May 15, 2019

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Premier’s Office, Room 281
Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford:

Re: Town of Aurora Council Resolution of Tuesday, May 14, 2019
Re: Motion (a) Mayor Mrakas; Re: Response to Bill 108, the More Homes,
More Choice Act

Please be advised that this matter was considered by Council at its meeting held on
Tuesday, May 14, 2019, and in this regard Council adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the legislation that abolished the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) and
replaced it with the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) received
unanimous, all-party support; and

Whereas all parties recognized that local governments should have the
authority to uphold their provincially-approved Official Plans, to uphold their
community-driven planning; and

Whereas Bill 108 will once again allow an unelected, unaccountable body to
make decisions on how our communities evolve and grow; and

Whereas on August 21, 2018, Minister Clark once again signed the
Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Association of Municipalities of
Ontario and entered into “...a legally binding agreement recognizing Ontario
Municipalities as a mature, accountable order of government.”; and

Whereas this MOU is “enshrined in law as part of the Municipal Act’ and
recognizes that as “…public policy issues are complex and thus require
coordinated responses...the Province endorses the principle of regular consultation between Ontario and municipalities in relation to matters of mutual interest”; and

Whereas by signing this agreement, the Province made “...a commitment to cooperating with its municipal governments in considering new legislation or regulations that will have a municipal impact”; and

Whereas Bill 108 will impact 15 different Acts: Cannabis Control Act, 2017; Conservation Authorities Act; Development Charges Act; Education Act; Endangered Species Act, 2007; Environmental Assessment Act; Environmental Protection Act; Labour Relations Act, 1995; Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act, 2017; Municipal Act, 2001; Occupational Health and Safety Act; Ontario Heritage Act; Ontario Water Resources Act; Planning Act; and Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997;

1. Now Therefore Be it Hereby Resolved That the Town of Aurora oppose Bill 108, which in its current state will have negative consequences on community building and proper planning; and

2. Be It Further Resolved That the Town of Aurora call upon the Government of Ontario to halt the legislative advancement of Bill 108 to enable fulsome consultation with Municipalities to ensure that its objectives for sound decision-making for housing growth that meets local needs will be reasonably achieved; and

3. Be It Further Resolved That a copy of this Motion be sent to The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, The Honourable Christine Elliott, Deputy Premier, The Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Andrea Horwath, Leader of the New Democratic Party, and all MPPs in the Province of Ontario; and

4. Be It Further Resolved That a copy of this Motion be sent to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and all Ontario municipalities for their consideration.

The above is for your consideration and any attention deemed necessary.
Re: Town of Aurora Motion (a) Response to Bill 108, the More Homes, More Choice Act
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Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]
Michael de Rond
Town Clerk
The Corporation of the Town of Aurora

MdR/lb

Copy:  Hon. Christine Elliott, Deputy Premier
       Hon. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
       Andrea Horwath, Leader of the New Democratic Party
       All MPPs in the Province of Ontario
       Association of Municipalities of Ontario
       All Ontario Municipalities
Petrolia Town Council
Resolution Form

Date: May 13, 2019
Resolution #: C-32 - 05/13/2019

Moved By: Councillor Field
Seconded by: [Redacted]

WHEREAS on the May 13, 2019 regular council agenda, correspondence item 12 q) was received from the Ontario Good Roads Association;

AND WHEREAS as during the 2019 OGRA conference AGM a resolution was passed regarding the re-establishment of an annual combined conference for both OGRA & ROMA;

AND WHEREAS as a past attendee of the combined conferences, it makes great sense for the OGRA & ROMA conferences to be returned to a combined conference effort each February, not only financially for the municipality but also for availability for participation of members of Council and staff;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Town of Petrolia support the original resolution passed at the OGRA AGM to re-establish a combined OGRA & ROMA conference;

AND FURTHERMORE that a letter be sent to the ROMA Board of Directors, outlining our support for a collaborative OGRA ROMA annual combined conference, and that this letter of support be circulated to the Ontario Municipalities, and the OGRA Board of Directors;

Recorded Vote if called:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loosley, Brad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgton, Wade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field, Joel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Hara, Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdy, Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, Marty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetten, Donald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clerk's Signature: [Redacted]

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

[Redacted] declared their interest, abstained from the discussion and did not vote on the matter.
Regular Council Meeting Resolution Form

Date: April 16, 2019
Moved by Councillor Scott Brum
Seconded by Councillor Heather Lang

No: RESOLUTION - 131-2019
Disposition: CARRIED
Item No: 9.1

Description: Request for Support #1-4
2. Councillor Scott Brum - Government of Ontario E-Learning

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS the Government of Ontario is proposing education adjustments; AND WHETHER the Government of Ontario announced that secondary school students will be required to take four (4) out of the thirty (30) high school credits as online courses; AND WHETHER thirty (30) credits are required for an Ontario high school diploma, the government is not providing rural Ontario with the same broadband access as the rest of the Province; AND WHETHER broadband service is lacking, making e-learning impossible, and may set our students up for a two-tier education system due to the lack of internet access; AND WHETHER online e-learning will disproportionately affect students with special needs, who may need more attention from their teachers, and students in low-income families, who may not have access to a laptop and internet at home to do their online course work; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Township of McNab/Braeside respectfully requests the Premier of Ontario to reconsider these online courses until rural Ontario students can be given the same opportunity to access the internet as the urban students; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this motion be circulated to Ontario Premier Doug Ford, Minister of Education Lisa M. Thompson, MPP of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke John Yakabuski, MP of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke Cheryl Gallant, all Municipalities in the Province of Ontario, AMO, and ROMA.

MAYOR

Recorded Vote Requested by T. Peckett Yee
B. Amarooni _
H. Lang _
S. Brum _
O. Jacob _

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest ( disclosed no/other interest (x) vacated the/attended the meets), abstained from discussion and did not vote
Hello,

The Township of Mulmur passed the following motion at the Council meeting on May 1, 2019.

