



June 15, 2022 Regular Council Meeting

Addition to the Consent Agenda Item 6.1.4 Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the June 15, 2022 Council agenda items.

Responses Appreciated Prior to Meeting

6.19 Town of Fort Erie - Niagara Region's Motion – Voluntary Russian Sanction Request
-has our County Council issued a similar motion or will in the future?

The County has indicated that they have not passed a similar motion and do not anticipate doing so.

9.2 Finance Department

9.2.1 Report FIN 2022-021 – First Quarter Financial Report – 2022

-Benefits for Fire Services have 43% remaining whereas other areas have more than 70% remaining. What is the explanation for this?

Majority of benefit expenditures in the Fire & Rescue services department are paid in the first quarter upon policy renewal related to volunteer firefighter group benefits to AON and Homewood Health. For the other departments, these benefits are paid on a monthly basis.

-p.134 OT wages have incurred 70% of budget and seasonal wages have incurred 35% of budget? What is the explanation for this?

OT wages in Public Works have 30% of budget remaining and seasonal wages have 35% of budget remaining. This is consistent with previous years due to the winter months in the first quarter.

9.2.2 Report FIN-2022-024 – 2022 Development Charges Study Amendment

-when will the Roads Management Plan be before Council?



The Roads Management Plan will be presented to Council by late summer, earlier if at all possible.

-will Watson and Associates attend to make presentation?

Yes, Watson & Associates will be attending the Council Meeting to present Schedule A to the report which includes the recent legislative changes and impact of these legislative changes to the Township.

9.3.1 Report ADM-2022-035 Corporate Workplan

Work Plan. We have quite the list of items to work towards. How is it that some items seem to just appear on the work plan and take priority? A couple examples that stick out in my mind is the Alcohol policy and filming policy. We have major illegal dumping occurring in the Township yet the fill by-law has yet to be completed.

The workplan represents the tasks known at the start of the year when the plan for the year is developed. The Workplan represents projects that are to be completed throughout the year. Approximately 25 tasks are already completed and the remaining are generally on track for completion as planned. Projects are sometimes added out of necessity as issues are identified through the year. This can be for a number of reasons. The Alcohol policy was identified as a significant need to due the risk/exposure to the municipality with not having one. This was identified by our insurer and needed to be in place for when the PCC commenced rentals where alcohol would be served. Not having this policy was a significant gap identified, as most municipalities have had an alcohol policy in place for many years. The Film Policy was a straightforward item that was identified due to an increase in numbers of filming requests. Given the challenges experienced by others who did not have similar policies in place, it was more appropriate to bring forward this fairly standard policy as this would take less time than dealing with matters resulting from not having the policy in place. The Fill policy has been to Council numerous times for review and comment and is proceeding well. As an interim measure, it was recommended that Council introduce a set fine schedule to the fill by-law for dumping and heavy truck fines while the by-law is under review. Unfortunately the Province decided this year to retroactively remove legislation that formed a significant portion of the proposed policy. This has resulted in the need to once again review many aspects of the policy, and to determine which provincial rules actually



apply. Unfortunately this has not been easy as clear responses and answers to questions are not really forthcoming from the Province.

9.2.3 Report FIN-2022-025 – Purchase of a Budget Solution

-which of the two cited programs do other member municipalities including County use?

Erin – PSD Citywide Inc.

Centre Wellington – Questica

County of Wellington - PSD Citywide Inc.

Wellington North – no current budgeting system

Minto – PSD Citywide Inc. - not yet fully implemented

Mapleton – Caseware

Guelph Eramosa – unsure

Many other public sector entities also utilize Questica including Hamilton, Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph Public Health, Dufferin County, Brantford, Ingersoll, Thames Centre, Muskoka Lakes, New Tecumseth, Barrie, Waterloo Catholic District School Board, Grimsby, Haldimand County, Bluewater, Sheridan College, Collingwood, Mississauga, Niagara, Middlesex Centre, Brampton, etc.

Questica is on a cloud service and therefore, no upfront IT infrastructure costs (such as a server) are required. The PSD Citywide Inc. quote was more expensive over the 5 year term (approximately \$40K more expensive). There are also significant upfront IT infrastructure costs associated with the purchase of a new server and licencing costs (Oracle) that would be required with the PSD Citywide Inc. budget solution. This was confirmed with Onserve and other municipalities who have invested in the PSD Citywide Inc. budgeting solution.

-will this program also be used for asset management?

The asset management data will be captured in a different system: CityWide asset management with data pulled into the budgeting system as required. Questica has the ability to import or export data from the Township's Asset Management system to the Township's proposed budgeting system. This is also the case with the PSD Citywide Inc. budgeting solution. There are no automatic integration opportunities with Asset Management.



Questica has an automated integration with Keystone which allows more current reporting of budgets vs. actuals. PSD Citywide Inc. integration to Keystone was not automated.

