-law Enforcement Officer's work is time sensitive (e.g. investigating a scenario where active tree cutting is occurring), and as such it is important to have alternate resources. The proposal is that the Director of Planning, or his/her designate, be delegated the authority to appoint other duly credentialed enforcement officers. Such additional officers would typically be other GSCA staff members.

Staff are recommending this report be received, and that a by-law be prepared to appoint the by-law officers as described above. Annual forestry reports will follow in the first quarter of each year, updating the County’s forestry numbers as per this report.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

Forest permits (Intents to Cut) are administered by the By-law Enforcement Officer as per the Forest Management By-law. The County’s by-law and activities are further governed by the Municipal Act. Municipal By-Law Enforcement Officers are appointed pursuant to the Police Services Act.

Financial and Resource Implications

There are no anticipated financial or resource considerations related to this report beyond what is included within the County budget. The activities described within this report are within the scope of the recently approved agreement between Grey County and the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority. The appointment of a Forest Management By-law Enforcement Officers would ensure continuous service delivery to the County and the public.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Planning Staff, County Clerk, Director of Legal Services

☒ External: Lee Thurston and Jason Traynor, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
Appendices and Attachments

PDR-CW-44-19 Recreational Trail Master Plan
Recreational Trails Master Plan (2019)
PDR-CW-06-20 Forestry Management By-law Updates
4341-06 Consolidated Forest Management By-Law
PDR-CW-09-20 Forest Management Plan
PDR-CW-45-19 Grey Sauble Contract Renewal
Committee Report

To: Warden McQueen and Members of Grey County Council
Committee Date: February 27, 2020
Subject / Report No: TR-CW-06-20
Title: Orchardville Bridge (Structure 900-272)
Prepared by: Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services
Reviewed by: Kim Wingrove, CAO
Lower Tier(s) Affected: Township of Southgate, Municipality of West Grey
Status:

Recommendation

1. That TR-CW-06-20 be received and that Grey County accept the preferred solution to have Orchardville Bridge (Structure 900-272) removed with full recording and documentation of the heritage bridge;

2. That Staff be directed to single source the bridge removal design to GM BluePlan.

Executive Summary

Structure 900-272 (South Orchardville Bridge) is located on the border of Southgate and West Grey on Orchardville Sideroad. It is located approximately 72 metres from Highway 6. The structure has been closed since 2009 and Transportation Services is nearing completion of the municipal class environmental assessment (schedule B).

The recommended option is to remove the existing bridge with full recording and documentation of the heritage structure.

Background and Discussion

In March 2009, Report TAPSR-23-09 recommended the closure of Structure 900-272 near Orchardville. At that time, pedestrian traffic was allowed on the bridge.
In 2016, Township of Southgate Staff informed Grey County that the Ministry of Transportation was divesting itself of a portion of Orchardville Sideroad. This property was to be transferred to the adjacent property owner. This created concern for Grey County as any future access to the Structure would only be from the north. To that end, Grey County was attempting to acquire an easement across the property for any future south access. Grey County GIS still shows the property in the possession of the Ministry of Transportation.

As the Structure is closed and in poor condition, and the agreement process was quite arduous, Transportation Services Staff decided that removal of the Structure was the most fiscally responsible option as:

1. It would remove a structure in poor condition from the inventory.
2. The structure, although closed, has required maintenance as closure barricades have been frequently moved. This represents a potential liability for the County as citizens have been ignoring the bridge closure signs.
3. Removal of the structure would mainly impact the adjacent property owner as they own lands on both sides of the structure.
4. Removal of the structure would save approximately $200 per year in inspection costs.

The adjacent property owner expressed no interest in taking over the Structure due to potential future liabilities.

Report TAPS-20-09 closed the bridge to vehicular traffic in March 2009.

The Orchardville Bridge is one of two remaining bowstring arch structures in Grey County. These structures are no longer acceptable in the current bridge code (structural members can be impacted by accidents). The Structure has a deck length of 15.6 metres.

