

Grey County Federation of Agriculture

446 10th St., Hanover, Ontario N4N 1P9
519-364-3050 or 1-800-275-9551

Grey County Planning Department
Linda Swanson
linda.swanston@grey.ca

re: Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP)

After reading through the draft action plan, Grey County Federation of Agriculture (GCFA) noticed that the climate change action plan indicates and outlines some objectives as they relate to farms but it isn't clear enough to understand what might be the actions and implications for farmers. Ideally, we would like to be consulted directly on any specific actions that are being considered so that we can provide specific feedback on behalf of our 2000+ farm family members.

The report references a theme in support of transition to regenerative agricultural practices, as this term is variously used by many to describe farming protocols which are not well defined; we would want to ensure that the details are reflective of the practical matters of "transition". It would be helpful if the report were more specific about what does "regenerative agriculture" mean.

We think it's important that the report not position Grey Farms as the "main problem" and the focus of the fix as it relates to climate change solutions. Farmers should be positioned as equal stakeholders with all businesses and individuals in Grey County. There are opportunities to do more but some acknowledgment about the work done already by the farm sector is important as this report targets agriculture to fix climate change. We would like to see farmers continue to be engaged in all stages of the process.

Respectfully,

Dianne Booker
GCFA President

Grey County Agricultural Services Centre
Box 463, 206 Toronto St S, Unit 3
Markdale, ON
N0C 1H0
519-986-3756
lorie@greyagservices.ca

To Whom It May Concern,

Grey County Agricultural Services is glad to have been asked to be part of the review process for the Grey County Climate Action Plan. We are eager to continue to provide any support possible as the County and Committee continue to develop and implement this plan. Grey Ag Services has a well-developed network within the agricultural community through which we will happily engage producers and agribusiness as requested. Thank you for allowing us to be a part of this effort!

To provide comprehensive and expert feedback from the agricultural sector, we reached out to contacts through OMAFRA, the OFA, and local producers for their thoughts. Our comments are a summary of what we gathered from those sources.

The point most voiced by respondents was concern for the tone of the Action Plan. Agriculture is based in, influenced by, and part of, nature. It should be clearly communicated that agriculture will be part of our solution. The agricultural industry is essential to food and resource production, and must be supported in sustainable growth, not demonized as the major source of problems!

Strategies 13, 15, and 16 are implemented, or are initiatives supported by programs currently. It is encouraging to see the alignment of County priorities and current farm practices as a starting point to this action plan. However, the likelihood of reaching target reduction potentials is called to question when strategies are already in action. If the actions are not new, will the reduction be the same as predicted? More research on current farming practices needed, to identify areas where an impact really could be made.

We also hope that the County will support programs already aligned with their strategies, rather than creating their own. Promoting or incentivizing programs that are currently established would meet the same goals and unify efforts between the County and outside agricultural programs. If the committee would like assistance with identifying current programs, and connecting with stakeholders, Grey Ag Services would be very glad to help! We have a large and well established network to draw on.

Concerns have been noted about Strategy #14. This was previously attempted in Grey County and was ultimately unsuccessful. Careful research should be done on why that was the outcome, and whether biogas digesters are actually an appropriate fit for our area.

Other needs highlighted included:

- The need for an agricultural plastics recycling program
- The need for better rural internet
- The need for more local abattoirs in Grey County. There are currently four in total, which limits local meat production – wait lists for local abattoirs can be months to years long

Overall, the County needs to begin with a better understanding of the agricultural practices currently happening in Grey. Having better representation of agriculture on the Task Force and Committees would be an excellent place to begin building this understanding, so that a truly effective plan can be built. With almost 50% of the County's GHG emissions stated as coming from agriculture, it is imperative that this aspect of the plan be done right from the beginning if the County's mitigation goals are to be met.

It must also be kept in mind that farmers need to be meaningfully consulted on any policy decisions that will impact agricultural production. No policies or changes should limit a farmers' ability to compete in a global marketplace and the best way to align with farmers is to include them in the decision making. Please consider adding enough agricultural representatives to your committee to balance the importance of the role that agriculture plays in reaching your goals.

In closing, we'd like to commend the County on this massive undertaking, and the ambitious goals that have been set. We understand that a Climate Change Action Plan is no small undertaking and would like to provide support in any way possible.

Thank you for your efforts, we look forward to working together in the future!

The Staff at Grey County Agricultural Services



Feedback - Grey County Draft Climate Change Action Plan

Jessica Linthorne – Director, Clean Energy Frontier

Chad Richards – Director, Net Zero Partnerships

November 15th, 2021

Overview

The following document has been prepared by Jessica Linthorne and Chad Richards of the Nuclear Innovation Institute (NII) for review by Linda Swanston of Grey County. The document provides feedback and general comments, as requested by Linda Swanston, on Grey County's draft [Climate Change Action Plan](#).

