



**January 19, 2022 Regular Council Meeting**

January 19, 2022

**Addition to the Consent Agenda Item 6.1.2 Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the January 19, 2022 Council agenda items.**

Consent Agenda

- p.45 6.6 Hamilton Conservation Authority - Comments on Official Plan Amendment 119
- does the County have any comments regarding the response?

*Policy staff will review all of the comments received through the circulation of the Official Plan Amendment, the Open House on January 31, 2022 and Public Meeting on February 10, 2022 and report to County Planning Committee. Further to this, Conservation Halton (via email in November) indicated they had no concerns with OPA 119 and the GRCA did not provide agency comments when circulated.*

- p. 99 6.18 Puslinch High-speed internet Initiative, Federal Universal Broadband Fund (UBF) status
- move that Council supports letter and forward to M. Chong

*Staff will have a draft motion of support ready at the meeting*

- p. 100 6.19 Puslinch High-Speed Initiative Committee - Infrastructure Ontario Reverse Auction
- move that Council supports letter and forward to Speaker Ted Arnott

*Staff will have a draft motion of support ready at the meeting*

- p. 106 6.21 Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry – Proposed regulatory changes under the Aggregate Resources Act
- have we received any response regarding the fill importation at the Capital site on WR34?



*Staff are working through this matter and are not able to share details at this time in accordance with the Township By-law Complaint Policy.*

-do we have access to a qualified person to review and provide comments to Province on our behalf ?

*Staff need Council direction to send this for a review by Township consultants potentially including engineering, hydrogeologist, ecologist, source water, and planning as there would be costs incurred. The commenting period is open until February 24, 2022.*

6.7 Monthly Monitoring Report - Dufferin Aggregates - Mill Creek License 5738 Report stated that “Due to the high effectiveness of the silt barrier installed between the Phase 3 and Phase 4 ponds, passive movement of water between the ponds was initiated in November 2021.”

Silt barriers are usually put in to manage water levels, sometimes to protect natural features from the impacts of extraction.

So they are an important part of the site plan and monitoring program..

Plus, Harden Environmental had identified concerns with water levels in one of these ponds in his annual review last year.

So it is reasonable to expect that any changes to this silt barrier that created “passive movement of water” between these ponds would be considered a major amendment to the site plans.

Were we notified of this change to the site plans prior to this change in operations and monitoring taking place?

Did the licensee receive approval from the MNRF prior to making this change?

If so , what changes have been made to the monitoring program to address this change?

*Staff need to look into the questions above and may need to involve the Township hydrogeologist in the review. If so, staff need Council direction as costs would likely be incurred if involving Harden Environmental in the review.*

Communications Policy:

7.2 Advertisements to External Publications

Policy provides two lists of approved publications. Two appear to be news letters and the rest promote themselves as News Publications.

since the policy does not provide any indication about what qualifies a news publication to be on this list, it is unknown why these were selected to be on the list or why other publications, newsletters, websites or blogs were not included or what would qualify one to be added to the list.



However the opening Policy Statement does indicate that the “ Township recognizes the importance of fostering accurate, balanced and fair reporting

Typically, news publications that share this same objective have appropriate policies and processes in place to achieve this goal and are members of the National NewsMedia Council.

are all of the publications on the list that promote or describe themselves as a news publication or provider of news, members in good standing with the National NewsMedia Council?

If not, what criteria was used to differentiate between the publications on the list and any area publication, website or blog that would like to sell us advertising?

