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Comments

As part of the approval for ION implementation in 2011, Regional Council approved an annual allocation of $1,000,000 for a period of ten years to implement a Transit Supportive Strategy (TSS) for Cambridge. The ultimate goal of the TSS is to accelerate the implementation of Stage 2 ION LRT through initiatives that improve transit ridership and/or encourage transit supportive development, specifically within the Central Transit Corridor (CTC) in Cambridge.

Each year, the TSS Working Group, which consists of City of Cambridge and Regional staff representatives, identifies initiatives that best meet the goals of the TSS and develops an implementation plan for Regional Council’s consideration as public transit falls under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo.

2021 Implementation Plan Update

This year is the final year of the Regional Transit Supportive Strategy for Cambridge with approximately $788,000 of unallocated funds remaining. Since 2012, TSS funding has been directed towards initiatives such as:

- Various types of studies
- Active transportation infrastructure
- Transit service improvements and infrastructure; and
- Transportation Demand Management Programs (i.e. CarShare, Travelwise)

While investment in these initiatives has been worthwhile, it was agreed by Region and City staff that other types of opportunities for the remaining funds should be explored. Using this approach, staff focused on the link between public transit and affordable housing.
Research has shown that there is a strong correlation between affordable housing and public transit. Connected communities are places with affordable housing options, pedestrian-friendly street designs, public spaces, and transportation options to access major employment centers, key goods and services, and amenities. Furthermore, the growing need for affordable housing is becoming a key priority and has highlighted the importance of strategic investments to create housing stability and achieve affordability for all.

With this in mind, aligning future affordable housing development with Stage 2 ION not only maximizes the opportunity to create a connected community, but also aligns with the objectives of the Transit Supportive Strategy for Cambridge. Investing in the development of affordable housing projects in close proximity to transit stations is likely to support an increase in transit access and ridership. As such, allocating majority of the remaining TSS funding to affordable housing development will assist in responding to the critical need for affordable housing in our community while also promoting sustainable transportation.

Based on the above, as part of the 2021 TSS Implementation plan both Region and City staff are proposing that the majority of remaining TSS funds be directed towards facilitating Regional Affordable Housing projects in Cambridge that support transit ridership along the Central Transit Corridor. If approved, these funds would be intended to be used for items such as, but not limited to:

- a) Consulting fees related to site selection/feasibility studies and other technical studies/work; and/or
- b) Land acquisition

A full report on the 2021 TSS Implementation Plan will be presented to Regional Council later this summer/early fall for approval with a follow-up report provided to City Council for information.

This memo has been prepared ahead of the follow-up report in order to provide City of Cambridge Council an opportunity to comment and provide feedback on directing majority of the remaining TSS funds towards affordable housing projects in Cambridge.

**Attachments**

N/A

**Approvals:**

☒ Manager/Supervisor ☒ Deputy City Manager ☒ City Manager
Date: (06/11/2021)  Internal Memo #: IM21-013(CD)

To: Council

Circulated to: By-law Enforcement

Department: Community Development

Division: Engineering & Transportation

From: Shannon Noonan, Manager of Transportation

Subject: Core Area Parking Enforcement Update for New Provincial Pandemic Framework

Comments

On March 16, 2021 Council approved Report 21-010 (CRE), Cambridge Economic Response Plan which recommended that modifications to core area parking lot regulations and fees be adopted when a Provincial lockdown or similar order is in place.

At that time the province was using the colour-coded control framework and it was intended that normal parking operations would resume once the Region entered the Orange control level. The approved parking modifications were as follows:

Red Zone, Lockdown (or similar) Modifications

- Parking permit fees suspended.
- Unrestricted daytime parking in City operated core area public lots (no time limits or fees).
- Late night parking enforcement continues to ensure proper use of the parking lots and effective winter maintenance. While fees are suspended it will still be necessary to display Residential parking permits. In the absence of paid overnight guest parking the 5 night guest exemption used in Downtown Hespeler will be available in all core areas.
- On-street parking regulations and enforcement remain in effect to ensure easy access for curbside pickup.

Orange, Yellow & Green Zones (or similar)

- Normal parking operations.
The province has since switched to the 3-step Re-opening Plan in which Steps 1 and 2 place restrictions on retail, restaurants and personal service similar to the previous Red and Grey controls. Therefore, in keeping with Council’s intention, the above parking modifications will remain in place until Step 3 of the current framework.

In addition, with the conclusion of winter maintenance activities, late night parking enforcement will also be suspended except for the following Parking Lots as these lots are either leased or unsuitable for overnight parking:

- Barradell’s Loft (170 Water Street South, Galt)
- Market Square (40 Dickson Street, Galt)
- Queen’s Square Library (1 North Square, Galt)
- Dover Street (417 King Street East, Preston)
- St. James Church lots (21 Cooper Street, Hespeler)

All lots will continue to be enforced for illegally parked or derelict vehicles.

Staff will continue to monitor the Provincial framework and public health requirements for any further changes and will follow up with Council accordingly, as required.

**Attachments**

N/A

**Approvals:**

☒ Manager/Supervisor ☒ Deputy City Manager ☒ City Manager
The purpose of this memo is to provide additional information about community engagement feedback received as part of the Cambridge Connected Strategic Plan update, and to follow up on staff report 21-131(CRE) regarding the Phase 3 final report.

Community Engagement and Community Safety

Community engagement for the strategic plan began in February 2020 with the Community Satisfaction survey. The survey asked respondents what they felt was the most important issue facing the community, with the top two responses being 'Homelessness' and 'Drug Use and Addiction' (tied with 19% of responses). ‘Crime and violence’ was the 7th most common response (5%) and ‘Safety of the residents’ was tied at 10th with ‘Population growth’ (2%). This information was included as part of the Phase 1 staff report 20-067(CRE), which was approved by Council on July 14, 2021.

Each phase of the strategic plan built upon the feedback of the previous phases, allowing us to ‘dig deeper’ and narrow the focus to the actions that would have the greatest impact on the community. In order to better understand the specific actions that the City could take to best respond to concerns specifically related to safety and other social issues, a Community Priorities survey was conducted on Engage Cambridge from November 11-18, 2020. The survey gauged community response to actions that are within the City’s mandate, in order to better understand which actions community members wanted to see reflected in the plan. It received 215 responses. The following list of statements are those that more than 70% of respondents agreed with:

- Communicate more information about the work that is already being done (87%)
- Work more closely with service providers located in Cambridge, including the hospital (74%)
Advocate more strongly for social services at the provincial/national level (73%)
Advocate more strongly for social services in the community at the Regional level (72%)
Review zoning, by-laws and/or regulations for impacts on the availability of affordable housing (71%)
Work to address and planning or building regulations that may create barriers for developing affordable housing (71%)

The same survey also asked respondents to select the ‘top 3’ actions the City could take that would best support the respondents’ perception or experience of community safety (feeling safe and being safe). The most frequently selected responses by far were “advocate at the regional level for additional policing in Cambridge” (45%) and “maintenance and cleanliness of public spaces” (44%). The next most common responses were “more visibility of safety measures in downtown cores” (30%) and “proactive by-law enforcement” (29%). Attachment 1 shows an image of the community safety responses. The full results of this survey were appended to the Phase 2 staff report 20-011(CRE), which was approved by Council on January 12, 2021.

These responses directly informed the list of strategic actions developed in Phase 3. From March 31 to April 9, 2021 a survey on Engage Cambridge asked the public to provide feedback on thirteen proposed strategic actions. Respondents were asked to rank the proposed actions based on how much of an impact they would have on achieving the City’s goals for People, Place and Prosperity. “Encourage safe and healthy neighbourhoods” was ranked highest by community members. In a separate survey, staff were asked the same thing and also ranked “Encourage safe and healthy neighbourhoods” quite high at #3. Similarly, “Establish our core areas as attractive destinations” was ranked 6th by both community and staff respondents.

Looking Ahead

As noted in the Phase 3 final report [(21-131(CRE)], specific projects and implementation initiatives will be linked to each action as part of the regular budget and business planning cycle of the City’s work in order to report on the progress of the strategic actions.

With regards to community safety, the City has taken several actions to improve safety and security over the past year. Currently, the Region of Waterloo is in the process of developing the 2021 Region of Waterloo Community and Safety Wellbeing Plan (CSWP). Earlier this year, Regional Council approved an updated strategy for developing a new CSWP with a collaborative approach and the City of Cambridge will have an opportunity to provide input into its development.
Question 4 - Tell Us About: Feeling Safe in Your Community

Actions to improve community safety may include several different activities intended to support community members in both feeling safe and being safe in their community. What actions could the City take that would best support you? (Please select your top three responses)

- Other (please specify)
- Strengthen anti-racism and anti-discrimination measures
- Offer inclusive, barrier-free programming
- Facilitate neighbourhood-level conversations about community safety
- Proactive bylaw enforcement
- Maintenance and cleanliness of public spaces
- More visibility of safety measures in downtown cores
- Increase presence of Ambassador Team in core areas
- More public education
- Use design principles that improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- Increase traffic calming measures in neighbourhoods
- Advocate at regional level for more access to social services in Cambridge
- Advocate at regional level for additional policing in Cambridge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Manager/Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Deputy City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ City Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 6, 2021

The Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Corporate Services Department
Clerk’s Division
The City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street, P.O Box 669
Cambridge, ON N1R 5 W8

Dear Danielle Manton, City Clerk:

At the meeting May 5, 2021 Council passed Resolution #2021-107 in support of your request that the Province of Ontario and Premier Doug Ford, should require Ontario employers to provide no less than five paid sick days annually to workers – after three months of employment – by amending the Employment Standards Act.

The lack of sufficient paid sick time is problematic due to employees not being able to afford to stay home and workers bringing the virus with them to their place of employment. We need to protect our essential workers, coworkers, and vulnerable population.

We thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Amanda Richardson
Clerk Administrator / Treasurer
May 19, 2021

The Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Corporate Services Department
Clerk’s Division
The City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street, PO Box 669
Cambridge ON N1R 5W8

Dear Ms. Manton:

RE: Support for Paid Sick Leave

Council, at its Regular Meeting held on May 13, 2021, passed the following resolution:

Res. #21-242 Moved by Councillor Sayne
Seconded by Deputy Mayor Schell
Be it resolved that Council supports the resolution from the City of Cambridge regarding the request for Paid Sick Leave dated April 21, 2021;

And further that the Township of Minden Hills forward this resolution to the City of Cambridge; the Association of Municipalities of Ontario; Rural Ontario Municipal Association; the Honourable Minister of Labour; and the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario.