**Motion #83-19 Boxem-Cufaro:** WHEREAS, Mulmur Township Council considers public libraries as a vital service to community well-being especially in a rural community such as ours;

AND WHEREAS, public libraries offer much needed support to the very vulnerable members of our society - the children, the seniors, recent immigrants, and the low-income citizens;

AND WHEREAS, the Provincial Government has cut the budget for Ontario Library Services by 50%;

AND WHEREAS, this funding will end the Interlibrary Loan Service to libraries;

AND WHEREAS, due to limited resources available to some libraries, the Interlibrary Loan Service is of great importance to its patrons;

NOW THEREFORE, Mulmur Township Council respectfully requests that the Province reconsiders the 50% budget cut for Ontario Library Services and finds some other means to fund necessary library services.

Carried.

Have a nice day,

Adam Hicks | Administrative Assistant
Township of Mulmur | 758070 2nd Line East | Mulmur, Ontario L9V 0G8
Phone 705-466-3341 ext. 234 | Fax 705-466-2922 | ahicks@mulmur.ca

This message (including attachments, if any) is intended to be confidential and solely for the addressee. If you received this e-mail in error, please delete it and advise me immediately. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free and the sender does not accept liability for errors or omissions.
Hello,

The Township of Mulmur passed the following motion at the Council meeting on May 1, 2019.

Deputy Mayor Hawkins requested a recorded vote on the following motion:

**Motion #78-19 Hawkins-Clark:** THAT The Township of Mulmur recognizes the importance of aggregate extraction and the proper management of aggregate resources, including recycling aggregates;

AND WHEREAS, Mulmur owns and operates a gravel pit;

AND WHEREAS, the inappropriate extraction of aggregate can impact host communities, including, but not limited to: risk to surface and underground water supplies stress placed on local infrastructure; road safety; air and noise pollution; loss of farmland; encroachment on residential communities; interference with natural heritage systems;

AND WHEREAS, the Ontario Government commenced a detailed review of the Aggregate Resources Act in 2016;

AND WHEREAS, the Ministry of Natural Resources hosted a summit on Aggregate Reform on March 29, 2019, and did not include municipal government as stakeholders;

AND WHEREAS, the Township supports the recommendations to allow policy interpretation for accessing material under Road Allowances;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1) The Township of Mulmur hereby requests the following:
   a) the Provincial Government provide for municipal representation at future meetings related to the Aggregate Reform;
   b) Municipalities be provided authority to regulate hours of operation and haul routes within municipal boundaries;
   c) If the Provincial level is accepted as a single level for applications, Municipalities be provided a process through which to provide comments on aggregate extraction activities proposed within or in the vicinity of their boundaries;
   d) The comments on “Cutting the Red Tape” provided by the Ontario Sand and Gravel Association be evaluated from the perspective of the local host community and ensure that there are mechanisms/processes in place to address impacts.
   e) That land unavailable for extraction due to changes on the rules to endangered and threatened species and other policies within the Natural Heritage System continue to be protected.
Shirley Boxem - yea
Patricia Clark - yea
Ken Cufaro - yea
Earl Hawkins - yea
Janet Horner - yea
Carried.

Have a nice day,

Adam Hicks | Administrative Assistant
Township of Mulmur | 758070 2nd Line East | Mulmur, Ontario L9V 0G8
Phone 705-466-3341 ext. 234 | Fax 705-466-2922 | ahicks@mulmur.ca

This message (including attachments, if any) is intended to be confidential and solely for the addressee. If you received this e-mail in error, please delete it and advise me immediately. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free and the sender does not accept liability for errors or omissions.
The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau  
Prime Minister  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  

Honourable and Dear Sir:  

Re:  Issuance of Cannabis Licenses in Residentially Zoned Areas  

The Municipal Council of the Town of Fort Erie at its meeting of May 21, 2019 passed the following resolution:  

That: Council requests the Federal Government to provide information on all cannabis licenses including personal medical licenses to the Town of Fort Erie when licenses are issued, and further  

That: A public process take place in connection with granting cannabis licenses and their location, and further  

That: This resolution be circulated to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Health, the Niagara Members of Parliament and Provincial Parliament, and all Ontario municipalities.  

Thank you for your attention to this very important issue.  

Yours very truly,  

Carol Schofield, Dipl.M.A.  
Manager, Legislative Services/Clerk  
cschofield@forterie.ca  

The Honourable Ginette Petitpas Taylor, Minister of Health Sent via email: Ginette.petitpastalor@parl.gc.ca  
The Honourable Rob Nicholson, MP-Niagara, Sent via email: rob.nicholson@parl.gc.ca  
Vance Badawey, MP-Niagara Centre Sent via email: vance.badawey@parl.gc.ca  
Chris Bittle, MP-St. Catharines Sent via email: chris.bittle@parl.gc.ca  
Wayne Gates, MPP-Niagara Falls, Legislative Assembly of Ontario Sent via email: wgates-co@ndp.on.ca  
Sam Oosterhoff, MPP-Niagara West-Glanbrook, Legislative Assembly of Ontario Sent via email: sam.oosterhoff@pc.ola.org  
Jennifer Stevens, MPP-St. Catharines Sent via email: JStevens-CO@ndp.on.ca  
Jeff Burch, MPP-Niagara Centre Sent via email: JBurch-QP@ndp.on.ca  
All Ontario Municipalities Sent via email  

Mailing Address:  
The Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie  
1 Municipal Centre Drive, Fort Erie ON L2A 2S6  
Office Hours 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.  Phone: (905) 871-1600  FAX: (905) 871-4022  Web-site: www.forterie.ca
May 19, 2019

To: The office of the mayor and council.

From: Alice Otrysko, resident of Ashbury Crt.,

Dear Members:

It was Saturday, May 18 when I was awoken at 10:00 p.m. by the sound of a gunshot outside my window. That was followed by several more. I and sleep is very important to me so I was deeply disturbed when I found out it was FIREWORKS steps from my bedroom window, in the ball park.

This noise continued for about another hour frightening my pets and upsetting me terribly especially since I feel fireworks should be banned. They pollute the environment with noise and chemicals, they frighten and disturb people like myself, and they definitely scare animals especially wildlife. They are also dangerous and a fire hazard. Most of all fireworks should never be set off in a residential area that close to people’s homes.