9.3.4 Report ADM-2022-034 – Municipal Street Naming Policy Third Draft
-p.329 or p.8 of policy; I believe “10.2” should read “10.3”

Staff will make this edit.

The Canadian constitution states that we are a Multi Cultural Society where many different cultures exist. These Cultures have different faiths, symbols and creeds. It is important that we recognize the CONTEXT of these symbols and words. Staff response to the concerned raised around faith symbols that are prominent in Wellington County would be addressed simply by section that 5.2.3 addresses this concern. 5.2.3 does not speak to context at all. If there is a secondary negative component to a symbol or name, the context shall be part of the consideration.

Section 5.2 of the draft policy is intended to provide a list of criteria to assist when determining if a new or existing street name is appropriate and suitable. The draft policy includes sections 7.4, 8.4 and 9.4 which would require each request to demonstrate conformity or non-conformity with the naming standards within the policy. It is contemplated that the context of the existing/proposed name be considered through third party peer review (as noted in sections 7.4, 8.5 and 9.5).

For example, if a request was made to change a name due to non-compliance with the naming standards, the requester would be required to provide a rationale of why the existing name does not comply. Staff would have the request peer reviewed by a third party with expertise in the subject matter. This information would form part of the staff report to Council and provide Council with context on the re-naming request and conformity/non-conformity with the naming standards. The staff report would also include any public feedback received on the request through the public consultation process outlined in Sections 8.12 and 9.11.

Section 5 of Street Naming and Re-Naming Policy

1. Subjective vs Objective Criteria



Most of the criteria listed in Section 5 apply an objective test to what would be considered to be an appropriate street name.

However, some of the criteria appear to be very subjective so it is difficult to know how they would be applied.

For example, 5.2.2 speaks to “Names with any sexual overtones, inappropriate humour, parody, or slang”.

By noting that “inappropriate humour” is not permitted the clause suggests that appropriate humour would be appropriate.

What would be an example of appropriate humour to have as a street name?

For clarity, this section could be revised to state:

*5.2.2 Names with any sexual overtones, **intentional** humour, parody, or slang;*

Also, many places have a Queen Street Yet the word Queen has been used as a negative slang word. Would this mean that Queen Street is no longer an appropriate name for a street?

If a request for re-naming was received, the policy sets out a process to determine compliance with the naming standards. The requester would be required to submit a rationale which would be peer reviewed and presented to Council for consideration. Staff are not able to make the determination about whether or not the name ‘Queen’ would be considered slang at this time.

In a similar manner, section 5.2.3 indicates that “Names that have a secondary negative or offensive meaning” are also not acceptable.

Since many names or words have multiple meanings or interpretations it would be helpful to clarify what is meant by a secondary meaning.

For example, is the term secondary being used as in a word having a Primary meaning that most people would understand, a Secondary meaning that some would understand and a Tertiary meaning that very few would understand.

So that as long as the Primary and Secondary meaning were not negative or offensive, the name would be acceptable, even if a Tertiary meaning could be found that was potentially negative or offensive?

Or is the intent of this clause to suggest that a name can not have any other possibly offensive meaning understanding regardless of how obscure the understanding of the secondary meaning may be?

It is understood that some words may have multiple meanings. The purpose of section 5.2.3 is to establish a provision that acknowledges there may be multiple perspectives on what a word means – some of which may be offensive. The requester would be required to demonstrate this as part of their application. Staff suggest the following revision to provide further clarity:



5.2.3 Names that have an **alternate** negative or offensive meaning;

2. Combined Effect

When read together 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 seem to create a highly subjective test that makes it very difficult to predict what is intended to be an acceptable name. ?

For example, Hidden Valley Dr. sounds like an acceptable road name.

However, the word Hidden is often used with regard to a “Hidden Entrance” also known as a “Blind Entrance” and both of these terms are used as short hand for an entrance that is sub standard.

As a result it could be argued that in the context of transportation and roads, the word Hidden has a secondary, possibly offensive meaning that perpetuates discrimination against people with disabilities. So would a name like Hidden Valley Dr. be considered as an offensive name?

Same comment as above: If a request for re-naming was received, the policy sets out a process to determine compliance with the naming standards. The requester would be required to submit a rationale which would be peer reviewed and presented to Council for consideration. Staff are not able to make the determination about whether or not the name ‘Hidden’ would be considered discriminatory at this time.

3. Unlimited Scope

Section 5.2.4 prohibits “Names that could be construed as advertising for, but not limited to, current operating businesses and industries.”

Since this clause does not place a limit on where such a business is located, the wording of this could apply to any business located anywhere.

Is the intent to have this apply to companies globally or just in Puslinch or Wellington County?

Similarly, the suggestion that this test would not be limited to existing businesses creates a very broad scope and the balance of the policy does not appear to explain how this test would be satisfied.