CARRIED

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Vicki Bull, at vbull@mindenhills.ca or 705-286-1260 ext. 515.

Yours truly,

Vicki Bull

Vicki Bull
Deputy Clerk
May 14, 2021

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

Dear Premier Ford:

RE: Urge Provincial Government Require Ontario Employers to Provide No Less than Five Paid Sick Days Annually to Workers 8.c.3.e) Belleville City Council Meeting, May 10, 2021

This is to advise you that at the Council Meeting of May 10, 2021, the following resolution was approved.

"THAT Belleville City Council supports the following resolution of The Corporation of the City of Cambridge:

'WHEREAS as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the increase in cases in Ontario, our hospitals and Intensive Care Units are overrun with people sick with the virus;

AND WHEREAS according to the Provincial Science Advisory Table on COVID-19 we need to protect essential workers and support them with paid sick leave;

AND WHEREAS it is being reported that the drivers of transmission are indoor work places, particularly industrial workplaces, warehouses, and distribution centres;"
AND WHEREAS the COVID-19 crisis has unmasked the inequalities in our Province as most of the people now getting sick are the vulnerable in our society and are those who cannot afford to stay home and often live and work in crowded conditions;

AND WHEREAS Workers who are denied paid sick days do not avoid illness, they bring the infections to work with them, and they transmit them to their coworkers, employees without paid sick leave;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Cambridge Council urge the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier to require Ontario employers to provide no less than five paid sick days annually to workers – after three months of employment – by amending the Employment Standards Act, 2000, or through a different mechanism and to provide necessary funding, fiscal relief and/or support to employers so that all workers in Ontario have access to no less than 10 paid sick days annually in the event of a declared infectious disease emergency, such as the COVID-19 pandemic and ensure all Ontario workers have access to protected and paid emergency leave so care can be provided to children, parents and/or other family members who may become ill and that all workers may receive paid time off to enable them to receive the COVID-19 Vaccine;

AND FURTHER that upon Council's approval of this motion that it be forwarded to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Provincial Minister of Labour, the Premier, and each Ontario municipality.”

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours truly,

Matt MacDonald
Director of Corporate Services/City Clerk

MMacD/nh
Pc: AMO
Todd Smith, MPP Prince Edward-Hastings
Daryl Kramp, MPP Hastings – Lennox & Addington
Danielle Manton, City Clerk, City of Cambridge
Monte McNaughton, Minister of Labour, Training & Skills Development
The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario  
Legislative Building  
Queen’s Park  
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1  

Honourable and Dear Sir:  

Re: Support of the Corporation of the Town of Perth’s Resolution - Provincial Hospital  
Funding of Major Capital Equipment  

Please be advised the Municipal Council of the Town of Fort Erie at its meeting of May 31,  
2021 received and supported correspondence from the Corporation of the Town of Perth dated  
April 30, 2021 requesting that further consideration be given to having the Province be  
financially responsible for the replacement costs associated with all major capital equipment in  
hospitals or alternatively assume full responsibility for funding local hospitals completely.  

Attached please find a copy of the Corporation of the Town of Perth’s correspondence dated  
April 30, 2021.  

Thank you for your attention to this matter.  

Yours very truly,  

Carol Schofield, Dipl.M.A.  
Manager, Legislative Services/Clerk  
cschofield@forterie.ca  
CS:dlk  
Attach  
c.c. Ontario Municipalities  
AMO@amo.on.ca  
John Fenik, Mayor of Perth  
adminclerk@perth.ca
April 30, 2021

Honourable Premier Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queens Park
Toronto, ON  M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford:

Sent via Email: premier@ontario.ca

Re: Provincial Hospital Funding of Major Capital Equipment

The Town of Perth is requesting that further consideration be given to having the province be financially responsible for the replacement costs associated with all major capital equipment in hospitals, as municipalities across the province are facing major shortfalls in meeting their financial obligations. As set out in their asset management plans and cannot afford to directly absorb the financial responsibility for the replacement costs of the hospitals’ major capital equipment without jeopardizing their financial sustainability.

As well, if the province is unwilling to assume the full responsibility for funding local hospitals completely, the Town of Perth requests that the province must develop a legislative framework as to how counties and municipalities should best address the financial shortfalls facing hospitals throughout Ontario, specifically the funding of major capital equipment;

Sincerely,

John Fenik
Mayor of Perth

cc: Ontario Municipalities
   AMO – amo@amo.on.ca

Received by
MAY 31, 2021
COUNCIL
May 26, 2021

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A1

Dear Honourable Premier:

Please be advised our Council adopted the following support resolution at their meeting of May 10, 2021:

**SUPPORT RESOLUTION RE PAID SICK DAYS**

**RESOLUTION # 2021-5-116**

MOVED BY: Frederic Diebel
SECONDED BY: Rod MacDonald

RESOLVED: that the Corporation of the Township of Nairn and Hyman endorse and supports the resolution of the City of Cambridge urging the Premier to require Ontario employers to provide no less than five paid sick days annually to workers, after three months of employment, by amending the Employment Standards Act, or through a different mechanism to ensure that all Ontario workers have access to protected and paid emergency leave.

AND FURTHER THAT: a copy of this motion be sent to the Premier, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Provincial Minister of Labour and the City of Cambridge.

CARRIED

**RECORDED VOTE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourrier, Katherine</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diebel, Frederic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gingras, Brigita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, Rod</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falldien, Laurier</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourrier, Katherine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diebel, Frederic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gingras, Brigita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, Rod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falldien, Laurier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The Mayor will circle the name of the council member deemed to have requested the recorded vote.)
Sincerely Yours,

Belinda Ketchabaw  
CAO Clerk - Treasurer

BK/mb

Cc:  AMO  
Provincial Minister of Labour  
City of Cambridge
April 21, 2021

Re: Resolution - City of Cambridge Council – Request for Paid Sick Leave

At the Special Council Meeting of April 20, 2021, the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge passed the following motion:

Mover: Councillor Wolf
Seconder: Councillor Reid

WHEREAS as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the increase in cases in Ontario, our hospitals and Intensive Care Units are overrun with people sick with the virus;

AND WHEREAS according to the Provincial Science Advisory Table on COVID-19 we need to protect essential workers and support them with paid sick leave;

AND WHEREAS it is being reported that the drivers of transmission are indoor work places, particularly industrial workplaces, warehouses, and distribution centres;

AND WHEREAS the COVID-19 crisis has unmasked the inequalities in our Province as most of the people now getting sick are the most vulnerable in our society and are those who cannot afford to stay home and often live and work in crowded conditions;

AND WHEREAS Workers who are denied paid sick days do not avoid illness, they bring the infections to work with them, and they transmit them to their coworkers, employees without paid sick leave;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Cambridge Council urge the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier to require Ontario employers to provide no less than five paid sick days annually to workers — after three months of employment — by amending the
Employment Standards Act, 2000, or through a different mechanism and to provide necessary funding, fiscal relief and/or support to employers so that all workers in Ontario have access to no less than 10 paid sick days annually in the event of a declared infectious disease emergency, such as the COVID-19 pandemic and ensure all Ontario workers have access to protected and paid emergency leave so care can be provided to children, parents, and/or other family members who may become ill and that all workers may receive paid time off to enable them to receive the COVID-19 Vaccine.

AND FURTHER that upon Council's approval of this motion that it be forwarded to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Provincial Minister of Labour, the Premier, and each Ontario municipality.

Should you have any questions related to the approved resolution, please contact me.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Danielle Manton
City Clerk
Township of McKellar
701 Hwy #124, P.O. Box 69, McKellar, Ontario P0G 1C0
Phone: (705) 389-2842
Fax: (705) 389-1244

May 17, 2021

The Honourable Justin Trudeau
Prime Minister of Canada
Email: pm@pm.gc.ca

Re: Requesting Consideration of Tax Breaks on 2020 CERB payments

Please be advised that at its regular meeting held, May 11, 2021 the Council of the Township of McKellar passed the following resolution:

Resolution No. 21-195

Moved by: Marco Aacinelli
Seconded by: Don Carmichael

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has implemented the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB) to financially assist those in dire need during the Covid-19 pandemic;

AND WHEREAS the CERB grant has helped many Canadians in dire need;

AND WHEREAS many of those that applied were single women, single parents, lower income citizens without employment and lacking in tax knowledge;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada did not initially inform CERB recipients that CERB was a taxable benefit;

AND WHEREAS when the CERB was merged with Employment Insurance Benefits (EI) in the fall of 2020, the Federal Government stated that they would have tax withheld similar to EI;

AND WHEREAS the Federal Government did not withhold tax on CERB for the second time as promised;

AND WHEREAS CERB recipients are surprised to learn that they are expected to pay income tax on CERB funds;
AND WHEREAS these recipients were never advised of this issue;

AND WHEREAS these recipients are now faced with an added burden of paying unexpected taxes on CERB, which they can ill afford;

AND WHEREAS the Federal Government has, in the past, found ways to assist businesses and corporations through difficult times by forgiving large loans and debts to the Government;

AND WHEREAS many businesses and corporations have the means to find ways to reduce their tax obligations;

AND WHEREAS those most in need do not have the means or understanding of how the tax system and are simply trying to survive and cope with the effects of Covid-19, feed their families and put a roof over their head;

NOW THEREFORE, since the Federal Government did not inform the recipients of the CERB grant that it is taxable;

AND FURTHER when the CERB grant and EI were merged, the Federal Government did not, as they stated, withhold tax from CERB as they did on EI, and are now insisting CERB recipients repay as much as $3,000.00 to $4,000.00 in tax, which they can ill afford to pay;

THEREFORE we urge the Federal Government to address this serious issue and consider giving disadvantaged CERB recipients a tax break for 2020, or giving them a tax credit for 2021;

AND FURTHER, that this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Federal Minister of Finance, Parry Sound-Muskoka MP Scott Aitchison, and Ontario Municipalities.