Thank you for reading my concerns,

Alice Otrysko
Dear Niagara Escarpment Commission:

RE: NEP Nott SR 26-27 CR 91, proposed NEP amendment PS 215 18
   Township of Clearview Sideroad 26-27, County of Simcoe Road No 91

Please find below preliminary comments regarding the Township of Clearview’s proposed NEP amendment. I have supported nature and protection of the environment for over three decades across three Counties and beyond. Over the past four decades, a number of Local Municipalities, two Counties, and the public have had the benefit of my professional knowledge, experience, and skill set. The comments are provided as constructive criticism and are not intended to detract from the good services that are provided to the public.

As local municipal Council members and Recreation Committee members will remember, I promoted trail development in The Township of Oro-Medonte, the Town of The Blue Mountains, the Township of Clearview, and the Township of Essa, and I still support it today.

In the description of the instrument on the Environmental Registry it states, in part, that the purpose is “... to make improvements to Sideroad 26/27 to make it an all-season road to replace the County Road.” Notwithstanding that the Township chose to
rush into a road improvement agreement without due diligence and assessment of adverse environmental impacts, the proposed road works, through Escarpment Natural and Protection Areas, do not bring Sideroad 26/27 up to a County engineering road standard and, therefore, do not provide for a replacement of the County Road within the overall and intertwined road networks of the County of Simcoe and the County of Grey and all of its existing attributes and benefits. Due to its many shortcomings, Sideroad 26/27, whether as a substandard rural gravel road or as a substandard local paved road, cannot be considered as a replacement to County Road No 91.

There is no justification for ignoring alternatives for the development of infrastructure in wetlands. In fact, there are at least two viable alternatives to consider: 1) keep the existing upper portion of County Road No 91 between Nott Concession 10 and the Osprey Clearview Townline (Simcoe Grey boundary) open as a County of Simcoe road, and 2) keep the existing upper portion of County Road No 91 between Nott Concession 10 and the Osprey Clearview Townline (Simcoe Grey boundary) open as a County of Simcoe road, re-align it, and optimize it to a County engineering road standard for the safety of the travelling public.

The Township could also consider stopping up and closing Sideroad 26/27 to through traffic and construct parking for the Bruce Trail crossing or Nottawasaga Lookout at or near the dead end(s) while minimizing the environmental impact now and for the future. The proposed road works are not necessary or a necessity. County Road No 91 is existing transportation infrastructure that provides for existing needs.

Had the Township’s consultants undertaken a Class C Municipal Class Environmental Assessment including meaningful public consultations, all of this would already have been known, considered, and documented. Why did the Township’s consultants classify the proposed works only as a Class A? Have socio-economic impacts, haul routes, traffic patterns, tourism, local growth, regional dynamics, and Provincial interests all been down-played to push this policy change through?

The Township’s consultants appear to have more interest in bats than utilizing existing infrastructure, being County Road No 91, which should not be removed from public use. What led them down this slippery slope and how did they lose sight of the big picture?

The proposal will further erode the integrity of the Escarpment face, degrade the environment, cause harm to the extensive natural areas and wetlands, adversely affect the scenic views of the Escarpment, and compromise the regional transportation system and road network across the Counties and beyond; it is not transparent in its intended purpose or motivation. There is no public benefit to giving the upper portion of County Road No 91 and the underlying road allowance to the private owner of the quarry.
These are preliminary comments and questions. Further comments may be provided as additional information becomes available.

I understand that the Commission is in the process of reviewing the application and comments and that the application will be considered at a future meeting. Please provide any amendments or addendums to the application as they become available to the public. I wish to receive further notice of the status of this application and be advised of any scheduled meetings.

Sincerely,

J. A. Brydges

J. A. Brydges,
HBMath, CPA, CA, CGA, CMA

copy
County of Simcoe info@simcoe.ca
County of Grey heather.morrison@grey.ca
Town of Collingwood salmas@collingwood.ca
Town of The Blue Mountains cgiles@thebluemountains.ca
The Municipality of Grey Highlands clerk@greyhighlands.ca
Township of Clearview pfettes@clearview.ca
Blue Mountains Watershed Trust Foundation norman.wingrove@sympatico.ca

tá an féar i gcónaí níos géire ar an taobh eile den lochán
COMMITTEE AND BOARD EXPERIENCE

Member of the Provincially appointed Financial Adjustment Committee for Restructuring (Committees of Referees) (County of Simcoe Act, 1993), on behalf of the former Township of Medonte, with respect to negotiating the restructuring of the County of Simcoe, 1994

Expert Witness, on behalf of the Township of Oro-Medonte, regarding the decision of the Committees of Referees under the County of Simcoe Act, 1993, as appealed by the Township of Severn, before the Board of Arbitrators, 1995 to 1996

Expert Witness, on behalf of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with respect to development charges, before the Ontario Municipal Board (P L Wyger), 2001 to 2002

Member of steering committee and technical committee, on behalf of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with respect to Comprehensive Environmental Assessment for Camperdown, Lora Bay, Clarksburg, and Thornbury Service Areas, 2001 to 2006; related cost sharing and financing agreements

Member of steering committee and technical committee, on behalf of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with respect to Combined Environmental Assessment Master Plan for Craigleith, Castle Glen, and Osler Service Areas, 2004 to 2006; related cost sharing and financing agreements

Member of mediation team and Witness, on behalf of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with respect to “Camperdown” appeals, servicing, financing, and minutes of settlement, before the Ontario Municipal Board (J R Mills, May 28, 2003, No 0696), 2002 to 2004

Member of mediation team and Witness, on behalf of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with respect to “Lora Bay” appeals, servicing, financing, and minutes of settlement, before the Ontario Municipal Board (J R Mills, July 10, 2003, No 0938), 2002 to 2004

Member of mediation team and Witness, on behalf of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with respect to “Castle Glen” appeals, servicing, financing, and minutes of settlement, before the Ontario Municipal Board (B W Krushelnicki, Nov. 6, 2003, No 1499), 2003 to 2004

Resource to mediation team, on behalf of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with respect to “Craigleith” appeals, servicing, and financing, before the Ontario Municipal Board, 2003 to 2004

Witness, on behalf of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with respect to development charges, before the Ontario Municipal Board, 2005 (D R Granger), 2005

brydges cv 2011
April 30, 2019

To: Heads of Council
All Ontario Municipalities

From: Dan Mathieson
Chair, MPAC Board of Directors

Subject: 2018 Annual Report

The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation’s (MPAC) 2018 Annual Report is available for your information.