In April 2017, Transportation Services retained the services of GM BluePlan and Scarlett Janusas Archaeology Inc. to undertake environmental assessment work and complete a built heritage and cultural heritage assessment. The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) determined that the Structure retains some cultural heritage value. The following nine conservation options were evaluated to ensure any heritage concerns are considered:

1. Retention of existing bridge and restoration of missing or deteriorated elements where physical or documentary evidence (e.g., photographs or drawings) can be used for their design;
2. Retention of existing bridge with no major modifications undertaken;
3. Retention of existing bridge with sympathetic modification;
4. Retention of existing bridge with sympathetically designed new structure in proximity;
5. Retention of existing bridge no longer in use for vehicular purposes but adapted for pedestrian walkways, cycle paths, scenic viewing etc.;
6. Relocation of bridge to appropriate new site for continued use or adaptive re-use;
7. Retention of bridge as heritage monument for viewing purposes only;
8. Replacement/removal of existing bridge with salvage elements/members of heritage bridge for incorporation into new structure for future conservation work or displays;
9. Replacement/removal of existing bridge with full recording and documentation of the heritage bridge.

Evaluation of the above noted criteria resulted in the following recommended solution:

While Conservation Option 8, removal of the heritage bridge with salvage of elements for incorporation into new structure for future conservation work or displays could be considered, based on the condition of the concrete structure, this would not be technically or economically feasible. Further, the Grey County Historical Society did not indicate that the preservation of components (or elements) from the existing structure was of interest.

Therefore, Conservation Option 9, removal of the existing bridge with full recording and documentation of the heritage structure, is considered appropriate for this undertaking. As such, impacts to this heritage resource are expected.

It is also noted that Conservation Option 5, retention of the bridge for pedestrian walkways, cycle paths, scenic viewing etc. was evaluated within the framework of the Project File. Following a detailed review, and in consideration of the technical and economic implications, this alternative was not recommended.

A site meeting was held Thursday, December 5, 2019. The majority of residents were opposed to the closing, but many realized that due to the cost and low traffic volume, a bridge removal was likely. Many felt it should be kept open for pedestrians.

Some concerns were voiced about school bus pickup. The removal of the structure would prevent the student from walking across the bridge north to the school bus pickup point near Southgate Road 14. Subsequent discussions with Kunkel indicated the school board would likely revise routes to pick up the student on Highway 6, which was a concern of the resident.

It is recommended that if Structure 900-272 is removed, that GM BluePlan continue to be retained as the consultant to complete the removal construction drawings.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

Grey County will complete the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process and obtain all relevant permits.
Financial and Resource Implications

Grey County is currently proposing $127,500 for costs relating to removal of the structure. These costs are included in the 2020 Transportation Services budget. Consultant design fees are included in this figure. Removing the structure avoids a costly repair or replacement and eliminates future liability.

Relevant Consultation

☐ Internal
☒ External

Adjacent Property Owner, Kunkel Bus Lines Ltd., Township of Southgate, Municipality of West Grey

Appendices and Attachments
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To: Warden McQueen and Members of Grey County Council
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Reviewed by: Kim Wingrove, CAO

Lower Tier(s) Affected: None

Status: Recommendation

Recommendation

1. That Council receive Report FR-CW-04-20 titled 2019 Year-End Transfers and approve the recommendations, as contained and estimated in Report FR-CW-04-20, regarding transfers to and from Reserve; and

2. That Council approve any surplus/deficit arising in the 2019 budget be transferred to/(from) the respective departmental reserves.