Carried.

Sincerely,

Ina Watkinson
Acting Deputy Clerk
Township of McKellar

Encl.

cc: Chrystia Freeland, Minister of Finance
Scott Aitchison, MP, Parry Sound-Muskoka
Ontario Municipalities
TOWNSHIP OF MCKELLAR

DATE: May 11, 2021
RESOLUTION No. 21- 195

Moved by: Marco Ancinelli
Don Carmichael
Morley Haskim
Mike Kekkonen

Seconded by: Marco Ancinelli
Don Carmichael
Morley Haskim
Mike Kekkonen

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has implemented the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB) to financially assist those in dire need during the Covid-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS the CERB grant has helped many Canadians in dire need; and

WHEREAS many of those that applied were single women, single parents, lower income citizens without employment and lacking in tax knowledge; and

WHEREAS the Government of Canada did not initially inform CERB recipients that CERB was a taxable benefit; and

WHEREAS when the CERB was merged with Employment Insurance Benefits (EI) in the fall of 2020, the Federal Government stated that they would have tax withheld, similar to EI; and

WHEREAS the Federal Government did not withhold tax on CERB for the second time, as promised; and

WHEREAS CERB recipients are surprised to learn that they are expected to pay income tax for 2020 on CERB funds; and

WHEREAS these recipients were never advised of this issue; and

WHEREAS these recipients are now faced with an added burden of paying unexpected taxes on CERB, which they can ill afford; and

WHEREAS the Federal Government has, in the past, found ways to assist businesses and corporations through difficult times by forgiving large loans and debts to the Government; and

WHEREAS many businesses and corporations have the means to find ways to reduce their tax obligations; and

WHEREAS those most in need do not have the resources, means or understanding of the tax system and are simply trying to survive and cope with the effects of Covid-19, feed their families and put a roof over their head;
NOW THEREFORE, since the Federal Government did not inform the recipients of the CERB grant that it is taxable;

AND FURTHER, when the CERB grant and EI were merged, the Federal Government did not, as they stated, withhold tax from CERB as they did on EI, and are now insisting CERB recipients repay as much as $3,000.00 to $4,000 in tax, which they can ill afford to pay;

THEREFORE, we urge the Federal Government to address this serious issue and consider giving disadvantaged CERB recipients a tax break for 2020, or giving them a tax credit for 2021;

AND FURTHER, that this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Federal Minister of Finance, Parry Sound Muskoka MP Scott Atchison, and Ontario Municipalities.

Carried _______ Defeated _________ Deferred _______

[Signature]
Peter Hopkins, Mayor

DIVISION VOTE

Councillor Marco Ancinelli
Councillor Don Carmichael
Councillor Morley Haskim
Councillor Mike Kekkonen
Mayor Peter Hopkins

YEA NAY
THAT Council hereby supports the attached resolution from the Township of McKellar regarding the Tax Relief on CERB Payments, dated May 11, 2021.

AND FURTHER THAT Council directs the Clerk to forward this resolution to Hon. Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, Chrystia Freeland, Federal Minister of Finance, Marcus Powlowski, MP Thunder Bay-Rainy River, Patty Hadju, MP Thunder Bay-Superior North and other Municipalities.
May 7, 2021

Premier Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford:

At the meeting held on April 7, 2021, the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Matachewan passed Resolution 2021-064 requesting that the Province of Ontario reverse their decision on the closure of Youth Justice Facilities in Northeastern communities.

A copy of Resolution 2021-064 is attached. Your consideration and support of this resolution would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Barbara Knauth
Deputy Clerk Treasurer

Cc: Honourable Todd Smith, Minister of Children, Community and Social Services
Honourable Sylvia Jones, Minister of Indigenous Affairs
All Municipalities with the Province of Ontario
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MATACHEWAN
P.O. Box 177, Matachewan, Ontario  P0K 1M0

DATE: April 7, 2021
RESOLUTION #: 2021-064

Moved by:

Seconded by:

WHEREAS the MeeQuam Youth Residence in Cochrane is one of the facilities that will be closing effective April 30; and

WHEREAS children aged 12 to 17 from the northeastern communities will be impacted by this closure. These are children who have increased needs yet limited access to much needed set of services and support that assist them with their transition to productive and flourishing adulthood; and

WHEREAS with the closure of the MeeQuam Youth Residence, these vulnerable children will find themselves in a facility hundred and thousands of kilometers away from their community and their families; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Matachewan requests that the Province of Ontario reverse their decision to close the youth justice facility in Cochrane, known as MeeQuam Youth Residence, as these vulnerable children need to be as close as possible to their families and communities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Resolution be forwarded to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Todd Smith, Minister of Children, Community and Social Services; Honourable Sylvia Jones, Minister of Indigenous Affairs; and all municipalities within the Province of Ontario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCILLOR</th>
<th>YEA</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>PID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARRIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. A. Commando-Dubé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENDED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. N. Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFEATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. G. Dubé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. S. Ruck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Durand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certified to be a true copy of the original.

Anne Commando-Dubé
Mayor

Barbara Knauth
Deputy Clerk Treasurer
“Via Email: premier@ontario.ca

May 19, 2021
The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON
M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford:

Re: Reopening of Greenwater Provincial Park

This will serve to advise you that Council, at its regular meeting held Tuesday, May 11th, 2021 passed the following resolution pertaining to the above noted:

“Resolution No.: 123-2021
Moved by: Councillor Daniel Bélisle Seconded by: Councillor Robert Hutchinson

WHEREAS the pandemic has caused people to stay indoors for an extended period of time; and

WHEREAS there is an extreme demand for camping and RVing from Ontarians wanting to go and enjoy our great outdoors; and

WHEREAS in 2013 approximately 10 Provincial Parks were closed by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) in the North; and

WHEREAS Northerners have very little areas to be able to enjoy the outdoors, as the closest Provincial Park are Kettle Lakes and Rene Brunelle; and

WHEREAS these Provincial Parks will be fully booked with nowhere for Cochranites to go camping nearby;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Corporation of the Town of Cochrane call on Premier Ford and the Minister of Natural Resources to reopen the Greenwater Provincial Park;

AND FURTHER THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Cochrane establish an Ad Hoc Committee to petition the Provincial Government;

AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the MP, Charlie Angus, MPP John Vanthof and the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities for their endorsement and support

CARRIED

Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated!

Yours truly,

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF COCHRANE

Alice Mercier
Clerk

/am

c.c.:
Charlie Angus, MP, Timmins – James Bay
John Vanthof, MPP, Timiskiaing - Cochrane
Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities
May 19, 2021

Premier Doug Ford
Queen's Park,
Toronto, ON
M7A 1A1

Sent via email: doug.fordco@pc.ola.org

Dear Honourable Sir:

Re: Durham Dead-End Road Kids

Please be advised that the Committee of the Whole of the Township of Brock received a delegation at their meeting held on May 10, 2021 and adopted the following resolution:

Resolution Number 05-6

MOVED by Lynn Campbell

That Dead-End Road delegations be received from parents, video, site www.durhamdeadendroadkids.ca and attached correspondence and;

Whereas Dead-End Road Kids (cul-de-sacs, private roads) busing is being moved from long-time residential pick ups; percentages of 830,000 Ontario bused students impacted as Student Transportation Services (STS) citing buses shouldn't access private roads, do 3-point turns, or back ups; kids are expected to walk 1-2 km twice daily (caregivers 4x) in the morning dark or narrow road shoulders, and with no “bus stop ahead” warning signage;

Whereas parents report employment/housing is at risk as they must leave work to drop off/pick up children to avoid safety hazards of kids walking on highways unsupervised; secondary school youth reporting education at risk as missing class/affecting grades; children with disabilities are not helped (eg. double amputee who needs bus stop moved 160 ft and parents were told it’s their “responsibility to get kids to bus safely”);

Whereas parents are being told busing policy is schoolboard’s, but schoolboard say its STS, who say it is the Governance Committee of Ministry of Transportation, but Ministry of Education say it’s “transportation consortia who administer the policy”; and trustee, governance say cannot change policies, so parents appealing to police, press and Councils with respect to the dangers; and that an oncoming car killed 12 year old Cormac and injured his sister while waiting at a newly relocated bus stop at the base of a hill, and;

Whereas STS have advised road improvements are the responsibility of municipalities, yet municipalities do not own the needed land, nor have millions of dollars to create 77m bus turnarounds, and;
Whereas Ontario Transportation Funding is $1 billion: Jan 27/20 Ministry said they’d improve student transportation, review funding formula; and given STS gets their funding by scoring well in reviews, and given Ministry establishing “Student Transportation Advisory Group” to hear STS sector expertise experience, and ideas;

Now Therefore Be it Resolved that the Corporation of the Township of Brock requests;

1. Exceptions to allow 3-point turns or backing up where necessary, to provide safer service to dead-end and private road kids, that policies be amended to reflect; and when not possible,

2. Exceptions to allow indemnification agreements to access private land for bus turnarounds to keep bus stops safer and closer to prescribed 800m distance; and when not possible,

3. “Bus Stop Ahead” warning signage be required to notify oncoming traffic, prior to STS moving common stops to main roadway and,

4. STS be comprised of solutions like mini-buses, vans, taxis or public transit worked into funding formulas so that it does not negatively impact STS funding stats; and,

5. Kid Key Performance Indicator (KPI) be included for Ministry “Effectiveness & Efficiency Follow Up Reviews”, establishing benchmarks for responsive problem solving for kids & parents’ busing concerns, and that this be an STS factor to receive funding; and,

6. That the Province provide a “Parent Portal” for ongoing busing feedback of their STS, so families and kids can review/provide comments, especially during Ministry STS reviews and revisions to funding; and,

7. That the Province have GPS tracking software to notify parents when children picked up/dropped off, and;

That this Motion be distributed to Premier Doug Ford; Honourable Stephen Lecce, Minister of Education; Honourable Caroline Mulroney, Minister of Transportation; Durham MPP Lindsey Park; Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock MPP Laurie Scott; all Durham MPP’s; Durham Region; all Ontario Municipalities; Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA); Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA); and Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)

MOTION CARRIED

Should you have any concerns please do not hesitate to contact the Clerk’s Department, clerks@brock.ca.