For example the policy includes clauses regarding consulting with Canada Post, and circulating proposed names to the County and other consultants or committees.

However, since none of these are responsible for maintaining a data base of registered business names similar to the NUANS database of existing and former business names, how will staff confirm compliance with this clause for proposed or existing road names?

Section 4 provides a list of categories to be used when proposing a new name for a street. Section 4 and section 5 form part of the naming standards and would be used together to evaluate requests in conjunction with the rationale provided by the requester and/or peer reviewer.



Staff suggest leaving section 5.2.4 as written to allow it to be interpreted broadly rather than just applying to specific location(s).

9.3.5 Report ADM-2022-036 - Joint Compliance Audit Committee for the 2022-2026 Council Term

-any changes of note from prior years terms of reference?

One addition was made to the TOR for 2022-2026 in Section 7. as follows:

Some or all of the previous Compliance Audit Committee members may be requested to serve again. In the event that sufficient membership is obtained, the participating municipalities are not required to complete a recruitment process so long as the members meet the criteria listed below.

This section was added to allow for the previous members to serve without a formal recruitment process so long as all criteria to serve on the committee were met.

9.3.8 Report ADM-2022-041 – Recent Concerns/Questions regarding GJR and GJR Responses

-does the GJR have public Board meetings? If so when is the next one?

GJR does not have public board meetings.

-p.394 re “GJR hopes to be at Stone Rd with tie replacement in 2023 which includes collection and disposal of ties in the locations between Stone Rd and Midway Lane.”; can GJR provide us with a more specific schedule for tie removal by area?

Between April - November 2023 depending contractor availability.

-p. 419 what does this mean “GJR will establish standard temperature and moisture levels to determine appropriate incline speeds.”

Higher temperatures and drier than expected conditions will implement a slower train speed. Determined by extreme heat warnings.

-p. 419 re “GJR will continue with fire patrols until new growth has covered over the



dead winter grasses” and “GJR will continue to monitor dry conditions in the spring, year to year from April to the end of June, by conducting fire patrols.”; what is the frequency of the patrols?

Fire patrols are daily pending weather conditions. If a good amount of rain has fallen no patrol will be completed.

After the first fire, GJR conducted fire patrols twice daily until conditions changed.

9.4.2 County of Wellington Planning Recommendation Report – Internal Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Additional Residential Units (ARU)

-p. 427 re “Planning staff is proposing to increase the maximum percentage from the current 40% to 45%, and retain the existing (and m2. proposed) maximum area cap of 130 The increase in percentage will add some flexibility for home owners with smaller primary dwellings when establishing an ARU”;

-is there available a listing of number of home sizes in our Township ie. such as less than 1000ft², 1000 to 1500 ft², 1500 to 2000ft², 2000 to 2500 ft² and greater than 2500ft²?

This information is not readily available in a comprehensive Township listing and would be time consuming to compile.

-p. 428 re “ the Zoning By-law regarding conversions as this can be addressed through the interpretation and implementation of the proposed amending By-law.”

Shouldn't there be specific wording to prevent misunderstanding and misinterpretation?

The Zoning By-law does not include a provision related to conversions as we are of the opinion it is unnecessary to include as this generally could be permitted. However, if the Township does not want conversions then it would be more pertinent to explicitly state that in the amending by-law for clarification.

To assist with any potential confusion or misunderstanding, we included a comment in the report about this item to ensure there is a public record on the topic to avoid future confusion. Further, additional consideration/internal process will need to be determined by Township staff prior to this be allowed (i.e. a way to track, if agreements are required, or change of use permits). This has also been flagged in the recommendation report.

10. Correspondence ≠



10.1 Dufferin Aggregates Aberfoyle Pit #2 2021 Annual Monitoring Report and Harden Environmental Services Peer Review

-p.443 re “I will request a site visit with CRH Canada Group and their consultant so I can see firsthand the on-site conditions.”; does Council need to do anything to make this happen?

-at Council Meeting in June 16, 2021 Harden Report of June 14th noted similar concerns with monitoring well SW2-91 and the wetlands. By Resolution No. 2021-188, this report was forwarded to the pit operator and the MNRF. Did we ever receive a reply?

The peer review and Council resolution was sent to the local MNRF contact, the pit operator and the Minister in June 2021 and no reply was received. Staff suggest that a follow up be sent to the pit operator requesting the site visit and that Harden be copied on the correspondence.

10.2 Mill Creek Aggregate Pit 2021 Annual Monitoring Report and Harden Environmental Services Peer Review

-p. 448 re “The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry should be consulted on efforts to control beaver activity in Mill Creek.”; how is this requirement best conveyed?

Staff suggest that this peer review be forward to the pit operator highlighting this recommendation and that the MNRF be copied on the correspondence.