General Comments, Fact Checking, and Typos

After conducting a review of the action plan, the NII suggests making the following corrections:

- Pg. 18 – The action plan references the Federal Government's commitment of "reducing GHG emissions by 30 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2030 under the Paris Agreement."
 - It should be noted that the Federal Government updated their commitment under the Paris Agreement [in April of 2021](#) to: "40-45% below 2005 levels by 2030". Grey County's final Climate Change Action Plan should reflect this updated commitment.
- Pg. 19 – The action plan references the Province of Ontario's "Made-In-Ontario Plan" of 2018.
 - For clarity, the NII suggests referencing the full name of the plan as the ["Made-in-Ontario Environment Plan"](#).
- Pg. 35 – The action plan states: "While West Grey, located in Ndoes..."
 - This appears to be a typo.



Suggested Inclusions

Topic	Section	Page Number	Suggested Addition
Clean Energy Frontier / Role of the County as a clean energy leader and partnership with the Nuclear Innovation Institute	5.6.2 – Benefits to Businesses and the Local Economy	23	<p>NII proposes the inclusion of a recognition of the County’s role in clean energy production – particularly as part of the Clean Energy Frontier. Grey County Council has formally endorsed the program via a resolution from council indicating it’s support for the program. A public announcement in May 2021 further highlights this support.</p> <p>Proposed text (as a bullet point added to 5.6.2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained recognition of the County as part of the Clean Energy Frontier – highlighting the role of the region of Grey, Bruce and Huron as a clean energy leader in the province of Ontario and a hub of clean energy production. • Continue to access and leverage the knowledge, expertise and the network offered by the Nuclear Innovation Institute.



Leveraging the NII's <i>Plugging In</i> report	8.1.2 – Transition to Low-Carbon Transportation Modes (Strategy #6 – Electric Vehicle Adoption)	46 – 47	<p>The NII has produced a report titled <i>Plugging In: Why Bruce, Grey and Huron must prepare for electric vehicle future.</i></p> <p>The report presents the results of a survey the NII conducted with EV drivers in Ontario regarding their perceptions of the Bruce, Grey, Huron region as well as their preferred charging locations while travelling. With this EV tourism lens, the action plan can leverage this data and use it to develop associated strategies.</p> <p>Proposed text (as bullet points added in Strategy #6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leveraging the information contained within a recent report from the Nuclear Innovation Institute to develop a public charging infrastructure strategy in the county that aligns with the data collected on preferred charging locations. • Market the county as an EV-friendly tourism destination in public campaigns by highlighting available infrastructure.
--	---	---------	--



Creating local carbon offsets in Grey County	8.1.4 – Supporting Grey’s Agricultural Community (Strategy #16 – Facilitate Capacity Building in the Agricultural Community)	55	<p>Through the NII’s Net Zero Partnerships program, the NII seeks to connect the nuclear sector with other key sectors in our regional economy. Namely, the Carbon Offset Coalition provides an opportunity through which groups can submit ideas for decarbonization in the region.</p> <p>Proposed text (as bullet points added in Strategy #16):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connecting key sectors of the regional economy on decarbonization initiatives, including highlighting the opportunity for local carbon sequestration and other on-farm decarbonization projects through the Carbon Offset Coalition initiative launched by the Nuclear Innovation Institute and Bruce Power. • Making use of key community resources like the Nuclear Innovation Institute with respect to decarbonization strategies.
Clean Energy Promotion	8.1.6 – Renewable Energy (Strategy #20 – Renewable Energy Policy)	60	<p>Experts agree that to reach net zero emissions by the year 2050, we will need a strong mix of clean energy resources including renewables, nuclear power and various forms of energy storage systems. To reflect this</p>



			<p>reality, the NII proposes amendment of Strategy #20 to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Encourage the development of clean energy in Grey County by providing clear and streamlined land use polices, bylaws, regulations, permitting, and procedures. <p>As part of the clean energy policy, the following components will also be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of existing bylaws and policies for barriers to clean energy development. - Collaboration with local utilities to establish a landing page that provides clear direction on the procedures, regulations and permits required to develop different types of renewable energy projects including but not limited to wind, solar, nuclear, energy storage and geoexchange systems.
--	--	--	---



5 November 2021

Linda Swanson
Grey County Planning Department

Re: Feedback on Grey County Draft Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP)

The Bruce Grey Poverty Task Force provides the following response to Grey County's Draft Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) and ways that we can be engaged in its implementation. In response to the County's request for feedback on the draft Action Plan.

We support the vision outlined in this Action Plan and the Recolour Grey plans to *"create a more prosperous, sustainable, and healthier future in Grey that is equitable, accessible, and inclusive of urban and rural lifestyles."*

1. Does the draft Climate Change Action Plan reflect your priorities? What should we do first?

We need to consider the deep interconnection between poverty and climate change.

We agree with your statement - "The impacts of climate change tend to be larger on more vulnerable populations and reinforce existing demographic inequities, highlighting an unfortunate commonality between climate change and COVID-19." ([Grey County Draft CCAP](#), pg. 25)

- People with low income have very little savings and ability to adapt to increased costs of living. The newly [proposed](#) general minimum wage of \$15.00/hr effective January 1st, 2022, raises the rate from \$14.35 but it does not come close to paying a Living Wage. In 2019, [Grey Bruce's Living Wage](#) was calculated at \$18.39.
- People's ability to relocate to secure jobs and affordable housing requires resources that many people with low income do not currently possess. People who are already affected by food insecurity, will find it even more difficult to put food on the table if climate change impacts food availability like the pandemic has.