Yours truly,

THE TOWNSHIP OF BROCK

Deena Hunt
Deputy Clerk
cc. The Honourable Stephen Lecce, Minister of Education, Ontario – stephen.lecce@pc.ola.org
The Honourable Caroline Mulroney, Minister of Transportation – caroline.mulroney@pc.ola.org
Lindsey Park, MPP, Durham – lindsey.park@pc.ola.org
The Honourable Laurie Scott, MPP, Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock - laurie.scottco@pc.ola.org
All Durham MPP’S
Ralph Walton, Regional Clerk, Durham Region – clerks@durham.ca
All Ontario Municipalities
Rural Ontario Municipal Association – roma@roma.on.ca
Ontario Good Roads Association - thomas@ogra.org
Association of Municipalities of Ontario – amopresident@amo.on.ca
BUS STOP NOTICE OF MOTION:
That Dead-End Road delegations be received: from parents, video, site www.durhamdeadendroadkids.ca and attached correspondence and;

- Whereas Dead-End Road kids (cul-de-sacs, private roads) busing being moved from long-time residential to highspeed (some 80km) common stop pickups; percentage of 830,000 Ontario bused students impacted as Student Transportation Services (STS) citing buses shouldn’t access private roads, do 3-point-turns, or back up; kids expected to walk 1-2km twice daily (caregivers 4x) in morning dark, on narrow road shoulders, with no “bus stop ahead” warning signage,

- Whereas Parents report employment/housing at risk. Must leave work to drop off/pick up children to avoid safety hazards of kids walking on highways unsupervised; secondary school youth reporting education at risk as missing class/affecting grades; children with disabilities not helped like double amputee who needs stop moved 160ft; parents told it’s their “responsibility to get kids to bus safely”,

- Whereas Parents being told busing policy is schoolboard’s, but they say it’s STS’s, who say it’s Governance Committee or Ministry of Transportation, but Ministry of Education say it’s “transportation consortia who administer policy”; and trustee, governance say cannot change policies, so parents appealing to police, press, & councils re dangers then; oncoming car killed 12-yr-old Cormac and injured sister while waiting at newly relocated bus stop at the base of a hill, and

- Whereas STS have advised road improvements are responsibility of municipalities, yet municipalities don’t own needed land, nor have $ millions to create 77m bus turnarounds, meanwhile

- Whereas Ontario Transportation Funding is $1 billion; Jan 27/20 Ministry said they’d improve student transportation, review funding formula; and given STS gets their funding by scoring well in reviews, and given Ministry establishing “Student Transportation Advisory Group” to hear STS sector expertise, experience and ideas,

Now therefore be it resolved that the Municipality of Scugog requests:

1. Exceptions to allow 3-point turns or backing up where necessary, to provide safer service to dead-end and private road kids, that policies be amended to reflect; when not possible,
2. Exceptions to allow indemnification agreements to access private land for bus turnarounds to keep bus stops safer and closer to prescribed 800m distance; when not possible,
3. “Bus Stop Ahead” warning signage be required to notify oncoming traffic, prior to STS moving common stop to main roadway, and
4. STS be comprised of solutions like mini-buses, vans, taxis, or public transit, worked into funding formula so doesn’t negatively impact STS funding stats; and
5. Kid KPI “Key Performance Indicator” be included for Ministry “Effectiveness & Efficiency Follow Up Reviews”, establishing benchmarks for responsive-problem-solving for kids & parents’ busing concerns, and this be an STS factor to receive funding; and
6. That Province provide “Parent Portal” for ongoing busing feedback of their STS, so families and kids can review/provide comments, especially during Ministry STS reviews and revisions to funding; and
7. That Province have GPS tracking software to notify parents when children picked up/dropped off, and

Motion be distributed to Premier Doug Ford, Honorable Stephen Lecce (Minister of Education), Honorable Caroline Mulroney (Minister of Transport), Durham MPP Lindsay Park, Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock MPP Laurie Scott, all Durham MPPs, Durham Region, all Ontario Municipalities, Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA), Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA), and Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO).
Honorable Stephen Lecce you told us, “You Are Listening to Parents”. We need your help.

Please help Durham’s Dead End Road Kids, and others around the Province! Remember Adam & Cormac. Kids Deserve Better. They Deserve to Live.

Help us Keep Busing as Safe as Possible; Keep Kids off Highspeed Roadways.

*Note: in this report, click on images/links to read more details or watch videos.

April 15, 2021
The Honourable Stephen Lecce, Minister of Education
438 University Ave, 5th Floor, Toronto, ON M7A 1N3
Dear Minister Lecce:

Ontario School Busing is in the news... but not for the right reasons! UPS can do it, garbage trucks, snow plows, fire trucks, ambulances can provide driveway service, but schools can’t?

Remember when school children were picked up by school bus at their driveway?

Now private road, cul-de-sac and dead-end road kids are losing long-time neighbourhood school bus pickups. Student Transportation Services (STS) citing “for safety” school buses can not do 3-point-turns, back-ups, or access private roadways even though they have been for years!

Children are being dropped on highspeed thoroughfares and high trafficked intersections and this is more-safe? Minister Lecce, Adam died at a driveway highway pickup. Cormac died just before Christmas ‘20 accessing his bus at the base of a hill (see Dad’s public facebook post above). Where bus stops are located is important. Parents around the province feel sick with fear and worry for their dead-end road kids whose bus stops are being moved to higher trafficked high-speed...
roadways. Further, Dead-End Road Kids are expected to walk upwards of 1-2km twice daily (caregivers 4x), in morning dark, on narrow road shoulders (no sidewalks). Parents reporting employment and housing at risk due to losing senior caregivers who can’t walk to new highspeed stops. Parents now having to beg off work daily to drop off/pick up children to avoid safety hazards of then walking alone on highways unsupervised. This puts their employment at risk. Secondary School Youth reporting long distance stops impacting their ability to log back in for afternoon classes, affecting grades.

STS advised parents road improvements are responsibility of municipalities, yet municipalities don’t own land adjacent to roadways needed to create 77m bus turnarounds, nor have $ millions necessary to create turnarounds, so STS keep moving long-time neighborhood pickups to highspeed common stops.

1) Parents request exceptions to allow 3-point turns or backing up where absolutely necessary to provide safer service to dead-end and private road kids, that policies be amended to reflect.

For Durham Region alone, this change in busing policy means 178 dead end roads are not accessed by Durham Student Transportation Services (DSTS), impacting 386 students and their families in Durham Region alone (DSTS letter Dec ’20)! How many children live on private cottage roads, dead end roads or cul-de-sacs around the province affected by this?

Durham Dead End Road Kids’ Video re: Durham District School Board Bus Stop Changes (Ajax, Brock, Clarington, Oshawa, Pickering, Scugog, Uxbridge, Whitby)

Watch Parents’ Video Fearful of Trillium Lakelands District School Board’s Bus Stop Change (Kawartha Lakes, Haliburton, Muskokas)

Police report filed when daughter was nearly hit by a car. Mother reports “being thrown around like a baton” trying to get answers. “I am looking for a voice who can help me show TLDSB, that it’s common sense not to ask children to stand in an intersection, on an S bend of a busy high traffic area.” Kids stand in snow covered ditch or on road shoulder to wait for bus. No other space. “I need a voice who understands that keeping your children safe is a mother’s job... Help me fight to keep my children safe. I pray daily that our voices will be heard.” (Mom Tammy Mitchell Lakelands School District).

“I’m afraid it will be too late before they do anything.” News story reports family had one vehicle leaving mom with no choice but to walk 3 children (including baby in stroller) to new dangerous bus stop. Bus used to pick up on private road since ’09 but now TLDSB has denied request to keep safer private stop. “Every morning Katie walks with three young children to the bus stop... she fears they’re going to get hit. “It’s a blind corner and there’s nowhere to go. It’s so dangerous, especially with how busy this road is.” (Mom Katie Morris, Huntsville)
“We don’t take responsibility for children, they are the parents’ responsibility up until they get to the bus stop and on the bus,” says Catherine Shedden, District Manager, TLDSB

“The Governance Committee concluded that the DSTS Transportation Policy has been applied... the decision is final and not subject to further consideration. Accordingly, no further action will be taken on this matter,” says Kelly Mechoulan, CAO of DSTS

(Response to Grandfather trying to get his 4-yr-old granddaughter’s bus stop off 80km intersection and back to dead end road.)

2) Parents request exceptions to allow indemnification agreements to access private land for bus turnarounds, to keep bus stops safer and closer to prescribed 800m distance away.

Dad speaks to Council Dec ’19 explaining “My kids have had 10 opportunities to be killed!” at new Highway 60 common stop. Used to be picked up on dead-end Millar Hill Road. Now bus passed by speeding cars potentially hitting kids in morning dark while boarding. Even though Limberlost Forest and Wildlife Reserve has offered their entrance for a bus turnaround, TLDSB says can’t use private land unless they donate it for bus turnaround. (Dad Kevin Miller, Lake of Bays)

A tractor-trailer nearly plowed into the back of kids’ bus stopped on highway. STSCO had moved bus stop to Highway 7 where speed limit is 80km, to avoid dead-end Leanne Avenue. “Buses don’t typically go down dead-end roads... but with the...increased traffic, STSCO recognized change needed.” “It was really traumatic watching (oncoming semi-truck) because there was nothing we could do.” (Parents Lisa & Matt Couture, Peterborough)

3) Parents request “Bus Stop Ahead” warning signage be required to notify oncoming traffic prior to STS moving common stop to main roadway. Durham parents on Dead-End Roads Jack Rabbit Run & William’s Point, whose children being moved to base of hill on Regional Road 57, tried to get bus stop warning signage installed, but DSTS said not warranted.