*The current policy includes wording in Section 13.3 that states Township spokesperson(s) are encouraged to participate in interviews with journalists and/or bloggers who Conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the Canadian Association of Journalists’ Principles for Ethical Journalism and Ethics Guidelines. The policy does not require each journalist or publication to be a member of this association but rather that they conduct themselves/itself in a manner that is consistent with the association’s established guidelines and code of practices/ethics. Staff did not include a provision requiring all publications to be a member of the National News Media Council primarily because it does not impose its own code of practice. It expects members to adhere to their own or generally accepted code of journalistic standards, practices and ethics. The National News Media Council does serve as a forum for feedback/complaints and promotes ethical practices within the news media industry.*

*Of the publications included in the draft policy, the following are members of the National News Media Council:*

- 1. Wellington Advertiser*
- 2. Guelph Mercury Tribune*
- 3. Guelph Today*
- 4. Cambridge Times*

*The list of ‘local publications’ included in the policy are those that are already regularly used by staff for a number of different advertising purposes. This includes advertising for Township awards like volunteer and senior of the year, public meeting notices, office holiday closures, property tax reminders, Council meeting dates, facility hours and closures, job postings, and tax sales. The list of other publications by geography, subject*



*matter or target audience was a suggested list based on the Township's media distribution list but is not intended to be comprehensive nor is it intended to serve as a list of approved publications. This can be made more clear in the policy.*

*Section 7.2 lists criteria that would need to be included when staff are drafting a proposal. This is where a section could be added requiring the proposed publication to conduct itself in a manner consistent with an accepted code of journalistic standards, practices and ethics (either the Canadian Association of Journalists' Principles for Ethical Journalism and Ethics Guidelines or the National News Media Council). The draft policy provision is intended to provide the ability for external advertising/communications to occur subject to approval of a detailed project proposal that describes the need and justification for the selected publication.*

## **9.2 Finance Department**

### **9.2.2 Report FIN-2022-004 – Cancellation, Reduction or Refund of Taxes**

-p. 138 re "Township staff could have caused the tax rate on the original Commercial assessment from its Roll-as-Returned for 2020 changed to Residential, providing a reduction in taxation to the property owner for the 2020 taxation year, if the application had not been withdrawn and replaced by the s.258 application." Is this statement correct as I was of the opinion that it was to be changed to Agricultural?

*The default classification for lands used for agricultural purposes is the "Residential" Property Class. A property does not qualify as being farmland eligible unless the owners submit an application to AgriCorp and meet the Province's requirements for designation of the property as Farmland. Once AgriCorp approves these applications, it advises MPAC and MPAC provides the Township with the necessary documentation to transfer the property into the farmland property class so the property can receive the associated reduced rate of taxation. The adjustment for this property based on the 2020 357 application received is changing the classification from commercial to residential assessment.*

*Township staff have received advice from MTAG that based on Provincial law, any/all licensed Marijuana facilities are to be deemed as agricultural for property assessment and taxation purposes even if the property is located in an industrial park.*



9.2.3 Report FIN-2022-005 – 2022 Municipal Insurance Renewal

-p. 151 identifies that item “7. Cyber Risk/Computer Hacking Exclusion Endorsement” is excluded. Do we have any coverage from another carrier?

*Yes the Township has cyber coverage with CFC Underwriting Limited*

-other than what is listed on p. 151 are there any material changes in the policy coverage ie. limits, deductibles, from prior year?

*There are no material changes to coverages, deductibles, etc. The updated property schedule was updated based on changes to assets and includes an inflationary adjustment of 2% as recommended by Marsh to address asset increasing values.*

9.3 Administration Department

9.3.2 Report ADM-2022-003 By-law Enforcement Occurrence 4th Quarter Report

-what are the types and associated number of outstanding complaints?

Year	Total Open Files	Complaint Type
2019	1	1 – Zoning
2020	6	3 – Zoning 1 – Other 1 – Site Alteration 1 – Noise
2021	17	3 – Building 2 – Site Plan Control 2 – Property Standards 7 – Site Alteration 2 – Zoning 1 – Other
2022	2	1 – Site Alteration 1 – Property Standards

9.3.3 Report ADM-2022-004 2021 Annual Water Report



-p.172 what do the lead 3.96/1.47 ug/L and sodium 160/0.01 mg/L numbers indicate ... a range?

