



June 17, 2026 Council Meeting

June 17, 2026

Addition to the Agenda Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the June 17, 2026 Council agenda items.

6.4 Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks Direction Under Section 1.14 of Conservation Authorities Act

-does this affect our recent purchase of the GRCA lands?

In reviewing this directive, it does not prohibit the sale of lands, but rather requires all CA's to obtain written authorization for such activities from the chief executive officer of the Ontario Provincial Conservation Agency ("OPCA CEO"), or the Chief Conservation Executive of the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks if the chief executive officer has not yet been appointed. The draft APS already contemplates the agreement being conditional upon Ministerial confirmation under s.21 of the CAA, and so that condition can easily be expanded to include parallel authorization from the CEO / CCO as the case may be.

6.9 United Counties of Leeds & Greenville Resolution Regarding Support for Municipal Engineers Association

Do we have similar concerns?

This is a repeat of a previous consent item and staff have confirmed previously with the Township engineer that there are no concerns.

6.12 Prince Edward County Support Resolution Regarding Sustainable Funding for Public Health Units

Does Wellington County have a position on this issue?

Staff have forwarded this inquiry to County staff.

6.13 Town of Plympton-Wyoming Support Resolution Regarding Sustainable Provincial Grant Funding for Fire Services in Ontario

-do staff have similar concerns?



Puslinch Fire would strongly agree with the views expressed by the Town of Plympton-Wyoming. By the province implementing a stable, predictable non-competitive funding program, it would help ensure the success of smaller rural volunteer fire departments. Although Puslinch Fire is classed as a volunteer fire service and handles a much smaller call volume than a fulltime fire service it is still forced to deal with the challenges of the 401 Highway and that in and of itself presents an unusual set of challenges both in terms of equipment needed and personnel required. Predictable funding provided by the provincial government would let us better budget for upcoming years with guaranteed money being allocated to the department by the province.

6.15 Town of Iroquois Falls Request for Support Ontario Firefighter Certification Requirements

-do staff have similar concerns?

While Puslinch Fire does recognize the need for proficiency in fire related skills amongst its members, it also recognizes the strain of achieving these certifications puts on staff and as a result the department. There are numerous challenges being presented to us by the Regulation 343/22.

1. Limited courses available for staff to enroll in to even achieve the certifications. In many cases staff want to take the courses needed but they are simply not available. There is little explanation as to the implications of having someone not fully certified responding after the certification requirement date.
2. These regulations will force the department to hire already certified applicants if they will be responding immediately. Typically, these applicants are seeking full time careers in the fire service and that leads to high staff turnover.
3. These certifications are a deterrent for many people to apply thus limiting our available population to draw from.

Again, we fully support the certification process, but it needs to allow some flexibility for smaller departments with limited populations to draw from.

6.21 IESO South and Central Bulk Plan Municipal Update

-there is a new facility marked on the map entitled Puslinch DS. As well, in the presentation slides of a webinar on June 10 this facility is to have batteries and solar panels to provide backup power. Do we where it is anticipated to be located?



IESO has confirmed that there is no anticipated location at this time for the KWCG IRRP draft recommendations relating to distributed solar generation and energy storage in the Township of Puslinch. Further potential locations for these projects will be determined through the development process led by the non-wires solution proponent.

Finance Department 9.2.1 2:00 P.M. Report FIN-2026-017– Supporting Local Business in Puslinch: A Township-wide Community Improvement Plan

-what is the total value of the interest so far?

Based on the three inquiries received in 2026 regarding the façade, signage, and landscape improvement grant at the \$4.5K maximum, the amount known is approximately \$13.5K. All other inquirers in 2026 have not stated which specific grants they were interested in.

-where will the \$15k come from ie. projected under expenditures?

The financial implications section of the report indicates that \$5K of the amount will be funded by the Planning Cost Centre for CIP

grants, reflecting historical program uptake under the existing “Our Corridor” CIP. Any funding shortfall beyond the approved Planning Cost Centre allocation will be supported through available County Business Retention and Expansion (BR&E) funding approved previously for the CIP work.

9.2.3 Report FIN-2026-019 – 2025 Development Charges and Cash in Lieu of Parkland ≠

-Schedule A shouldn't the second subtotal be the difference between the first subtotal and the amount transferred to capital funds?

The heading is intended to be total deductions, not the net of additions less deductions. The closing balance calculation implicitly performs the subtraction.

10.1 10:15 A.M. Presentation by Julia DeDecker regarding Highway 6 and 401

Improvements from Hamilton North Limits to Guelph South Limits G.W.P. 3042-14-00

-is there a pedestrian walkway incorporated into the bridge over the 401 to ultimately link Aberfoyle and Morriston?

Yes, there is a pedestrian walkway or multi-use path that is contemplated in the construction, however how this path will be linked and continued north into Aberfoyle and south into Morriston is yet to be determined. Further, the MTO advised that they would require the County or the Township to maintain the multi-use path following construction. It is the County's position that it would be the Township's responsibility to maintain the multi-use path similar to how sidewalks on Brock Road are maintained by the Township.



-has our traffic consultant reviewed this plan? If so any concerns?

Staff have received the below comments from the Township's Traffic Consultant which have been shared with the MTO:

I've taken a look at the preferred alternative design that the MTO is bringing forward to Council tomorrow – thank you for sharing that. It does include a multi-use path (or provisions they say) through the interchange. There is some language in their presentation that suggests there may be some flexibility in the design because it will be finalized through the final design process.

A multi-use path is a good approach in this location, in my opinion, because it would allow space for pedestrians, cyclists, and people otherwise rolling on low power devices (like scooters and e-bikes) separately from the road. I have a question and a comment:

- 1. Is MTO going to build the multi-use path as part of the project?*
- 2. The current layout of the multi-use path crosses three free-flowing ramps. We would like the opportunity to work with MTO to see if there are opportunities to minimize the number of free-flow ramp crossings and to have input into the final design of the MUP.*

10.4 Site Plan Amendment Approval for Licence #626648 under the Aggregate Resources Act

-are there any changes outside of aggregate lands that MNRF inadvertently approved under this notice?

Staff have reached out to the MNR regarding the amendment with the following questions:

1. Provide the location of the building that was demolished (the Township is not aware of a demolition permit being issued);
2. Provide the location, number, and square footage of the sea cans and the purpose of the sea cans in relation to the aggregate operation; and
3. Provide the location and extent of the lane way that was added.

10.5 Proposed Planning Act Changes Schedule 7 of Bill 119, the Proposed Protecting Ontario Streets and Communities Act ≠

-do we currently have the ability, through AMPs, to address some zoning bylaw contraventions? For instance trailer storage in an agricultural zone. **Currently, there is no ability to enforce Planning Act violations under Part I penalties through Provincial Offences or the Administrative Monetary Penalty System (AMPS). As a result, zoning violations are currently enforceable only through a Part III summons and prosecution process. Bill 119 will introduce authority to enforce Section 34 of the Planning Act (zoning) through AMPS.**



Once Bill 119 is in force, the Township will have the ability to issue Part I-style penalties through its AMPS program, creating a more streamlined and administrative enforcement mechanism for zoning-related offences.

16.1 Councillor Goyda submits the following notice of motion to be considered by Council at the July 15, 2026 Council Meeting

-procedurally can this item be discussed at this meeting in relation to 6.1.1 May 27, 2026 Council Meeting Minutes Resolution No. 2026-177?

In accordance with our procedural By-law, the discussion should wait until the following meeting as this gives proper notice to all members and the public.