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide information to Council regarding the estimated year-end surplus/deficit amounts per functional area and to provide staff with the authority to make the following adjustments necessary to finalize the County’s 2019 year-end financials:

- Year-end surplus and deficit transfers – Identifies surplus and/or deficit and recommends on how to allocate surplus or fund deficits.
- Year-end transfers for purchases that were budgeted to occur in 2019 and need to be carried forward to 2020 – Recommends the transferring of taxation and/or the allocation of reserve funding that projects can be undertaken in 2020.
- Year-end transfers for donations for specific purposes – Donations received for specific purposes are recommended transferred to reserve to be utilized for these purposes when undertaken.
- Year-end Provincial funds to be utilized in 2020 – Recommends the remaining Provincial project funds be authorized for use in the 2020 budget to complete the project.

Background and Discussion

Each Department has reviewed its actual to budget figures as of mid-February 2020 and has projected a year-end position by estimating results still to happen. These projections have
been used to recommend 2019 transfers to and from reserves. These transfers are estimates and will be finalized once all 2019 budgeted and endorsed transactions have been completed. Council will receive the final year-end figures when the audited financial statements are presented in May 2020.

In addition to year-end surplus and deficit transfers, this report deals with transfers for purchases that were budgeted to occur in 2019 but that have been delayed until 2020. The County’s auditors require a Council resolution authorizing staff to transfer unspent funds to reserve for use in the 2020 budget.

The County has also received donations to be used for specific purposes. These funds are required to be transferred to reserve to be used for these specific purposes.

The non-budgeted transfers included in this report are estimates at this time and the actual transfers to and from reserves may vary once all 2019 budgeted and endorsed transactions have been completed.

**Summary**

The following table summarizes the projected year-end surplus or deficits by functional area that have been estimated by each Department. These year-end financial projections overall do not vary greatly from what had been previously reported to Committee of the Whole in November 2019, where a year-end surplus of $1,415,000 had been projected.

**Summary of Projected Year-End Surplus / (Deficit) by Function**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 Budget by Function</th>
<th>Projected Year-End Surplus/(Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>$1,331,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Community Development</td>
<td>($136,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>$256,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Public Safety</td>
<td>($200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,252,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surplus / (Deficit) Transfers To / From Reserve

The following table lists the functional area surplus/deficit amounts and the transfers to/from reserve to fund any surplus / (deficits).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Function</th>
<th>Reserve / Notes</th>
<th>Projected Surplus/ (Deficit)</th>
<th>Estimated To/From Reserve Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>Portfolio Projected Surplus/((Deficit)</td>
<td>$1,331,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Supplementary Taxation – Town of The Blue Mountains – Attainable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining Surplus to One-Time Funding Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>$186,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Community</td>
<td>Portfolio Projected Surplus/((Deficit)</td>
<td>($136,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Planning – General Reserve</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture – One-Time Funding Reserve</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry – General Reserve</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trails – General Reserve</td>
<td>$36,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development – One-Time Funding Reserve</td>
<td>($176,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism – General Reserve</td>
<td>($2,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey Roots – Main Building Improvements Reserve</td>
<td>($18,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Portfolio Projected Surplus/((Deficit)</td>
<td>$256,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Services – One Time Funding Reserve</td>
<td>$300,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Care Mitigation Reserve</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing – Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTC – Grey Gables - Lee Manor Reserve</td>
<td>($102,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTC – Lee Manor – Lee Manor Reserve</td>
<td>($176,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTC – Rockwood Terrace – Lee Manor Reserve</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTC – Redevelopment – LTC Redevelopment Reserve</td>
<td>($41,700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Public</td>
<td>Portfolio Projected Surplus/((Deficit)</td>
<td>($200,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Function</td>
<td>Reserve / Notes</td>
<td>Projected Surplus/ (Deficit)</td>
<td>Estimated To/From Reserve Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic Services – One-Time Funding Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($675,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services - General Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$411,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services – Land Acquisition Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Surplus/(Deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,252,400</td>
<td>$1,252,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Budgeted Transfers to/from Reserve for Use in 2020

