



## March 25, 2026 Council Meeting

March 25, 2026

**Addition to the Agenda Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the March 25, 2026 Council agenda items.**

---

### 6.4 Ministry of Transportation Request for Comment - Harmonization of Municipal Road Construction Standards

-are there any comments that staff wish Council to support?

Staff have provided this regulatory proposal to our Engineering Consultant for review with respect to potential impacts to the Township. Staff will report back with any potential impacts at a future Council meeting and will submit any concerns identified to the regulatory proposal posting should time allow.

### 6.10 Township of McNab Braeside Council Resolution regarding Ontario Heritage Organization Development Grant Advocacy-

-comments from staff would be appreciated

Staff have reviewed the support resolution and have no concerns should Council wish to pass a similar support resolution.

### 9.2.2 Report FIN-2026-010 Temporary Borrowing By-law

-would it make sense to borrowing funds from the County in the future?

Borrowing through the County is typically utilized for long-term financing of approved capital projects through the issuance of debentures, often with terms of 10 years. This allows the Township to benefit from favourable interest rates through the County's pooled debenture process, which combines borrowing requirements across multiple lower-tier municipalities and the County. For short-term or temporary borrowing needs, as permitted under Section 407 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, municipalities generally utilize their primary banking institution. This approach provides greater flexibility, immediate access to funds,



and is better suited to managing short-term cash flow requirements within the fiscal year. Accordingly, borrowing from the County would not typically be used for temporary financing purposes.

#### 9.4.1 Report COR-2026-013 2024 & 2025 Annual Aggregate Monitoring Reports Dufferin Aggregates Aberfoyle Pit #2

-p.242 Harden Report re “There is a departure from historical trends in 2024 where OW2-90 has markedly lower water levels than nearby OW3R-05. There is no explanation for this, nor any cause for immediate concern. This trend should be monitored and evaluated should it continue.”; when should we be concerned?

Please see the response from the Township’s Hydrogeologist below:

*I have looked at the data again and the water levels at OW2-90 follow a similar trend to previous years and decline throughout the year, whereas, the water levels in OW3R-05 stay the same or increase at the same time. The water levels at OW2-90 are not at historic lows, therefore, no concern necessary. The water levels in OW3R-05 are higher because the pit pond moved approximately 100 m closer throughout the year. This pit pond becomes a source of water, moderating the seasonal declines normally seen, thus water levels in OW2-90, which is farther way from the pit pond, declines normally and OW3-5R is buoyed by the nearby pond.*

-p.244 re “A land use planner may be able to evaluate if provincial policy statements or official plan policies of the County of Wellington are being contravened. We note that the pit pond extends into the area formerly regulated by the GRCA as shown on the attached map”; please comment on the need for this review by our Planning Consultant

Please see the response from the Township’s Hydrogeologist below:

*I have attached the GRCA regulated area map and the northern corner touches on land regulated by the GRCA, a wetland and its buffer area. This northern area is affected by lower water levels caused by the westward expansion of the pit pond. The wetland will be drier and there is data from SW2-91 that shows that it is almost always dry compared to being always wet prior to extraction. As your technical advisor, I confirm that the data is showing much drier conditions beneath the wetland. I am not sure if it is pertinent given that the license was issued some 30 years ago after review by the MNR. A provincial policy statement may be being contravened or a policy protecting wetlands in the*



*Wellington County OP. I have not explored either is what I am saying by having a planner take a look.*

Staff can prepare a resolution for Council to direct staff to provide the above noted comment to the GRCA regarding this matter and our Planning Consultant to draft correspondence to be submitted to the pit operator and the MNR.

-p.293 Consultant recommends removing WP1-93 from the monitoring program. Does Harden agree?

*Please see the response from the Township's Hydrogeologist below:  
We do not agree with the removal of WP1-93. We have concerns regarding the lake levelling effect on water levels beneath this wetland and monitoring should continue.*

-will recommend that the recommendation include sending the reports to the GRCA

Staff will amend the resolution accordingly.

-are there annual reports for the McMillan and Rozell pits?

The Township does receive monitoring reports for McMillan, Roszell and a few other pits within the Township. These monitoring reports are received at varying times throughout the year and staff will bring this report back reiteratively until all annual monitoring reports have been reviewed by Council each year.

Correspondence ≠

10.1 10:05 A.M. Presentation by County of Wellington and Dillon Consulting regarding Wellington Road 46 Road Study

-It is my understanding that the amendments to the Highway Traffic Act (under Schedule 5) prohibiting municipalities from reducing motor vehicle lanes contain exceptions for projects that are already underway or contracted. These exceptions apply where a contract has already been awarded or the work has already begun. Can you please confirm that the Brock Road Diet was awarded/work was under way prior to Bill 60 receiving Royal Assent and therefore the prohibitions noted in the report on page 446 of the agenda do not apply.



Staff have provided the following question for response by the County and their consultants at the meeting.

#### 10.2 Puslinch Golf Course PTTW

-p.459 Wellington Hydrology report has the following recommendation “the MECP should consider requiring a cumulative impact assessment of major water takers”; do we have a list of all major water takers that can be provided to the Province?

Major water takers generally include municipalities, aggregate operations, water bottling facilities, and other large industrial or commercial users. All major water takers are required to hold a Permit to Take Water (PTTW), and PTTWs are publicly accessible through the Access Environment Database/Website

([https://www.lioapplications.lrc.gov.on.ca/Access\\_Environment/index.html?viewer=Access\\_Environment.AE&locale=en-CA](https://www.lioapplications.lrc.gov.on.ca/Access_Environment/index.html?viewer=Access_Environment.AE&locale=en-CA)). The MECP maintains and has ready access to this information.

-will suggest that covering letter makes specific note of the recommendations by WHL and Source Water

Attached is a draft cover letter prepared by the Township’s Hydrogeological Consultant to be sent with the Township’s Council Resolution and peer reviews.

#### 10.2 Correspondence Puslinch Lake Golf Course PTTW from Wellington Hydrogeology report

Would like to suggest we include the following comments similar to part 4 of the Source Water Protection comments (p2) as a standard response to all large water taking permits in the Township

“...staff are recommending that the Ministry consider... Given the number of large water takers and sensitive groundwater and wetland features within the Township, the MECP should consider...cumulative impacts of all major water takers within and surrounding Puslinch... when considering permitting a Permit to take water application.(p7)

Staff will have a draft motion prepared.