*The lead result of 3.96/1.47 ug/L are the results are the Standing and Flushed test respectively. The sodium result of 160/0.01 mg/L represents the test result and the method detection limit (the minimum value that can reliably be measure and reported) respectively.*

*The maximum allowable concentration for sodium is 20 mg/L, and so the result for sodium exceeds this. This has been reported to the Ministry and staff are re-testing in late January.*

*The PCC has a water softener and has been closed to the public since March 2020 due to the pandemic. The combination of the treated water and the lack of use has caused the high sodium result. The Ministry is aware that this facility remains closed to the public and that the building is adequately signed with signage prepared by the Health Unit stating: 'this water is not safe for drinking for salt reduced diets'. The facility has had these signs posted for a number of years due to the use of a water softener. The results of the re-test will be circulated to the Ministry and all other organizations listed in the report as well as posted at the facility.*

#### 9.3.4 Report ADM-2022-005 Update on Line Fences Act

-am I understanding correctly that 4 fence reviewers (other than PDAC members) will be hired for this year and the next four years and that in 2023 3 PDAC members will also appointed for a total of 7 available fence viewers in 2023?

*This is correct. Staff are advising the 4 fence viewers be appointed and trained starting now for a 5 year term; and that 3 PDAC members be appointed and trained to provide coverage for the next term of Council starting in 2023. Given that the proposed annual training sessions would occur at the first regular PDAC meeting in January, no additional costs would be incurred in training the PDAC members. This will provide coverage in the event that fence viewers are unable to perform their job duties within the tight timelines imposed by the Line Fences Act.*

#### 9.3.5 Report ADM-2022-007 Proposed 2022 Corporate Workplan



-p. 180 Street naming and renaming By-law/policy indicates completion by end first quarter. Does this mean it will then be circulated for public and Council review or does this mean that these steps would have been completed and that it will be before Council for approval? What are the approximate dates for Council review and public review?

*Staff are preparing to bring this draft by-law to the first Council meeting in March. Subject to Council feedback, it could be scheduled for public consultation at the Public Information Meeting on March 23. Both Council and public feedback will be a factor in when the by-law is approved.*

#### 9.3.6 Report ADM-2022-008 Brock Road Crosswalk

-has there been any discussion on having speed cameras installed?

*The County has indicated that once a Community Safety Zone has been created. The implementation of Photo Radar can be considered. There would be a process to be followed and it would not be applied immediately.*

#### 9.3.7 Report ADM-2022-009 Amendment to Advertising, Communications and Media Relations Policy

-p. 197 clause 7.1 re “communications to external publications must be pre-approved by the applicable process.”; what is the applicable process?

*The applicable process refers to the last paragraph in the draft provision:*

*“Project proposals for justification of advertisements for inclusion in publications not listed as local must provide detailed budgetary requirements, outline the subject matter, and identify the target audience. Project proposals are to be approved by Council through either the Corporate Work Plan, Township Annual Budget Process, or Council approved Committee Goals and Objectives.”*

#### 10.2 Wellington County Road Master Action Plan – WR 46 Strategic Traffic Analysis presented



by Don Kudo, County of Wellington Engineer, and Paul Bumstead, Dillon Consulting

10.2 Wellington County Road Master Action Plan - WR 46 Strategic Traffic Analysis presented by Don Kudo, County of Wellington Engineer, and Paul Bumstead, Dillon Consulting

2000 Study \*

- Stats Can Guelph population in 2001 was 106k
- population projected for 2025 not identified in 2000 study\*
- 2021 Guelph population is 147k a 39% increase over 2000
- 2041 Guelph population expected to be 191k a 29% increase over 2021

Issue 1 Link Maltby Road to County Road 34

- in study \* 1997 total peak hour was 1210 or (using 55% split) was 670 NB
- projected for 2025 total peak hour to be 2200 or (using 55% split) 1210 NB
- in 2018 data\*\* same link is currently 900 or 25% less
- given the slower growth and possibility of diverting traffic onto Maltby to connect to mid-block Hanlon interchange does it make sense to add lanes in this section?