➤ “Bus stop has been on Jack Rabbit Run for years...I have two small boys ages 4.5 and 6. I live over 1.5km from Reg Rd 57. There’s no possible way we can walk that far twice daily! Multiple vehicles, parents, and children congregating... There’s no parking, no shoulders... I’m a Registered Nurse in critical care. I know accidents can happen without warning! Please take residents’ concerns seriously! I work shift work so my elderly mother takes children to bus, but now will not be impossible! How will I support my family (if I have to leave work to pick them up)?” (Mom Cara Tunney, Registered Nurse Critical Care, Scugog)

➤ “My work takes me around province. Puts all responsibility of taking kids (2- and 4-year-olds) to highway on my wife. What drives me crazy is that it’s been possible for a bus to make a three-point turn in the past... why isn’t a smaller bus not a possibility?” (Dad Steve Anning on Video, Hydro One Safety Officer, Scugog)

35
“How can this be safe? I am beyond upset that this continues to happen:
* cars stopped on hill behind bus,
* 1 car trying to turn right around bus,
* 1 car honking because came over hill and cars stopped behind bus,
* ALL parents screaming because another car came around William’s Point bend and almost ran over kids boarding! Kids scared... How can this be safe? Imagine if there were snow or ice on hill?”

“Please explain Mrs. Mechoulan how you are going to deal with a child getting hit by a car and all of us parents have to tell DSTS how unsafe it is?”
(Mom Laura Turnbull, Feb ’21 Email to Trustee Morton & DSTS CAO Mechoulan)

4) Parents request STS be comprised of solutions like taxis, public transit, mini-buses or vans, worked into funding formula so doesn’t negatively impact STS funding stats. Other options could be incorporated not just full-size buses that can’t navigate dead-end roads. Why not use new Durham Transit On-Demand?

“We were informed Friday that the bus stop is again, at Cartwright and Church intersection. This is an unsafe stop for any child... Vehicles are always speeding (over 80km/hr) not to mention when there’s a problem on 7A, they detour through that intersection. Our neighbours are appalled DSTS refuses to send a bus down our road. All their children were picked up at the ends of their driveways. The road is in the best shape it’s ever been. Wilma (Wotten Regional Councillor) had commented that she used to ride the bus that came down this road. In 2017, the town came out and met with DSTS to look at areas where the bus could turn a round. Nothing ever came of it (don’t own enough land there to build turnaround). We now have 6 children who live on this road, ages 4-13. None of the families are okay with the current bus stop, only one is using it (while they fight DSTS).” (Mom of Disabled Child, Krista Ormsby, Scugog)

Parents being told busing policy is schoolboard’s but they say it’s STS’s, but STS say busing changes are schoolboard governance & policy of Ministry of Transportation, meanwhile Ministry of Education says it’s “transportation consortia that administer policies”. Parents are spinning in circles trying to figure out who to talk to, since STS not responding to their concerns!

Parents reporting frightening near accidents/deaths to Trustees, School Boards, STS, but continue to be advised “it’s the parents’ responsibility to get children to bus stop safely”, and are forced to appeal to councils, press, make videos, yet appeals largely unresolved and unknown liabilities mounting.

5) Parents request Kid KPI “Key Performance Indicator” be included for future Ministry “Effectiveness & Efficiency Follow Up Reviews”, establishing benchmarks for responsive problem solving for kids & parents’ busing concerns, and this be a factor to receive funding. Viktoria says DSTS, “senseless bureaucratic approach must change.” There’s more to busing than business.

“DSTS picked a community stop but my kids only ones taking bus...which drives right by our house? How does 40-minute walk sound four times a day with a 2 and 4-year-old?”
(Mom Viktoria Brown, Scugog ’17 Focus Magazine Appeal to DSTS)
We need a “Kid” KPI, where high-level service is rewarded. Rui Webster who’s lost both his legs, uses prosthetic limbs to walk, yet DSTS won’t move bus stop 160 feet to accommodate. “The bus stop was just a couple of houses down the street from him... however busing contractor changed routes... Rui has to cross intersection to reach (new) bus stop (more traffic)... snow plows deposit large banks of snow... Twice last week, Rui slipped and fell... "We just want bus stop put back where it was or to assign Rui to another bus that still goes past our house – either of these things are easy to do,” Kurt says. The busing contractor has steadfastly refused to change route. School district has refused to budge as well.” (Parents Kurt & Melissa Webster, Ajax)

Transports blowing by stopped school buses on area highways a regular occurrence. "It's so stressful. It's awful. Every morning I stress out and every afternoon when I know (transport trucks) are coming back." (Mom Cara Smetana, Martin River Nipissing)

6) Province provide “Parent Portal” for ongoing busing feedback of their STS, so families and kids can review/provide comments, especially during Ministry STS reviews and revisions to funding.

Provincial funding for student transportation is projected to be more than $1 billion and Ministry routinely has “Effectiveness and Efficiency Follow-Up Reviews” of STS which is the vehicle of STS funding.

Ontario Government announced January 27, 2020 they’d improve student transportation experience by reviewing funding formula to achieve more efficient and accountable system, reviewing three goals of: 1) equity, 2) fiscal responsibility, accountability, and 3) evidence-based decision making.

Government is establishing a Student Transportation Advisory Group meeting with Parliamentary Assistant and Ministry staff, to hear from STS sector partners expertise, experience and ideas. Parents and children should be included in this review. Given busing is supposed to be for the children, why not give parents and kids a say?

7) Province have GPS tracking software to notify parents where children are when dropped off/picked up, giving evidence of safety.

On behalf of Durham Dead End Road Kids, and William’s Point Cottager’s Association, we hope our website, videos, and this report help explain. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you further.

Deborah Kiezebrink, Scugog Ward 4 Councillor
dkiezebrink@scugog.ca

Wilma Wotten, Scugog Regional Councillor & Deputy Mayor
wwotten@scugog.ca

Brent Clemens, WPCA President
bclemmy@aol.com

Michelle Burg, WPCA Board Director
michelle.j.burg@gmail.com

cc: Premier Doug Ford, Honorable Stephen Lecce (Minister of Education), Honorable Caroline Mulroney (Minister of Transport), Durham MPP Lindsey Park, Durham Region, all Ontario Municipalities, ROMA, OGRA, and AMO.
Nov. 4, 2020

Good Day,
This letter is to inform whomever can resolve this catastrophe.
My name is Curtis Sewards and live at Beacock rd., Nestleton, Ontario. L0B 1L0. I am being told that my granddaughter is to walk 1.4 km to highway 57 to the bus stop. My granddaughter is 4 and just started JK. Her mother has no car or drivers license, so both would have to walk. They would have to leave about 45 minutes before pick up, which would be in the dark during the winter months. Beacock is a dirt road and has no sidewalks or lights. This is extremely dangerous for such a cute kid.

4 years ago, I was told a similar situation, which meant my grandson would have to walk the 1.2 km to the pick-up point. The reason was it was not safe for the bus to turn around. After taking measurements, the driveway beside mine is 25 feet wide and at least 50 feet long going to a work shop. I discussed this problem with my neighbor and he had absolutely no problem with the bus turning around.

The transportation safety inspector from the bus company came to my house and spoke with said neighbor and the bus started coming with no incidence for the 2 years my grandson was here. I have also had my own 2 children bused to school for their 14 years of public-school education.

Now I am being told someone has determined no bus should turn around on a private driveway? I am not sure where this came from but my house is on a public road well maintained and plowed. I might add the grader, snowplow and garbage trucks easily use Beacock rd. If the bus company is not allowed to send the big bus, send the small one but Avrie deserves an education.

This is a problem created with the decision about bus turning, with no plan for the children. I was never consulted about the losing access to education for anyone living at my house. Please solve this, do it for the kids!

If any further information is required, I am always available.
Curtis Sewards
905-926-8251
From: Laura Turnbull <Laura.Turnbull@durham.ca>
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 3:20 PM
To: CAROLYN MORTON; Kelly Mechoulan; Deborah Kiezebrink
Cc: DAVID WRIGHT
Subject: School bus incident at Williams point

Good afternoon Mrs. Mechoulan,

I am beyond upset that this continues to happen, this is the first time I finally got it on camera, unfortunately I did not get the car behind the bus because it was so unsafe I cared more for the kids then the pictures, the details of the drop off are as follows:

- parents waiting at the side of Williams point for the bus to arrive 2:54
- bus shows up lights on kids begin to come off bus
- two cars stopped on the hill behind the bus
- as kids coming off bus, car comes around bend on Williams point road and almost runs them over!
- all parents begin yelling “Stop, Stop!” so the kids stop, car stops...
- bus closes doors and carries on
- the first car behind the bus wants to turn right on to Williams point but has to wait for the children to clear so the second and then third car start hammering on their horns so they can get by because they just came up over the hill and a car is parked
- the kids all stop walking again because they don’t know what’s going on with all the horns and they are scared.

How can this be safe? If this bus stop continues, please explain to me Mrs. Mechoulan how you are going to deal with the situation when one of these kids gets hit by a car and all of us parents have continued to tell the bus transportation company how unsafe it is. This is completely unacceptable and please let me remind you it’s a sunny dry day, I can’t even imagine if it were raining or snowing or ice. I will continue to film and take pictures of this very concerning situation.

Laura

From: KELLY MECHOULAN <kmehoulan@dusts.ca>
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 6:04 PM
To: Laura Turnbull; CAROLYN MORTON; Deborah Kiezebrink
Cc: DAVID WRIGHT
Subject: RE: School bus incident at Williams point

Dear Ms. Turnbull,

Thank you for letting us know about the driver at the intersection. Although, DSTS has confirmed with the bus driver that no vehicle has gone through the bus flashing lights at the Regional Road 57 and Williams Point Road, our Safety Officer has reached out to Durham Regional Police to request surveillance in the area at the time of drop off and pick up at the bus stop location.

The car at the stop sign can not legally turn into the bus lights, and the bus driver has been instructed to block as much of the intersection at time of stopping as possible.

DSTS will continue to monitor the bus stop with the bus operator and driver. The current bus stop location is the closest available bus stop location, the next closest available bus stop location is on Regional Road 57 at Park Street.

If you would prefer to use this bus stop location please let me know and DSTS staff will facilitate the change in bus stop location for your family.

Sincerely,
Kelly Mechoulan
Durham Student Transportation Services
AUG 7/20 Laura wrote to Durham District Schoolboard Trustee Carolyn Morton, who is also the Chair of the DDSB Governance Committee:

"Good morning, I might not be the first time you are hearing a complaint regarding this but I haven’t heard of anything changing so I wanted to voice my concern as well.

My house received a letter from the Durham Bus Transportation (DSTS)... starting this school year the bus would no longer come down the road. I am located end of William’s Point 2.4 km from Highway 57 the new pick up. There is no possible way in good weather (let alone bad weather) my kids are going to be able to make it down there and back, so that leaves me no choice now but to drive them.