The following table lists purchases that were budgeted or endorsed to occur in 2019, but due to various factors have been delayed until 2020. Where projects were funded from taxation in 2019, these funds are being recommended to be transferred to reserve for use in 2020. Projects budgeted from reserves in 2019 that were delayed are being recommended to be funded from reserve in 2020. Staff is recommending the transfer of these projects to/from reserve for use in the 2020 budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Budget</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>2019 Project Funding to Reserve Transfer Amount*</th>
<th>2020 Project Amount From Reserve**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Wellness Initiative</td>
<td>One-Time Funding Reserve</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Trails</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>Trails General Reserve</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry Trail Work</td>
<td>Trails General Reserve</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>International Student Coordinator</td>
<td>Economic Development Initiatives Reserve</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Cycling Master Plan Brochures</td>
<td>Tourism General Reserve</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research and Data Analyst Project</td>
<td>Tourism General Reserve</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Roots</td>
<td>Grey County Gallery Update</td>
<td>Grey Roots County Exhibit Reserve</td>
<td>$19,700</td>
<td>$19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Parking Lot 50 McNab St Chatsworth</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Lot 481 11th St Hanover</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flooring 225 14th St West Owen Sound</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen Rebuilds 650 4th Ave ‘A’ East Owen Sound</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$191,572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flooring Common Area 130 Rowe’s Lane Dundalk</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Makeup Replacement 481 11th St Hanover</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siding 43 Hill St</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Budget</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>2019 Project Funding to Reserve Transfer Amount*</td>
<td>2020 Project Amount From Reserve**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flesherton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Lot 81 Bruce St Thornbury</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bath Rebuilds 315 Bruce St Thornbury</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roof 248 7th Ave East Owen Sound</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projects funded from taxation in 2019 with funds being recommended to be transferred to reserve for use in 2020.
** Projects budgeted in 2019, that have been delayed and being recommended to be funded from reserve in 2020 and/or were not included in the 2020 budget.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Budget</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>2019 Project Funding To Reserve Transfer Amount*</th>
<th>2020 Project Amount From Reserve**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Roof (Steel) and Eavestrough Family Units Durham</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior Doors/Front Entrance 157 Nelson St Meaford</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Lot 250 12th Ave Hanover</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Lot 248 Queen St Durham</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen Rebuilds 43 Hill St Flesherton</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Replacements/Screens 250 12th Ave Hanover</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Makeup Replacement 490 7th Ave East Owen Sound</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Security Alpha St Owen Sound</td>
<td>Housing Reserve</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Gables</td>
<td>Retaining Wall</td>
<td>LTC - Grey Gables Reserve</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>Grey Road 4 – Lambton Street to Highway 6 in Durham</td>
<td>Transportation Services General Reserve</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure 109-353 Grey Road 109 Holstein</td>
<td>Transportation Services General Reserve</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey Road 119 Stormwater Diversion</td>
<td>Transportation Services General Reserve</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Signal Upgrades</td>
<td>Transportation Services Traffic Light Maintenance</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase of two Roll-Off Tandems</td>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>$880,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Budget</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>2019 Project Funding To Reserve Transfer Amount*</td>
<td>2020 Project Amount From Reserve**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projects funded from taxation in 2019 with funds being recommended to be transferred to reserve for use in 2020.

**Projects budgeted in 2019, that have been delayed and being recommended to be funded from reserve in 2020 and/or were not included in the 2020 budget.
Donation Transfers to Reserve

The following table lists the unbudgeted transfers to reserve that have been donated to be used for a specific purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Function</th>
<th>Reserve / Notes</th>
<th>Estimated Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grey Gables</td>
<td>Grey Gables Donations Reserve</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Manor</td>
<td>Lee Manor Donations Reserve</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood Terrace</td>
<td>Rockwood Terrace Donations Reserve</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood Terrace</td>
<td>LTC Redevelopment Reserve</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Roots</td>
<td>Donations Reserve - 2020 Simple Machines Exhibit</td>
<td>$3,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provincial Funded Projects

The 2020 budget contains funding for the completion of provincially funded projects. Best estimates were used to as to the amount of remaining work that would be remaining at year end. Where the amount of remaining work being carried forward is greater than what had been budgeted in 2020, it is requested that the remaining project funding, for these projects listed below, be authorized for use in the 2020 budget.