*RESPONSE: The RMAP team can't speak to the underlying characteristics (i.e. network conditions, local travel behaviour) of the 1997 existing volumes nor the foundation assumptions for the 2025 condition (i.e. area growth, corridor growth). The RMAP team is working with volume counts in the corridor from 2017-2018 (pre-Pandemic) and policy growth to 2041 for the County and surrounding area, referencing specifically the Forecast Update 2011-2041, by Watson & Associates (May 5, 2015) and the County of Wellington Official Plan (August 15, 2019). This includes the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan area which is anticipated to generate 4,700 new vehicle trips in the p.m. peak hour (Clair-Maltby Background Mobility Study - Phases 1 & 2, BA Group, January 2019), of which 15% are anticipated to use Gordon Street (WR 46) south of Maltby Road. Based on these growth assumptions the p.m. peak hour volumes on WR 46 is expected to grow from 960 peak hour, peak direction vehicles in 2018 to to (at the limits of acceptable operating conditions) to 1,540 vehicles by 2041 (over capacity for a single lane in each direction).*

Issue 2 Projected Increase in Traffic Through Aberfoyle

2000 WR34 to Gilmour was 1470 in peak hour or 882 NB (60% split)

2021 WR34 to McLean is 990 NB in peak hour only a 12% increase





2041 WR34 to McLean is projected to be 1550 a 56% increase  
-again given the slower growth is a 56% increase in traffic reasonable?

*RESPONSE: While historical volumes provide some context for past corridor growth, the RMAP must consider the policy growth positions for the City and the County that will have an impact on the network and specific corridors. Per the response to Issue 1 above, land use forecasts for the 2041 condition have been used to generate volume forecasts.*

Issue 3 Diversions for section County Road 34 to McLean Road

D. Kudo email of July 14, 2021 identifies 2900 cars diverted on all day basis due to construction. Peak hour diversion for NB is  $2900 \times 8.5\% \times 60\%$  or 147

Using these numbers if extrapolate for 2041 ie. a 56% increase we get 230 diverted and this is not considering the future midblock interchange at Hanlon and Maltby (NB Guelph traffic will be able to avoid Aberfoyle), the paving of Concession 7 and the eventual Morriston bypass and speed enforcement

Does it make sense to ignore diversions to Hanlon, Concession 7, Morriston bypass if section through Aberfoyle has only one lane in each direction?

*RESPONSE: The potential diversions related to the future infrastructure were not ignored. Available traffic forecasts from the MTO project were reviewed and compared to the baseline forecasts generated for 2041. Significant detail related to the assumptions for the MTO forecasts was unavailable. However, the identified volumes were compared to the 2041 forecasts for WR 46 and the diversion potential of each infrastructure element was acknowledged. It was concluded, based on the information available, that the diversion would not be significant enough to state that a 2-lane WR 46 would operate safely and efficiently, i.e. diversion needed is stated as 500 vehicles in the peak hour, peak direction for the 2041 analysis while the anticipated diversion associated with these infrastructure improvements is only in the order of 200 vehicles (based on review of MTO forecasts). The RMAP analysis acknowledges that more detailed information (not currently available) is needed for the network and land use changes that are expected in the vicinity of the new mid-block interchange with Hanlon Expressway. One of the conclusions of the analysis is that: "A future review and study is required once future infrastructure and service implemented (Morrison By-Pass and Hanlon Road Expressway improvements; All-day, two-way rail service on Kitchener*



*line). This could take the form of a Municipal Class EA where alternative methods and alternative design concepts would be fully explored (ie., impacts and costs)." To this end, the Implementation section of the RMAP identifies costs to be included in the 0-5 year time frame for a WR 46 Area Study (\$50k) as well as a WR 46 EA Study to confirm the network and land use assumptions for the area and what these impacts would mean for WR 46.*

\* Gordon Street Wellington Road 46 Class Environmental Assessment Volume 1  
December 2000

[\[cid:image002.png@01D80B85.315B90F0\]](#)

[\[cid:image003.png@01D80B85.315B90F0\]](#)

\*\* Wellington Road 46 Road Diet

[\[cid:image004.png@01D80B85.315B90F0\]](#)

[\[cid:image005.png@01D80B85.315B90F0\]](#)