Due to Covid if I have to already drive them down the road I might as well drive them right to the school. However upon review of the back-to-school guidelines, I see that the board is discouraging parent drop offs as the area is not built for that many cars.

I can completely understand this, but honestly now that they took the bus away, I’ll have no choice. I also would like to know what the guidelines are distance wise as a tax payer for children to receive a bus pick up?

There are kids even further past me down Jack Rabbit Run that also will no longer get bus service. Are we not entitled to bus service after a certain mileage away? Also I would like to complain that the bus has been travelling past my house for over 14 years that I’ve lived here with the same turn around so why now?

I understand times right now are challenging for all. I just can’t sit back and say it’s ok that they don’t have a bus anymore knowing I pay my taxes and they had one every other year. Any guidance regarding this would be much appreciated."

Laura

From: Carolyn Morton (Trustee)
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 5:59 PM

I am sorry, but I have no authority to change decisions made by the CEO of DSTS. That would be out of my hands.

Sorry, Carolyn

Minister Lecce, who should this mom and others like her go to, who have authority to help?
I am writing on behalf of the deeply concerned parents and community members of Williams Point. Monday, February 8, 2021 was the first pick up and drop off at the new bus stop located on the highway. Most parents found alternative measures to get their children to school as they are not willing to risk their children's physical safety by having them congregate at the bottom of a blind hill with no signage, sidewalks, or designated waiting area. Those who did send their children by bus were frightened. Other families have decided to move their children to online schooling, being forced to make a choice between their children's physical safety and their mental health. Our parents are losing sleep regarding this ongoing dispute particularly following the death of a student in Port Hope December 2/2020. Read news story, Support the Kerin family here.

The parallels that can be drawn between the two bus stops are uncanny and downright terrifying to the parents of 22 kids who are expected to stand in the middle of an intersection on a highway at the base of a hill in winter to board the bus...
I would like to share with you direct quotes and feedback we have received from our community to better illustrate:

* "There is no stop sign here and the bus is stopping on the bottom of a blind hill where visibility is impossible. The snow and ice makes this dangerous spot even more dangerous. There are no sidewalks and cars are speeding in this area. As a critical care nurse, I am very concerned that this change was made and ultimately puts our children's lives at risk."

* "Pick up and drop off spot at the HWY 57 and William's Point Intersection is not an appropriate alternative. It isn't safe, it's not suitable for family routines and not good for overall community. The proposed stop is on the downhill side of a blind hill, where vehicles are often travelling well over the posted speed limit. This is very similar to the spot in Northumberland County where a boy tragically lost his life at a school bus stop just this school year. Again, add snow, ice or slippery conditions to this situation and it becomes even more unsafe."

* "We made the difficult decision to move our daughter to online. We cannot take this risk for something that should be as simple as getting to school safely. The impacts this will have on her mental health keep me up at night."

We understand that representatives from the Township of Scugog have subcontracted engineers to survey and create a design for a 77 metre turnaround for the bus at the location where it previously did a 3-point-turn, at Jack Rabbit Run and William's Point intersection. This is a very private and safe location and close for families who's children have disabilities to access. Our community has rallied together offering to donate land from our park if need to be construct a bus turnaround, to start a fundraising campaign, volunteer time, and some have even offered to build the bus turnaround themselves if need be, anything to keep our children safe.

We have requested that DSTS explore alternatives that could be available such as committing to send the mini-buses like before, having a parent or a second bus driver act as a spotter for the bus driver to turn around safely. We are aware that Councillor Kiezebrink sent letters to DSTS, our School Board Trustee Carolyn Morton, and Norah Marsh, Director of Education just last week, requesting that the bus stop remain in place in our community until the end of the school year so we can work tougher towards providing a suitable solution and allocate the appropriate amount of time and resources to have the solutions executed.
Each of our solutions, letters, and requests, have been dismissed as not possible. DSTS actions have made it clear that there is no intention to collaborate, have open dialogue or to work to resolve our very valid concerns. They have only restated what the policy is, in any email, meeting, or letter; that it's the parents' responsibility to get the children to the bus stop safely, that roadways are the municipality's responsibility, that it's not a hill, not a highway, that sight lines are met and "bus stop ahead" signage is not required (but we wonder where the measurements were taken from because the bus driver stopped mid-hill as it's the only place to stand for the students).

Parents and community members are asking when will DSTS be open and transparent with us? When will our concerns be responded to? Some parents have written letters or emails only to still receive no reply. How is this an acceptable practice of a Tax Funded Agency to simply ignore the very people who pay their taxes that provide the funding? Our families and members feel abandoned and ignored due to our rural status.

Minister Stephen Lecce, our elected Councillors (Ward Councillor Deborah Kiezebrink and Regional Councillor Wotten) have done everything they can think of to assist us. We are now asking that they engage you to investigate not only our concerns for our children's safety but how unfairly this community feels this matter has been handled by DSTS.

We wish to thank you in advance for your assistance and advocacy both on our behalf and on behalf of every Dead-End Road Child in Durham facing this same circumstance. Thank you for taking our concerns seriously and thank you to our Councillors for being safety ambassadors within Scugog Township.

We wish to thank you in advance for your assistance and advocacy both on our behalf and on behalf of every Dead-End Road Child in Durham facing this same circumstance. Thank you for taking our concerns seriously and thank you to our Councillors for being safety ambassadors within Scugog Township.

Sincerely,

Michelle Burg, WPCA Director

cc. Brent Clemens, WPCA President
April 21, 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

We are deeply concerned about there no longer being a bus route on our dead-end street with the safety concerns that it raises for the future of our two children. My wife and I have two young children, a daughter starting school in September and a son who will be starting 2 years behind her. We’re not the only ones impacted… The Williams Point Cottagers Association is quickly growing and the number of children on the street is steadily increasing. These concerns only multiply the further away the residence is down the street from the new bus stop.

The loss of the long-time bus route on William’s Point Road will force my wife to walk our daughter to the top of our street and will also force her to bring our son along 2.2km (twice daily) as my work requires that I am often on the road very early or on call while working around the province for the Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development and there would be no supervision for him in that time period. You can imagine the difficulties this would present for her. Tying into this, if the snowplow is no longer coming down the street early enough to accommodate for the bus route, you can envision how difficult it would be for two young children walking through unplowed streets with no sidewalk in the morning dark, as well as sharing roads with commuters on their way to work.

Though it breaks our hearts, we will have to consider leaving our beautiful community as this once proposed bus stop change has now become reality.

The challenges and safety concerns this presents for what seems like a minor issue of a three-point turn for the bus as compared to the frightful alternative of children walking up to 2.2 kilometres to reach a bus stop that impedes live traffic coming down a blind hill should really be reconsidered.

If you force parents to drive their children to the bus stop, not only will it congest narrow roadways during commuting hours, but it will also increase emissions from idling vehicles. In many cases this is not even a possibility for parents who would be unable to modify their hours of work to accommodate this. The possible economic impact of having to put off working to accommodate an amended bus route seems very inconsiderate to taxpayers who I guarantee will see no decrease in their taxation in response to the change.

I hope I have provided enough information to allow for thorough debate into this issue and I do hope that the safety of the children residing on Williams Point Road is considered the paramount concern by the school board and the Durham Student Transportation Services. I strongly urge you to reconsider this change.

We are available to discuss our concerns further at [Contact Information] and [Contact Information] or by phone at [Contact Number] and [Contact Number]. We hope you reach out.

Sincerely,

Concerned Parents Residing at [Address]
Steven and Kayla Anning
OVERVIEW

The following is a submission by Gravel Watch Ontario (GWO; gravelwatch.org) in response to the request for feedback on the Consultation on Growing the Size of the Greenbelt ERO 019-3136. Gravel Watch Ontario is a province-wide coalition of citizen groups and individuals that acts in the interests of residents and communities to protect the health, safety, quality of life of Ontarians and the natural environment in matters that relate to aggregate resources.

Gravel Watch Ontario recognizes the obligation to protect our agricultural lands, water resources and natural environment, all of which are essential for building a climate resilient Ontario for future generations. Gravel Watch Ontario has commented on government planning and aggregate policies for over 15 years and works with our members to ensure that policies regulating gravel extraction do not result in permanent loss of farmland or rural landscape amenities and do not damage the integrity of the water resources supplied by the rural landscape.

The consultation on ways to grow the size of Ontario’s Greenbelt is especially timely as the COVID 19 pandemic has highlighted the critical need for food security from local sources during crisis periods and as one of the key factors in the subsequent economic recovery. Ontario has some of the best agricultural land in Canada, much of which is not protected by current land-use planning policies. These lands are a finite, non-renewable resource, and the foundation of one of the province’s largest economic sectors, agri-food. Expansion of the Greenbelt will provide permanent protection of the farmland, water sources and natural ecosystems within the proposed Plan area as well as an opportunity for Ontario to become a world leader in farmland conservation. To mitigate the impact of the leapfrogging of development and aggregate extraction beyond the four Provincial Plans, Gravel Watch Ontario believes that more restrictive development policies are required throughout the province.

Overall, Gravel Watch Ontario supports the proposed expansion of the Greenbelt as outlined in the Initial Study Area of the Paris Galt Moraine and Urban River Valleys.
Gravel Watch Ontario agrees with the province that the Paris Galt Moraine is a valuable groundwater system that must be protected. The moraines continue to be under pressure for aggregate development, water takings (including below-water-table extraction), growth as well as the impacts of a changing and variable climate.

Recently an interim licence approval was granted for aggregate extraction of 750,000 tonnes of dolostone per year (for +25 years) in an ecologically rich area of the Paris Galt Moraine in Rockwood, Ontario (Hidden Quarry). Studies have shown that the quarry will impact both municipal and private wells and a provincially significant wetland. Gravel Watch Ontario is concerned that the quarry will serve as a precedent for unlimited extension to adjacent properties and an expansion into a mega quarry site.