- New Horizons for Seniors $12,600.

Note: The County received Modernization Funding and Cannabis Legalization funding in 2019. This funding is being treated as conditional grant funding and any unused funding will be recorded as deferred revenue and does not form part of any projected year-end surplus/deficit for 2020.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The Treasurer appointed by the municipality, as per the Municipal Act, is responsible for providing council with information with respect to the financial affairs of the municipality. This report gives staff the authority to transfer surplus funds into reserve, or fund shortfalls out of reserve, as required by the 2020 budget.

Financial and Resource Implications

The information contained in this report details the non-budgeted transfers to/from reserves and the carryover of these and other sources of funding that is being recommended for use in the 2020 budget or for future potential expenses.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal: Departmental Managers, Senior Management Team and CAO
☐ External
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Recommendation

1. That Report PSR-CW-04-20 be received; and


Executive Summary

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.

For the 2019 calendar year, the County met all response time criteria other than the response time target set for CTAS 2. This is the fourth year in a row that the County was under the response time target for CTAS 2 call types.

For the 2020-year, Paramedic Services will undergo a change of deployment modelling to match resource allocation during peak call timeframes.

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 2019 response time performance.
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.

Response Time Targets

There are six set criteria that are measured under the Response Time Target Plans. Five of the performance targets are measured by response times related to patient presentation as indicated by the Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale (CTAS) however, one of the six criteria is based on community response to patients in cardiac arrest.

The response time targets and criteria are described below:

1. The percentage of times that a person equipped to provide any type of defibrillation has arrived on-scene to provide defibrillation to sudden cardiac arrest patients within six (6) minutes of the time notice is received.

2. The percentage of times that an ambulance crew has arrived on-scene to provide ambulance services to sudden cardiac arrest patients or other patients categorized as CTAS 1 within eight (8) minutes of the time notice is received respecting such services.

3. The percentage of times that an ambulance crew has arrived on-scene to provide ambulance services to patients categorized as CTAS 2, 3, 4 and 5 within the response time targets set by the upper-tier municipality or delivery agent under its plan established under subsection (2). O. Reg. 267/08, s. 1 (2); O. Reg. 368/10, s. 1 (2).

CTAS is described as:

CTAS Level: The ‘Canadian Triage & Acuity Scale’ is used to assign a level of acuity to a patient. Acuity refers to the gravity of the situation – the potential for death and/or irreversible illness. CTAS is a tool that more accurately defines the patient’s need for care. Assignment of the CTAS level is to be based upon not only the presenting complaint identified on the initial assessment made by the paramedic, but also on their examination findings, and response to treatment.

CTAS I: requires resuscitation and includes conditions that are threats to life or imminent risk of deterioration, requiring immediate aggressive interventions (for example, cardiac arrest, and major trauma or shock states).

CTAS II: requires emergent care and includes conditions that are a potential threat to life or limb functions, requiring rapid medical intervention or delegated acts (for example, head injury, chest pain or internal bleeding).

CTAS III: requires urgent care and includes conditions that could potentially progress to a serious problem requiring emergency intervention, such as mild to moderate breathing problems, resolved seizure with normal level of alertness, moderate anxiety/agitation.
CTAS IV: requires less-urgent care and includes conditions related to patient age, distress or potential for deterioration or complications that would benefit from intervention or reassurance, such as urinary symptoms, laceration requiring stitches, upper extremity injury.

CTAS V: requires non-urgent care and includes conditions in which investigations or interventions could be delayed or referred to other areas of the hospital or health care system, such as sore throat, minor bites, dressing change.