This document has been prepared as required by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation Act. The report is also being provided to the Premier, Minister of Finance, Members of Provincial Parliament and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.

Our Annual Report provides an overview of our operational and financial performance over the year including highlights of our 2017-2020 Strategic Plan.

Should you have any questions regarding the report, please do not hesitate to contact me at 519 271-0250, extension 234 or Nicole McNeill, President and Chief Administrative Officer, at 905 837-6166.

If you would like a detailed copy of MPAC’s Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2018, please contact Mary Meffe, Vice-President, Corporate and Information Services and Chief Financial Officer, at 289 539-0306.

Yours truly,

Dan Mathieson
Chair, MPAC Board of Directors

Attachment

Copy Municipal Chief Administrative Officers and Clerks
Nicole McNeill, President and Chief Administrative Officer, MPAC
Mary Meffe, Vice-President, Corporate and Information Services and Chief Financial Officer, MPAC

Office of the Chair c/o Municipal Property Assessment Corporation
1340 Pickering Parkway, Suite 101, Pickering, Ontario L1V 0C4
T: 519.271.0250 ext 236  F: 905.831.0040  www.mpac.ca
May 15, 2019

Carolyn O’Neill
Great Lakes Office
40 St Clair Avenue West
Toronto, ON, M4V 1M2

Alex McLeod
Natural Resources Conservation Policy Branch
300 Water Street
Peterborough, ON, K9J 8M5

*Comments submitted through the EBR website and hard copy via mail*

RE: County of Grey Comments on ‘Modernizing Conservation Authority Operations – Conservation Authorities Act’ and ‘Focusing Conservation Authority Development Permits on the Protection of People and Property’
EBR Registry Numbers 013-5018 and 013-4992

Dear Ms. O’Neill and Mr. McLeod:

Please find attached a copy of Grey County Staff Report PDR-CW-22-19, which represents the County of Grey comments on the “Modernizing Conservation Authority Operations – Conservation Authorities Act” (ERO Number 013-5018) and “Focusing Conservation Authority Development Permits on the Protection of People and Property” (ERO Number 013-4992. This report was presented to the May 9th Grey County Committee of the Whole session, where the staff recommendation was adopted as per Resolution CW104-19. The County also intends to submit additional comments on the proposed Bill 108, which also covers similar subject matter.

In addition to the adopted staff recommendation, Committee of the Whole also adopted the following motion in relation to the Province’s budget reductions being imposed on conservation authorities:

CW105-19 Moved by: Councillor Burley Seconded by: Councillor Milne

WHEREAS Climate Change and flooding are mounting threats in Grey and Conservation Authorities provide services including real-time flood forecasting, emergency planning support and water-related studies; and

Grey County: Colour It Your Way
WHEREAS, in 1996, the total provincial Section 39 Transfer Payment to all of Ontario's conservation authorities for Flood and Erosion Control and Natural Hazard Prevention was reduced from $50-million to $7.4-million, and Grey Sauble Conservation Authority's and Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority's share of this payment has remained static at $71,779 and $157,669 since 1996; and

WHEREAS the recent Provincial Budget has further reduced Grey Sauble Conservation Authority’s and Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority’s Section 39 Transfer Payments about 50% to $37,055 and $81,396; and

WHEREAS this will affect emergency management supports and municipal planning, zoning, and development input provided by Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority; and

WHEREAS there is a provincial role in province-wide flood risks reduction and emergency management, and investments in prevention can potentially avoid or reduce losses to life and property and major expenditures during and after an emergency; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Government's Proposal on the Environmental Registry of Ontario 013-5018 on Modernizing Conservation Authority (CA) Operations proposes to define a limited list of the core mandatory programs and services for CAs; and

THAT Grey County recognizes the value provided by the work of the CAs, supports the current multi-municipality governance model for the selection of programs, and the current municipal levying approach that includes annual input from Local Municipal Councils; and

THAT Grey County recommends that the province acknowledge their strong and positive provincial role in flood risk reduction programs and reinstate funding to CAs; and

THAT Grey County Staff be directed to provide a copy of this resolution to the Environmental Registry of Ontario prior to the May 20th deadline, to Ministers Bill Walker and Lisa Thompson, Ministers MECP, MNRF and MOF, the Premier, AMO, ROMA, OSUM, and Conservation Ontario.

Carried

Based on the motion above, Grey County recommends that the province acknowledge the strong and positive provincial role in flood risk reductions programs that conservation authorities provide and to reinstate the funding to conservation authorities.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on these proposed legislative changes.

Should you have any questions, or require any further information please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Grey County: Colour It Your Way
Yours truly,

Warden Selwyn Hicks
County of Grey
519-372-0219 ext. 1225
Selwyn.Hicks@grey.ca

cc. Hon. Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario (via email only)
    Hon. Victor Fedeli, Minister of Finance (via email only)
    Hon. Bill Walker, Minister of Government and Consumer Services (via email only)
    Hon Lisa M. Thompson, Minister of Education (via email only)
    Hon. Rod Phillips, Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks (via email only)
    Hon. John Yakabuski, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry
    Jim Wilson, MPP Simcoe-Grey (via email only)
    ROMA (via email only)
    OSUM (via email only)
    Conservation Ontario (via email only)
    Association of Municipalities of Ontario (via email only)
    Local Municipalities Grey County (via email only)
    Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (via email only)
    Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (via email only)
    Grand River Conservation Authority (via email only)
    Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (via email only)

Attachment
Recommendation

1. That Report PDR-CW-22-19 which provides an overview of the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, proposed changes to the permitting process related to natural hazards, and the funding reductions to conservation authorities be received; and

2. That this report be forwarded onto the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry as the County of Grey’s comments on the proposed changes posted on the Environmental Registry through postings # 013-5018 and # 013-4992; and

3. That this report be forwarded onto member municipalities, conservation authorities, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and local MPPs within Grey for information; and

4. That staff be authorized to proceed prior to County Council approval as per Section 25.6 (b) of Procedural By-law 5003-18.