In determination of the boundary for the expanded Greenbelt, GWO believes that the following points must be addressed:

- That the Greenbelt boundaries be significantly expanded to include more of Ontario’s agricultural land
- That below-water table aggregate extraction be prohibited in the Greenbelt (refer to Bill 71, Paris Galt Moraine Conservation Act, 2019)
- That there be broader moraine protection across the province (i.e. The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act) in addition to the Greenbelt Plan
- That the Moffat Moraine (part of the Paris, Galt and Moffat Moraines ANSI) be included in the Initial Study Area and mapping
- That the Greenbelt Plan policy 4.3.2 (2) (Non-Renewable Resource Policies) which restricts municipal official plans and zoning bylaws from containing provisions that are more restrictive than the policies of the Greenbelt Plan be removed and replaced with 1.4.1 (How to Read This Plan) which states that if the plans, regulations or standards are more restrictive than this Plan, the more restrictive provision shall prevail
- That provincial policy leadership is required to analyze the extent to which the cumulative effect of aggregate extraction negatively impacts groundwater recharge in the moraine areas
- That the province assess the cumulative impacts of water taking and/or permitting in the Greenbelt Plan Study Areas and across the province
- That the outwash gravel deposits adjacent to the moraine that store and transmit groundwater recharged in the moraine to river valleys, and the river valleys that contain the high-baseflow streams fed by discharge from the moraine be included in the mapped area
- Clarification is needed as to how the identification and future protection of the designated areas relate to either the Natural Heritage System or the Agricultural System for the Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan
- Clarification is needed as to how the identification and future protection of the water features relates to existing source water protection policies. For example, how does Greenbelt designation of river valleys compliment and reinforce the source water protection area for the Eramosa River Valley
In keeping with the directives of the consultation proposal that stipulates the provincial government will not remove lands from the Greenbelt, we request that the government cancel plans to build Highway 413 (GTA West) and the Bradford Bypass (Holland Marsh Highway)

The above relates to the overall protection of the agricultural land base and the connectivity of the natural heritage and water resource systems that sustain ecological and human health and form the environmental framework in south-central Ontario. As requested in the consultation document, we have outlined in detail our answers to your specific questions below.

QUESTION 1
What are your thoughts on the initial focus area of the Study Area of the Paris Galt Moraine?

The Initial Focus Area of the Paris Galt Moraine indicates that the government has a clear understanding of the need to expand the Greenbelt and to protect water resource systems for future generations. Recent investigative studies show that the contributions of the moraine to groundwater recharge and discharge extend well beyond the physical land form and that they influence water flow, temperatures, quality and associated terrestrial and aquatic habitats in the water system. It has been pointed out in submissions by the City of Guelph and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) that the current mapping fails to consistently include all the glacial outwash areas next to the moraine that provide the groundwater flow linkages between the moraine features and the rivers which are sustained by moraine recharge (i.e. the Eramosa River and other streams identified by the GRCA in their submission).

Both urban development and rural land-use practices such as below-water-table aggregate extraction continue to be at risk to the integrity of the hydrologic and ecological functions of the moraine. The cumulative impacts of both aggregate extraction and water taking must be considered in relation to growth and development.

GWO recommends that a Moraine Protection Act for all moraines in the Province of Ontario be established in addition to the policies of the Greenbelt Plan. We also recommend that the mapping of the Initial Study Area include outwash areas and spillways.

GWO is concerned that the Greenbelt Plan may provide less protection from aggregate extraction than current municipal plans due to the wording of Section 4.3.2 (2) of the Plan. The Grand River Conservation Authority, the Township of North Dumfries, the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo oppose any extension of the Greenbelt Legislation at this time. The Region of Waterloo requests enhanced municipal consultation prior to establishment of final mapping associated with the proposed Greenbelt expansion. They advise that unless policies (language and framework) are
revised, they oppose any extension. Their response to the Province’s Consultation on Growing the Size of the Greenbelt is as follows:

“The Greenbelt Plan does not limit municipalities from adopting policies that are more stringent than the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan, except in relation to agricultural uses and mineral aggregate resources. On those topics, the policies of the Greenbelt Plan prevail and municipalities cannot adopt policies that are more stringent.”

“The Regional Official Plan also prohibits aggregate extraction in Core Environmental Features. The Greenbelt Plan does not include this prohibition.”

“Given that a large share of the region’s groundwater recharge areas also overlap with some of the region’s largest aggregate deposits, Regional staff have consistently recommended a precautionary approach when considering the extraction of mineral aggregate resources. As noted above, some of these policies are more stringent than the requirements in the Greenbelt Plan.”

QUESTION 2
What are the considerations in moving from a Study Area to a more defined boundary of the Paris Galt Moraine?

We agree with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture that the province clarify how defining a boundary to bring the Paris Galt Moraine into the Greenbelt will have regard for other provincial policy directives such as emphasizing a watershed-based approach to water-resource planning and giving recognition to the moraine’s role in hydrological functions.

Development of a Paris Galt Moraine Conservation Plan in addition to the Greenbelt Plan would address and protect the features and functions of a more defined Moraine Study Area. GWO recommends that these Moraine Plans be applied province-wide and that:

- they must prohibit below-water-table extraction in clear, straightforward language
- aggregate extraction is not permitted in natural core areas (as in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan)

The province must adhere to Section 1.4.1 of the Greenbelt Plan and not have exception for mineral aggregate resources.

QUESTION 3
What are your thoughts on the initial focus area of adding, expanding and further protecting Urban River Valleys?

Both public and private lands must be included to provide protection, avoid fragmentation and act as corridors for wildlife. We do agree with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture that including the Urban River Valleys in the total Greenbelt land area should not be used in order to balance the loss of protected agricultural lands to development and aggregate extraction.
QUESTION 4
Do you have suggestions for other potential areas to grow the Greenbelt?

We believe that Ontario’s Greenbelt should be expanded to include more agricultural land. In addition to the Greenbelt Plan, the moraines require a broader province wide Conservation Plan with more restrictive aggregate policies that include no below water table extraction.

Identifying ‘food belts’ in various regions of the province and by branding the goods produced there encourages Ontarians to grow and buy locally which will contribute to Ontario’s economy and promote tourism comparable to the evolution of the Niagara Region’s vineyards.

GWO supports Ontario Nature in that the following water resource areas should be protected:

- All moraines within the GGS, given their vital role in providing clean drinking water and mitigating floods;
- Private lands within urban river valleys, since it is primarily private lands, not public lands, that are threatened with urbanization and development;
- Coldwater streams, wetlands and headwaters of river systems since they improve water quality, provide critical habitat for fish and other wildlife and afford many further benefits such as flood control, carbon storage, groundwater recharge and recreational opportunities;
- Former glacial Lake Algonquin and Iroquois Shorelines and Plain since they feature significant groundwater discharge zones and are the headwaters of many cold water streams; and
- The Lake Simcoe Basin and Northern Simcoe County where many important ecological and hydrological features are vulnerable to land speculation and intensive development.

QUESTION 5
How should we balance or prioritize any potential Greenbelt expansion with the other provincial priorities?

As noted by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, it is important to acknowledge that less than 5% of Ontario’s land base can support any agricultural production. From 2011 to 2016, the Census of Agriculture indicated that Ontario lost 319,700 acres of Ontario farmland. That’s 175 acres of farmland per day. The current system is resulting in incremental loss of agricultural lands due to the prioritization of aggregate extraction, development and growth, over farmland preservation.

Several studies have suggested that enough aggregate supply is available currently to fuel economic growth for at least 50 years. Rather than continue to prioritize the extraction of new sources of aggregate, it would be in the province’s best interest to create incentives to maximize reuse and reprocessing of aggregate materials under
safe and appropriate industrial conditions. A recent study completed by The National Farmers’ Union, McMaster University and Gravel Watch Ontario revealed that 77% of aggregate extraction occurs on prime agricultural lands. Given that agricultural lands are a key economic driver in Ontario, they must be protected and prioritized from invasive industrial development such as mining, pits and quarries. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture stated that the ‘interim use’ of aggregate extraction as considered by the aggregate industry, undermines Ontario’s food sustainability and arguably permanently alters agricultural land. This finite, non-renewable resource must be permanently protected.

Aggregate extraction below the water-table results in a permanent water surface when extraction is finished. This situation results in direct exposure of the groundwater system to contamination from airborne sources and spills, as well as removes the possibility of rehabilitation of the site to resumed agricultural use. Prior to the late 1980’s, Section 3.16 of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Guidelines Policy did not permit mineral extraction on Class 1 to 3 agricultural lands unless agricultural rehabilitation of the site was carried out. Gravel Watch Ontario believes that in conjunction with growing the Greenbelt consultation, below water table aggregate extraction should be prohibited on and full rehabilitation of all extraction sites to agricultural use is necessary. More effective and extensive monitoring and transparent reporting of existing pits and quarries is required.

**QUESTION 6**

**Are there other priorities that should be considered?**

We must consider that while the Greenbelt Plan protects the countryside, it also offers green space for urban dwellers. A key consideration is the positive contribution of urban residents to rural economies through recreational uses, purchases of goods and services, visits to restaurants, farmers’ markets, fairs, festivals and bed and breakfast establishments. From field to fork, the agri-food sector contributes $47.3B to Ontario’s economy and supports over 860,000 jobs.

With its general hummocky nature, sand and gravel deposits and permeable soils, the Paris Galt Moraine provides and purifies water at no cost to citizens. Establishing a Moraine Conservation Act is an opportunity to address water management concerns in a fiscally responsible manner now before the situation becomes dire. Failing to properly protect the moraine and in turn preserve the region’s source of fresh water will lead to massive investments for infrastructure to provide water for the region. Furthermore, local business, farmers and industry depend upon this water source for local jobs and prosperity.
CONCLUSION

Gravel Watch Ontario is optimistic that the outcome of this consultation process will lead to the permanent protection of the Paris-Galt Moraine. It is essential at this time that the province moves forward with the permanent protection of Ontario’s agricultural lands, natural heritage and water resources through both the Greenbelt Plan and a Moraine Conservation Act with more restrictive aggregate policies. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Greenbelt expansion in the Initial Study Area. Gravel Watch Ontario looks forward to continuing to work with the province during the next stages of this consultation and we welcome any questions you may have.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER LINKS


Mike Schreiner, MPP, Guelph  Leader of the Green Party of Ontario.
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Dear Mayor and Council,

Gravel Watch Ontario acts in the interests of residents and communities to protect the health, safety, quality of life of Ontarians and of the natural environment in matters that relate to aggregate resources. Today, we share our comments (attached) which we have submitted to the Ontario government. It addresses several issues that concern you and communities across the province. They include the following:

- Cumulative impacts on communities of extraction industries, specifically of aggregate i.e., rock, gravel, sand, and clay;
- Preservation of prime farmland and of water resources necessary for food sustainability and renewable industries;
- Local planning to preserve natural capital through good policy, and practices;
- Resilience in the face of the twin threats of COVID-19 and climate change.