**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 the 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 2019**

The 2019 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 from 2016 to 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Type</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Response Time Target</th>
<th>2019 Target</th>
<th>2019 Performance</th>
<th>4 Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudden Cardiac Arrest (SCA)</td>
<td>Community Defibrillator or Paramedic Response</td>
<td>Six (6) minutes or less</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>57.81%</td>
<td>44.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 1</td>
<td>Paramedic Response</td>
<td>Eight (8) minutes or less</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72.60%</td>
<td>66.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 2</td>
<td>Paramedic Response</td>
<td>Fifteen (15) minutes or less</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88.71%</td>
<td>89.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 3</td>
<td>Paramedic Response</td>
<td>Twenty (20) minutes or less</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>97.16%</td>
<td>97.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 4</td>
<td>Paramedic Response</td>
<td>Twenty (20) minutes or less</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>97.30%</td>
<td>97.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the 2019 calendar year, the County met all response time criteria other than the response time target set for CTAS 2. This is the fourth year in a row that the County was under the response time target for CTAS 2 call types.

2019 90th Percentile All Code 4 Calls – 14:51

2019 Average Response Time Code 4 Calls – 7:43

### Challenge of Meeting Targets in Rural Ontario

Across the Province call volumes for high priority life threatening calls 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 geographical area make it difficult to meet response time target criteria outside of the urban areas where the ambulances are located.

The following charts indicate the percentage of the population living within and outside the response time targets based upon paramedic base locations within the County of Grey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Type</th>
<th>Within Response Time</th>
<th>Outside Response Time</th>
<th>Response Time (accounting for 1 minute reaction time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>31.84%</td>
<td>68.16%</td>
<td>5 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 1</td>
<td>42.88%</td>
<td>57.12%</td>
<td>7 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 2</td>
<td>73.62%</td>
<td>26.38%</td>
<td>14 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 3-5</td>
<td>89.64%</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td>19 Min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staffing Considerations

For the 2020-year, Paramedic Services will undergo a change of deployment modelling to match resource allocation during peak call timeframes.

### Legal and Legislated Requirements

Land Ambulance Response Time Standard Reg 257/00 Part VIII
Upper tier municipalities are responsible, either directly or through selected operators, for ensuring that patient care and transport are carried out in accordance with applicable legislation, standards and procedures. They are also responsible for the supervision of staff, maintenance of vehicles and equipment and the provision of a quality assurance program.

Financial and Resource Implications
None

Relevant Consultation
☐ External:
☒ Internal: CAO, Finance

Appendices and Attachments
None
If you could make a difference in the life of a child – wouldn't you?

Injuries are the leading cause of death for children in Canada. Almost ALL were considered to have been “preventable”. Hundreds of children die each year and thousands more suffer life-changing injuries that could have been prevented. The Saugeen Valley Children’s Safety Village is a community operated, interactive educational safety facility designed to aid in the elimination of preventable childhood injuries and death. The Children’s Safety Village CAN make a difference in the life of a child and it is anticipated that up to 10,000 children per year will attend the Village and participate in hands-on safety programs. There is no charge for attending schools. Additional safety programs and community events will be held throughout the year for youth, seniors, and families.

The Saugeen Valley Children’s Safety Village is located central to Grey and Bruce Counties in the Sulphur Spring Conservation Area in the municipality of West Grey, GREY COUNTY. Further to the presentation made to Grey County Council on the 13th February 2020 by Al Leach (SVCSV – Vice President), a formal request has been outlined below seeking support from Grey County.

2020 Financial request to Grey County – to Support Safety Program Delivery [$15,000]

The annual Economic Burden for preventable injuries in Canada = Billions of Dollars
Grey County children (4 to 11 years old) @ $2 per child = $15,000
Making a difference in the life of one child -- PRICELESS

This extraordinary community facility is in Grey County. The Safety Village aspires that Grey County... can be the #1 place for a child to grow up healthy and safe”.

The financial request ($15,000) to Grey County in support of program delivery at the Saugeen Valley Children’s Safety Village represents an investment in the future of Grey County – OUR CHILDREN.

Marilyn Rosner
Saugeen Valley Children’s Safety Village - President
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