Executive Summary

The Conservation Authorities Act was revised by the previous government in 2017. The County provided comments during the previous review of the Act. Further changes to the Conservation Authorities Act are being proposed; however, there are few details at this stage. Funding reductions to conservation authorities are also proposed which
could increase the risks associated with flooding and erosion, as well as impact the monitoring and forecasting of flood events. Given the impacts associated with changing climate and severe storm events being experienced in Grey County and across Ontario, it is recommended that the Province reconsider these funding reductions. It is also recommended that any changes to the Conservation Authorities Act does not limit the vital role that conservation authorities play in protecting our watersheds.

Background and Discussion

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry initiated a review of the Conservation Authorities Act (Act) in 2015 which included addressing roles, responsibilities, funding and governance of conservation authorities in resource management and environmental protection. The County provided initial comments on a discussion paper released by the Ministry seeking early feedback on the review of the Act. A link to the previous staff report providing initial comments to the Ministry can be found in the Attachments section of this report.

The Ministry released a further consultation document in 2016 entitled ‘Conserving Our Future – Proposed Priorities for Renewal’ which was based on the comments received in response to the discussion paper. A staff report providing comments on this consultation document was provided to the Ministry. A link to that staff report can be found in the Attachments section as well as using the following link – Addendum to PDR-PCD-36-15 - Conservation Authority Act Review - Second Phase.

Based on the comments received through the consultation, the Ministry noted that there was general agreement that the overall conservation authority model and principles upon which it is based remained relevant. Most respondents agreed that the watershed continues to serve as an ecologically appropriate scale for many resource management activities. The Ministry also noted that all stakeholder sectors ‘recognized the value and public benefit of conservation authority roles in providing environmental education, landowner and broader stewardship programs, and the provision of access to natural areas and recreational opportunities provided through conservation areas. Based on the feedback received, the Province made changes to the Conservation Authorities Act in 2017.

Further Proposed Changes to the Conservation Authorities Act

On April 5, 2019, the Province released an environmental registry posting (ERO 013-5018) entitled ‘Modernizing conservation authority operations – Conservation Authorities Act’ which proposes further changes to the Conservation Authorities Act. The details regarding the proposed changes are light at this stage. The Province notes that in the spring of 2019, they will develop and consult on a suite of regulatory and policy proposals to support the proposed amendments. The following is an outline of
the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act that are identified in the environmental registry posting:

- clearly define the core mandatory programs and services provided by conservation authorities to be, natural hazard protection and management, conservation and management of conservation authority lands, drinking water source protection (as prescribed under the Clean Water Act), and protection of the Lake Simcoe watershed (as prescribed under the Lake Simcoe Protection Act)
- increase transparency in how conservation authorities levy municipalities for mandatory and non-mandatory programs and services. Update the Conservation Authorities Act an Act introduced in 1946, to conform with modern transparency standards by ensuring that municipalities and conservation authorities review levies for non-core programs after a certain period of time (e.g., 4 to 8 years)
- establish a transition period (e.g. 18 to 24 months) and process for conservation authorities and municipalities to enter into agreements for the delivery of non-mandatory programs and services and meet these transparency standards
- enable the Minister to appoint an investigator to investigate or undertake an audit and report on a conservation authority
- clarify that the duty of conservation authority board members is to act in the best interest of the conservation authority, similar to not-for-profit organizations.

The Province is also proposing to proclaim un-proclaimed provisions of the Conservation Authorities Act related to:

- fees for programs and services
- transparency and accountability
- approval of projects with provincial grants
- recovery of capital costs and operating expenses from municipalities (municipal levies)
- regulation of areas over which conservation authorities have jurisdiction (e.g., development permitting)
- enforcement and offences
- additional regulations.

**Staff Response**

It is difficult to determine the full extent and potential impact that the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act may have at this stage. It is recommended that the Province provide further detail about the proposed changes for municipalities, conservation authorities, and others to provide further comments. Grey County and local municipalities rely on the programs and services provided by conservation authorities.
In terms of the current outline of the proposed changes, it is unclear as to why there is a proposed transition period for conservation authorities and municipalities to enter into agreements for the delivery of non-mandatory programs and services. Many municipalities have entered into agreements with conservation authorities to provide non-mandatory programs and services such as natural heritage review for planning applications. Grey County has an agreement with Grey Sauble Conservation Authority to help manage the County Forests and County Trails. Conservation authorities offer a number of non-mandatory programs and services to municipalities and the community at large including education programs, stewardship programs, and natural heritage commenting/planning. If the proposed changes to the Conservation Authority Act affect the ability for conservation authorities to levy municipalities for these programs, it could impact the ability for conservation authorities to leverage additional funds to help support the programs and services that are currently offered. It is recommended that whatever changes are proposed, that flexibility is still provided for conservation authorities and municipalities to enter into service agreements in order to raise sufficient funds to support the current programs and services, including providing comments on natural heritage matters, and supporting education and stewardship programs.

The services that conservation authorities provide are very important to municipalities and the community. Therefore, it is important for conservation authorities to continue to offer these programs and services at a watershed level in order to protect and preserve the health of our ecosystems and watersheds.

**Proposed Changes to the Natural Hazards Permitting Process**

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry is also consulting on a proposal to streamline and focus conservation authority’s development permitting and role in municipal plan review (ERO 013-4992). The following are the proposed changes to the permitting process as outlined in the Environmental Registry posting:

- Consolidating and harmonizing the existing 36 individual conservation authority-approved regulations into one Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry approved regulation will help to ensure consistency in requirements across all conservation authorities while still allowing for local flexibility based on differences in risks posed by flooding and other natural hazards.
- For the purposes of this regulation the Ministry is also proposing to:
  - Update definitions for key regulatory terms to better align with other provincial policy, including: “wetland”, “watercourse” and “pollution”;
  - Defining undefined terms including: “interference” and “conservation of land” as consistent with the natural hazard management intent of the regulation;
- Reduce regulatory restrictions between 30m and 120m of a wetland and where a hydrological connection has been severed;
- Exempt low-risk development activities from requiring a permit including certain alterations and repairs to existing municipal drains subject to the Drainage Act provided they are undertaken in accordance with the Drainage Act and Conservation Authorities Act Protocol;
- Allow conservation authorities to further exempt low-risk development activities from requiring a permit provided in accordance with conservation authority policies;
- Require conservation authorities to develop, consult on, make publicly available and periodically review internal policies that guide permitting decisions;
- Require conservation authorities to notify the public of changes to mapped regulated areas such as floodplains or wetland boundaries; and
- Require conservation authorities to establish, monitor and report on service delivery standards including requirements and timelines for determination of complete applications and timelines for permit decisions.