Gravel Watch Ontario recognizes the obligation of communities to protect our agricultural lands, water resources and natural environment, all of which are essential for building a climate-resilient Ontario for future generations. Gravel Watch Ontario has commented on government planning and aggregate policies for over 15 years and works with our members to ensure that policies regulating gravel
extraction do not result in permanent loss of farmland or rural landscape amenities and do not damage the integrity of the water resources supplied by the rural landscape.

We thank you for your significant work on these, offer the attached to assist you, ask you to link us to local community groups facing aggregate issues, and invite you to continue this dialogue.

Sincere wishes for good health.

Bryan Smith, President
Gravel Watch Ontario

info@gravelwatch.org
www.gravelwatch.org
ph: 289 270 7535
Ministry of Government and Consumer Services
777 Bay St., 5th Floor
Toronto, ON
M5B 2H7

May 27th 2021

To Whom it May Concern:

Please be advised that at the Town of Plympton-Wyoming Council Meeting held Wednesday, May 26th 2021, the following resolution was adopted:

Motion 10
Moved by Gary Atkinson
Seconded by Muriel Wright
That Council support item 'L' of correspondence from the Township of Terrace Bay regarding Advocacy for Reform MFIPPA.

Carried.

If you have any questions regarding the above motion, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or email at ewkarcik@plympton-wyoming.ca.

Sincerely,

Erin Kwardiak
Clerk
Town of Plympton-Wyoming
546 Niagara Street
Wyoming, ON N0N 1T0
p. 519-845-3939
ewkarcik@plympton-wyoming.ca

Cc: All Ontario Municipalities
May 18, 2021

Ministry of Government and Consumer Services
777 Bay St., 5th Floor
Toronto, ON
M5B 2H7

To Whom it May Concern:

At the Township of Terrace Bay Regular Council Meeting held on Monday May 17, 2021, the following resolution of support was passed.

RE: Advocacy for Reform MFIPPA

Resolution: 122-2021
Moved by: Councillor St.Louis
Seconded by: Councillor Moore

WHEREAS the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act R.S.O. 1990 (MFIPPA) dates back 30 years;

AND WHEREAS municipalities, including the Township of Terrace Bay, practice and continue to promote open and transparent government operations, actively disseminate information and routinely disclose public documents upon request outside of the MFIPPA process;

AND WHEREAS government operations, public expectations, technologies, and legislation surrounding accountability and transparency have dramatically changed and MFIPPA has not advanced in line with these changes;

AND WHEREAS the creation, storage and utilization of records has changed significantly, and the Municipal Clerk of the Municipality is responsible for records and information management programs as prescribed by the Municipal Act, 2001;

AND WHEREAS regulation 823 under MFIPPA continues to reference antiquated technology and does not adequately provide for cost recovery, and these financial shortfalls are borne by the municipal taxpayer;

AND WHEREAS the threshold to establish frivolous and/or vexatious requests is unreasonably high and allows for harassment of staff and members of municipal councils, and unreasonably affects the operations of the municipality;

AND WHEREAS the Act fails to recognize how multiple requests from an individual; shortage of staff resources or the expense of producing a record due to its size, number or physical location does not allow for time extensions to deliver requests and unreasonably affects the operations of the municipality;
AND WHEREAS the name of the requestor is not permitted to be disclosed to anyone other than the person processing the access request, and this anonymity is used by requesters to abuse the MFIPPA process and does not align with the spirit of openness and transparency embraced by municipalities;

AND WHEREAS legal professionals use MFIPPA to gain access to information launch litigation against institutions, where other remedies exist;

AND WHEREAS there are limited resources to assist administrators or requestors to navigate the legislative process;

AND WHEREAS reform is needed to address societal and technological changes in addition to global privacy concerns and consistency across provincial legislation;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services be requested to review the MFIPPA, and consider recommendations as follows:

1. That MFIPPA assign the Municipal Clerk, or designate to be the Head under the Act;

2. That MFIPPA be updated to address current and emerging technologies;

3. That MFIPPA regulate the need for consistent routine disclosure practices across institutions;

4. That the threshold for frivolous and/or vexatious actions be reviewed, and take into consideration the community and available resources in which it is applied;

5. That the threshold for frivolous and/or vexatious also consider the anonymity of requesters, their abusive nature and language in requests to ensure protection from harassment as provided for in Occupational Health and Safety Act;

6. That the application and scalability of fees be designed to ensure taxpayers are protected from persons abusing the access to information process;

7. That administrative practices implied or required under the Act, including those of the IPC, be reviewed and modernized;

8. That the integrity of the Act be maintained to protect personal privacy and transparent governments.

Sincerely,

Jon Hall
CAO/Clerk

CC: Ontario Municipalities
June 10, 2021

The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau
Prime Minister
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Sent via email to: Justin.trudeau@parl.gc.ca

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1
premier@ontario.ca

Re: Correspondence received from the Town of Fort Erie regarding Capital Gains tax on Primary Residence

Honourable and Dear Sirs:

At the last regular General Purpose and Administration Committee meeting of the Township of Scugog held June 7, 2021, the Committee received and endorsed correspondence from the Town of Fort Erie dated June 1, 2021 with respect to Capital Gains Tax on Primary Residence. Attached please find a copy of the Town of Fort Erie’s correspondence dated June 1, 2021.

Please be advised that Committee approved the following recommendation:

“THAT the correspondence received from the Town of Fort Erie regarding Capital Gains Tax on Primary Residence, be endorsed.”

Please note that all recommendations made by the Committee are subject to ratification at the next Council meeting of the Township of Scugog, scheduled to take place on June 28, 2021.

Should you have any concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Becky Jamieson
Director of Corporate Services/Municipal Clerk
Encl.

Township of Scugog, 181 Perry St., PO Box 780, Port Perry, ON L9L 1A7
Telephone: 905-985-7346 Fax: 905-985-9914
www.scugog.ca
cc: Carol Schofield, Dipl.M.A. Manager, Town of Fort Erie, Manager, Legislative Services/Clerk
All Members of Parliament
All Members of Provincial Parliament
The Regional Municipality of Niagara
Ontario Municipalities
Community Services

Legislative Services

June 1, 2021
File #120203

The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau
Prime Minister
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6
Justin.trudeau@parl.gc.ca

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1
premier@ontario.ca

Honourable and Dear Sirs:

Re: Capital Gains Tax on Primary Residence

The Municipal Council of the Town of Fort Erie at its meeting of May 31, 2021 passed the following resolution:

Whereas primary residences are currently exempt from a capital gains tax, and

Whereas currently secondary and additional non-primary properties are subject to capital gains, and

Whereas the Federal Government is currently looking into a primary residence capital gains tax as they have recognized that affordable housing has become a serious issue in Canada, and

Whereas smaller communities including the Town of Fort Erie are seeing unprecedented higher selling prices that are outpacing prices in larger cities, and

Whereas many hard-working Canadians who have only a primary residence with no additional non-primary homes count on their home equity as financial aid to apply to upsizing or downsizing their home depending on their personal situation, and

Whereas a change in taxation to primary residences would be a significant financial blow to Canadians and would create an unfair, two-tiered taxation which could lead to depleted savings, inter-generational disparities, disparities among diverse groups such as seniors who may have a significant portion of their savings vested in their primary residence, as well as, reducing the ability of home ownership thereby a further, higher need for rentals, and

Whereas the Federal government could look at other means to slow down the rapidly escalating housing costs to improve housing affordability;

...2
Now therefore be it resolved,

That: The Federal Government cease further consideration of eliminating capital gains tax exemptions on primary residences, and further

That: A copy of this resolution be circulated to The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau, The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, All Members of Parliament, All Members of Provincial Parliament, The Regional Municipality of Niagara, and all Municipalities, for their support.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours very truly,

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

c.c. All Members of Parliament
     All Members of Provincial Parliament
     The Regional Municipality of Niagara
     Ontario Municipalities
June 11, 2021

Premier of Ontario
Hon. Doug Ford
Legislative Building
Queen’s Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1A1

Honorable Premier:

RE: Resolution Passed by Woolwich Township Council – City of Kitchener Resolution:
Housing Support for People Experiencing Homelessness

This letter is to inform you that the Council of the Township of Woolwich endorsed the following resolution at their meeting held on June 8, 2021:

That the Council of the Township of Woolwich endorse the following resolution from the City of Kitchener passed on Monday, May 17, 2021 regarding housing support funding for people experiencing homelessness:

That the City of Kitchener support the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and other area municipalities in their collective call for funding to respond to the urgent and growing need for housing support funding to end homelessness in Waterloo Region, as outlined in Region of Waterloo report CSD-HOU-21-06 – Housing Support Funding to End Homelessness, dated May 11, 2021; and further,

That Kitchener City Council request the provincial government to dedicate specific and sustained health funding for housing supports to help people experiencing homelessness achieve housing stability and recover from homelessness; and finally,

That the City Clerk be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; the Honourable Christine Elliott, Minister of Health; the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO); the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association (OMSSA); the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM); local Members of the Provincial Legislature (MPPs); Federal Members of Parliament (MPs); and area municipalities within Waterloo Region.
And further that the endorsement of the City of Kitchener resolution by the Council of the Township of Woolwich be forwarded to the Premier of Ontario, the local MP and MPP, to the Association of Municipalities in Ontario and to the Clerks in the Region of Waterloo.

Should you have any questions, please contact Alex Smyth, by email at asmyth@woolwich.ca or by phone at 519-669-6004.

Yours truly,

Val Hummel
Municipal Clerk
Township of Woolwich

cc. Tim Louis, MP Kitchener-Conestoga
    Mike Harris, MPP Kitchener Conestoga
    President of AMO
    Clerks in the Region of Waterloo