**Staff Response**

County staff generally have no concerns with the proposed changes to the permitting process as highlighted above. Consolidating the 36 individual conservation authority regulations into one will help to provide clarity and consistency across the different conservation authorities which will make it easier for municipalities and developers. With respect to the reduction in regulatory restrictions between 30 metres and 120 metres of a wetland, County staff generally have no objections with potential reductions in regulatory restrictions if the reductions can be supported from a technical and/or science-based perspective. There are certain circumstances where conservation authorities reduce the setbacks from a regulatory restriction. It is important however that these reductions be looked at on a case-by-case basis and that the reductions can be supported from a science-based perspective.

Exempting low-risk development activities from requiring a permit may be beneficial for municipalities and landowners, especially as it relates to municipal drains. If certain activities are exempted, it may be beneficial to have conservation authorities provide education material including best practices for undertaking these low-risk activities to ensure that any potential impacts are mitigated.

Staff see merit in notifying the public of mapping changes, provided they are not duplicative of municipal processes and provided that this does not limit the ability of conservation authorities in making changes to regulation mapping when further review is conducted (i.e. if new information is provided as part of a planning application process or through detailed site review). If a municipality is updating their zoning by-law and the
hazard land boundaries are changing as part of the by-law, then the municipality and conservation authority should not both be required to give separate notice. Instead, the municipality can give notice in accordance with the Planning Act, and the conservation authority can play a supportive role in the municipal public consultation (i.e. to help explain the mapping changes).

Funding Reductions to Conservation Authorities

In addition to the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act and the permitting process, the Province also announced funding reductions to conservation authorities. Based on information received from Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, the following are areas of funding that have been reduced by the Province:

- 50% reduction to funding for warning people about flooding and protecting property from damage
- The provincial 50 Million Tree planting subsidy has been eliminated.
- Summer staff funding eliminated which was used to assist with water quality monitoring and stewardship
- Provincial funding which supported looking at the health of south Georgian Bay shorelines has been eliminated.

Staff Response

Flooding and erosion can be very costly and are a risk to our communities. Conservation authorities provide necessary programs and services that help to reduce the risk of flooding and erosion and help to provide information to the municipalities and the public about flood risks, etc. Climate change threats, including the risk from severe weather events, are increasing year by year. Therefore, it is extremely important for conservation authorities to continue programs and services to help reduce the risks of flooding and erosion, to monitor and forecast flooding, and to provide necessary data and information to help municipalities to plan for infrastructure upgrades and to prepare and manage an emergency event. The funding reductions could also cause a financial impact to municipalities as they may need to fund the deficit in order to continue with the various programs and services offered by conservation authorities. Therefore, it is recommended that the Province reconsider the funding reductions to conservation authorities and to consult with conservation authorities and municipalities to see if there are other opportunities.

General Comments

Based on the nature of the changes being proposed, and the potential for both positive and negative impacts, the Province should consider a more robust consultation on these proposed changes. The current Environmental Registry posting was posted on April 21st and comments are due by May 20th and May 21st, respectively. This short
timeframe does not give municipalities, conservation authorities and other stakeholders much time to (a) respond, (b) ask questions, or (c) consult. It is recommended that when the consultation beings on the detailed suite of regulatory and policy proposals to be released this spring that a minimum of a 90-day consultation period is provided.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

Conservation Authorities Act

Planning Act

Financial and Resource Implications

The funding reductions to conservation authorities could cause a financial impact to municipalities as municipalities may need to fund the deficit in order to continue these programs. This could also cause other conservation authority programs to be discontinued or reduced as conservation authorities may need to look for ways to offset or reallocate funds based on these reductions.

Depending on the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, this could also impact what services conservation authorities are able to provide to municipalities and residents. For example, if municipalities were not able to enter into agreements with conservation authorities to provide natural heritage comments then municipalities will need to hire consultants and/or staff to address this gap. This could increase costs for municipalities and developers and result in duplication as conservation authorities will be reviewing natural hazard matters related to a development application and the municipal staff/consultant will be reviewing natural heritage matters, which is some cases will be the same features and functions being reviewed.

Relevant Consultation

- Internal (Transportation Services, Planning)
- External (Conservation Authorities, Municipalities)

Appendices and Attachments

PDR-PCD-36-15 - Conservation Authority Act Review
Addendum to PDR-PCD-36-15 - Conservation Authority Act Review - Second Phase
Environmental Registry of Ontario Posting – ERO 013-5018
Environmental Registry of Ontario Posting – ERO 013-4992
May 14, 2019

Municipal Clerks & Councils

RE: Bill 108 – An Act to amend various statutes with respect to housing, other development and various other matters (with specific implications for delivery of Clean Water Act requirements)

The Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region Management Committee (the “Management Committee”) held a meeting on May 8, 2019 to review and discuss the proposed changes identified in Bill 108.

Omnibus Bill 108 entitled the “More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019” was tabled for First Reading on May 2, 2019 by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Under Schedule 2, there are proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, which would have direct implications for the ongoing delivery of the source protection program. A summary of the proposed changes is as follows:

- Programs and services related to the authority’s duties, functions and responsibilities as a source protection authority under the Clean Water Act, 2006 (“CWA”), was listed as one of the mandatory programs and services.
- An authority is authorized to determine the amounts owed by specified municipalities in connection with the programs and services the authority provides in respect of the CWA.
- Authorities continue to be authorized to provide other programs and services, including programs and services that it determines to be advisable to further its objects. If financing by a participating municipality is necessary in order for the authority to provide such programs and services, the authority and the participating municipality must enter into an agreement in order for the authority to provide the program or service.

While the Management Committee was supportive of including source protection authority responsibilities as one of the mandatory programs and services under the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, the Committee expressed significant concerns with the reference to an authority being authorized to determine the amounts owed by specified municipalities in the delivery of the program requirements. To date, the drinking water source protection program has been funded 100% through provincial transfer payments. Provincial funding agreements are viewed as critical to support the ongoing maintenance of the local Source Protection Committee, Source Protection Plan amendments, municipal implementation, and annual reporting requirements for the Source Protection Region as a whole.

If Bill 108 is passed, it could result in significant financial increases to municipal levies to deliver CWA requirements. For example, current provincial source protection program funding for the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection
Region is approximately $210,000 per year and has remained the same over the past couple of years. If these program costs were to be paid by municipalities, this could result in an estimated 7% increase in municipal levies.

Municipalities also currently deliver Part IV powers under CWA related to Risk Management Office responsibilities. For example, Grey Sauble Conservation staff have been delegated Part IV powers on behalf of 13 municipalities for an approximate cost of $100,000 per year. As there are a total of 21 municipalities across the Source Protection Region, these additional costs to implement the source protection program should be taken into consideration as the province reviews future delivery options for the program.

It is important to note that the majority of the municipalities across our Region are smaller, rural municipalities with limited budgets. The Management Committee further expressed concerns that the downloading of source protection program costs directly to municipal budgets could result in significant tax increases for residents, or possibly cuts to key programs that support the delivery of the source protection programs (e.g. water quality monitoring programs, stewardship programs, and education and outreach programs).

Another potential issue that was identified would be the difficulty in addressing municipal costs and apportionment of these costs given the fact that source protection areas cross municipal and even watershed boundaries. The current provincial program oversight and funding model ensures consistent delivery of source protection program requirements and protection of municipal drinking water sources.

Source Protection Authorities were originally created under the CWA to ensure an efficient and effective way to deliver source protection programs that cross municipal boundaries, as recommended by Justice Dennis R. O’Connor following the Walkerton Inquiry. The Management Committee feels strongly that ultimate accountability should rest with the Province and that Source Protection Authorities should not take on additional liability or accountability in its administration of the program. Furthermore, municipalities should not have to incur additional costs in the delivery of this program within limited municipal budgets.

For more information related to the proposed Bill 108, see Schedule 2 under the attached link: https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/bills/parliament-42/session-1/bill-108

If your municipality has concerns with these proposed changes, comments can be made on the Environmental Registry of Ontario posting (ERO #013-5018) “Modernizing the Conservation Authorities Act” prior to May 21st, 2019 https://ero.ontario.ca/

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Seider, Project Manager
Drinking Water Source Protection

Sincerely,

Cathy Little, Chair
Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
THE MEAFORD HOSPITAL FOUNDATION
PRESENTS
SUMMER SOLSTICE CELEBRATION

The Meaford Hospital Foundation is excited to host a Summer Solstice Celebration at Lora Bay Golf Club on June 22, 2019. This fundraising event is in support of The Meaford Hospital Foundation’s initiatives and projects.

Through the generosity of caring sponsors and donors, the Meaford Hospital Foundation raises and manages funds for new and replacement medical equipment. With the government providing fewer funds, we count on generous financial support, which is critical to keeping healthcare close to home.

*We can meet our fundraising goal with your support.*

We are planning a magical evening with a country fair atmosphere. Our guests will have chances to play in a golf Calcutta, dig for treasure in our sandbox and pull corks for fine wines. Enjoy a complimentary cocktail hour followed by a three-course dinner while being entertained by a unique and exotic fashion show by *Cherchez la Femme Lingerie*. Dance to live music after our post-dinner live and silent auctions.

Please help us help our community by raising funds to support our local hospital, here in Meaford.

Tickets are available for purchase at [www.mhfoundation.ca](http://www.mhfoundation.ca) or by calling our office at 519-538-1311 ext. 4208

*We hope to see you there!*

---

Jen Wright

Executive Director
Meaford Hospital Foundation
229 Nelson St. West,
Meaford ON N4L 1A3
519-538-1311 Ext. 4208
www.mhfoundation.ca

“*Keeping healthcare close to home*”
Notice of Complete Application

Application for Zoning By-law Amendment

TAKE NOTICE that the Town of The Blue Mountains has received a Complete Application for Zoning By-law Amendment in accordance with the Planning Act and the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan.

Property Location: Part Lot 17, Concession 1 (Key Map on Reverse)

A Public Meeting to consider these applications has not yet been scheduled.

A Second Notice will be provided indicating a Public Meeting Date when scheduled.

What is being proposed?

The purpose of this application is to consider the zoning requirements to implement a proposed Plan of Subdivision on the subject lands. The Plan of Subdivision proposes 133 lots, open space, environmental protection areas and a public park area.

The effect of this application is to rezone the subject lands from the Development ‘D’ and Hazard ‘H’ zones to the Residential ‘R1-2’, Open Space ‘OS’ and Hazard ‘H’ zones. Exceptions are proposed on the Residential ‘R1-2’ lands to limit residential uses to single detached and semi-detached dwellings up to a maximum of 180 units. An increase in permitted lot coverage (35% to 38%) and minimum lot requirements for semi-detached units (225 sq m lot area, 7.5 m lot frontage) are also proposed. Short Term Accommodation uses are proposed to be prohibited.

Exceptions are proposed on the Open Space lands to permit a private recreational facility having a maximum floor area of 500 sq m and a minimum rear yard and side yard setback of 1 metre.

The Holding ‘-h’ symbol is proposed to require a Subdivision Agreement and registered Plan of Subdivision prior to development. Permission is requested to permit up to three model homes to be constructed on the lands prior to the removal of the Holding ‘-h’ symbol subject to a Model Home Agreement with the Town.

It is noted that the subject lands are also subject to County of Grey approvals for the Plan of Subdivision. Separate notice of Complete Application will be sent by the County of Grey when they receive a complete submission.

What happens at the future Public Meeting?

The public meeting is your chance to hear more about the proposal and make your views about it known. You may also speak at the meeting or submit written comments. Information from the public will help Council in their decision-making process, so make sure to have your say!

Any person or agency may attend the Public Meeting and/or make oral or written comments either in support or in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Where do I find more information?

Our website contains background studies, reports, plans and drawings. They are available for viewing or download at www.thebluemountains.ca.

Or come visit us in Planning Services, Town Hall during regular office hours Monday to Friday 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. or contact the planner for this file.

Where do I submit my comments?

Your written comments may be sent to the Town Clerk, Corrina Giles:
By Mail or in Person:
32 Mill St. Box 310, Thornbury ON, N0H 2P0
Fax: (519) 599-7723
Email: townclerk@thebluemountains.ca

When will a decision be made?

A decision on this proposal has NOT been made at this point and will NOT be made at the Public Meeting. After reviewing the application and any comments received, Town staff will bring a recommendation on this project to a future council meeting.

Want to be notified of a decision?

You must make a request in writing if you wish to receive a notice of any decision of Council on this proposal.

Your rights to appeal a decision:

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to Town of The Blue Mountains before the by-law is passed, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of Council to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting, or make written submissions to Town of The Blue Mountains before the by-law is passed, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Questions? Want more information? Ask the Planner!
Shawn Postma, Senior Policy Planner
Phone: (519) 599-3131 ext 248 or Toll Free (888) 258-6867 Email: planning@thebluemountains.ca
A Note about information you may submit to the Town:

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario’s Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Town’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region

Source Protection Committee Approves First Progress Report

The Source Protection Committee (SPC) has approved this source protection region’s first annual progress report to the Province of Ontario. This progress report documents the achievements we have made together to implement source protection plan policies that add protection to local municipal drinking water sources. You may download this report at [home.waterprotection.ca](http://home.waterprotection.ca)

The first annual progress report was submitted to the province May 1, 2019. It covers the Source Protection activities completed between July 2016 to December 2018, with a deadline of July 2021 to achieve full implementation of the plan’s policies. We extend sincere thanks to staff and partner agencies who contributed to the report, and for their ongoing support for this program. Highlights of the report include:

- 60% of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Plan (SPP) policies that address significant drinking water threats have been fully implemented.
- Municipalities with vulnerable areas where significant drinking water threat policies apply have processes in place to ensure that their day-to-day planning decisions conform with the SPP policies. 95% of these municipalities have amended, or are in the process of amending their Official Plan to conform with the SPP policies.
- There are 313 on-site sewage systems (septic systems), in this source protection region that are in the most vulnerable areas around municipal wells and subject to the mandatory re-inspection program. 97% of these systems have been inspected in accordance with Ontario Building Code.
- There are 152 drinking water protection zone signs that have been installed in the source protection region. The signs are installed on roads near municipal wells to alert citizens and emergency services that their actions in these zones can have an impact on a municipal drinking water source.
- Over 100 risk management plans (RMPs) have been established in this source protection region.
“The Committee has spent more than 11 years developing the Source Protection Plan and its policies. Now, to see them being implemented is rewarding,” said Committee Chair Bill Twaddle. “Seeing the annual progress report results and knowing that we are all doing our part to protect our region’s drinking water sources confirms why we got involved in this committee.”

“The great progress to-date on source protection plan implementation was made possible with the strong support and direct involvement of municipalities, agricultural and industry sectors, as well as other environmental and health-related stakeholder groups. It is important to note that there is an ongoing need for financial and stakeholder support and to not lose focus as the program approaches full implementation. While the number of remaining policies to be fully implemented is decreasing, the effort to address all significant threat policies will likely increase over the next couple of years as we approach the established implementation deadlines,” Source Protection Committee for Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region.

Source protection plan policies address 21 activities (such as fuel or chemical storage; among others) that can pose a significant threat to municipal drinking water sources in certain circumstances (for example, in certain quantities and in the most vulnerable locations such as municipal wellhead protection areas).

Source Protection Committee Guiding Principles
We value:

- Comprehensive, science-based research
- Recognizing and engaging all members of the community as valued stakeholders
- Informed decision-making through communication, education and responsiveness to community enquiries
- Being open and transparent
- Sustainable and long-term decision making

To find out more, please visit your local source protection region website at home.waterprotection.ca or phone Program Manager Carl Seider at 519-470-3000.

Thank you for all you do to keep our local municipal drinking water sources safe and clean.
I am fully supportive of having hockey and skating restored to Friday’s at the arena in Thornbury. I moved recently to Clarksburg 2 years ago and got involved in the 3:30pm Friday hockey group. This proved to be a great family time as my boys would come up to board/ski on the weekends but kicked it off with the 3:30pm skate at the arena. This all went for not this past season, very disappointing to all involved.

In March of 2018 we rented ice at the arena as my son attempted to conduct a hockey school. We called and booked the available ice, a very straightforward process. We paid the going rate for the ice. We cancelled the hockey school because of poor attendance. However, we were still on the hook for the total cost of the ice which we understood, no subsidy was applied here.

In closing we have to be fair and respect historical users, all users should use the same process to book the ice, all should have to pay the set hourly cost. I look forward to Friday afternoon family time restored this winter.
May 2019

The Collingwood Girls Hockey Association is a local league female hockey organization. We are sanctioned by Ontario Women’s Hockey Association, affiliated with Hockey Canada. As such, we follow the same guidelines as minor hockey organizations.

The COLGHA offers girls within the Georgian Bay Area an opportunity to play hockey in their own community. We participate in the Simcoe Muskoka Girls Hockey League, which includes Barrie, Orillia, Midland, Huntsville and Alliston.

We have grown from two teams in our first year of operation to five teams this season, including a strong Fundamentals Program. Of the 92 registered players, 18 are from the Town of Blue Mountains. We anticipate an additional three teams for the 2019/20 hockey season. Most recently we have been approved to offer competitive teams and have been awarded full Association status. We are thrilled with our growth, and honor those that have come before us from the Georgian Shores Girls Hockey Association. It’s very exciting to have girls hockey return to our area and we are quickly establishing ourselves as a viable female hockey centre.

As there are no boundary limitations within girls hockey, they are free to move among organizations. In order to retain our players, we feel it is very important to offer ice in a variety of locations.
We have respectfully requested the following BVCC ice times for next season; Wednesday evenings, Friday evenings and Sunday mornings. Offering blocks of times to our teams is the most efficient use of ice when booking officials, timekeepers and accommodating volunteers.

The staff at BVCC have been amazing to deal with and have supported our efforts with enthusiasm. They are the voices between us and the GSMHA, we have all worked together seamlessly to support one another and share ice.

Thank you so much for accommodating us thus far, we appreciate the support, and opportunity to grow the game of women’s hockey. We look forward to your further commitment and support of youth sports in this community.

Yours in Hockey, Ivy Martin