We agree that "It is for that reason that as we continue to try and learn from this pandemic, we need to, at the same time, identify ways in which we can apply these learnings in the fight against climate change." ([Grey County Draft CCAP](#), pg. 25)

- The data collected by [Food Bruce Grey](#) reflects an increase in the number of people accessing community meal programs and food banks under the pandemic. But while the pandemic lockdown has lifted we have not seen a decrease in usage but rather numbers are increasing and new families are accessing these services.
- The Rentsafe [research](#) we have participated in shows that many people with low income live in unsafe or live in homes which are unequipped with technologies like air conditioners,

purifiers and weatherproof windows or affordable heating systems that would help mitigate the worst impacts of extreme weather.

- Residents with low income in Grey Bruce, simply don't have the same purchasing power to care for their health in ways that middle-class Grey Bruce residents might. Residents have more health problems than their wealthier peers, and are less likely to have ready access to health care.

People's ability to decide fundamental questions about life, livelihood and well-being requires a freedom from poverty, intolerance, persecution and other forms of human deprivation.

2. What's your reaction to the draft GHG reduction targets?

We support reduction targets that also benefit low income communities.

For example, efforts to transition to low-carbon transportation modes and intercommunity transit projects.

- Strategy # 8 - to create a rural bus, ride share and on-demand transit program (Grey County Draft CCAP) - that is accessible and affordable would benefit low income households to access employment, education, food and other household needs.
- Whereas, without subsidies, the transition to electric vehicles would be prohibitive for these households under the current price structures.

3. How do you want to be engaged in implementing the County Climate Action Plan? How can we implement these strategies to deliver the most community benefit (e.g. create jobs, advance reconciliation, improve public health etc.)?

The Poverty Task Force would support these strategies/implementation by:

Making the case for Public Transportation

- Support awareness and education campaign on the shift to public transportation in communities that have relied heavily on individual vehicles for transportation.
- Identify and support analysis with target potential users of public transportation routes, fees, etc. to support uptake from low-income communities.

Advocating for Efficient and Affordable Energy

- Provide data on energy poverty in Grey Bruce generated by partners supporting people who live in inefficient and substandard housing.
- Continue to advocate for improved housing and energy efficiency in rental units and homes.
- Continue to support community members who are experiencing energy poverty¹ to access interim financial supports for utilities until more efficient energy systems are in place.

¹ In Ontario, energy poverty is defined as households that struggle to meet their energy needs and that use a disproportionate amount of their income for home heating and electricity. (Grey County Draft CCAP, 2021)

Promoting models for food waste reduction and diversion

- Continue to support/expand commercial kitchens that use excess food from fruit and vegetable markets, grocery stores and growers to provide community meals for people in need.
- Continue to promote and support community gardens, food forests and gleaning opportunities.
- Collect data on food waste diversion through foodbrucegrey.com. Almost 60 tonnes of food have been diverted from grocery stores to community meal programs through foodrescue.ca in Grey Bruce.
- Advocate for land use plans to include community gardens and food forests in County-owned housing units, schools and community centres in Grey Bruce.
- Support and participate in any working group or committees to address barriers to increased local food consumption in the County.

GREY BRUCE CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK

October 27, 2021

Linda Swanston, Manager of Climate Change Initiatives

Dear Linda,

We respectfully submit our Response to the Draft Grey CCAP and thank members of the Climate Change Task Force, the Internal and External Working Groups and the Project Team for their work and for the opportunity to add our recommendations.

Many of our recommendations are directed towards taking full advantage of Grey's rural nature in order to meet, and even exceed, both corporate and community targets. Opportunities abound to reduce our GHG emissions through such means as increasing carbon sequestration, encouraging and incentivizing regenerative agriculture and other nature-based solutions, moving to renewable energy and integrating the principles of smart planning as our settlement areas grow.

We are enthusiastic about your proposal to create an Implementation Working Group. As the County proceeds to Milestones 4 and 5 of the PCP program, it will benefit from widening the net of expertise to a multi-disciplinary group including experts in their fields from both inside and outside the community. GBCAN is eager to participate. We have, over our two-year history, gathered together considerable volunteer energy and know-how in the area of climate change.

We look forward to your response to our document. If any questions arise from our input, we would be happy to have an engaging dialogue with you.

Yours truly,

John Anderson, Bob Gray, Joyce Hall, Vitold Kreutzer, and Nikki May

CCAP Study Group, GBCAN

Response to the Draft Grey CCAP
By the
Grey Bruce Climate Action Network Study Group
October 27, 2021

GBCAN Study Group

John Anderson is a retired marine scientist living in Grey County for the past twelve years. He serves as scientific advisor on climate change issues to a number of groups and co-produced a local climate change film: "Resilience: Transforming Our Community". John also sits on a number of local climate action groups including GBCAT, GBCAC and CATOS.

After spending 20 years in the chemical industry, **Nikki May** switched gears and took a degree in forest restoration. Since then she worked as a coordinator with conservation communities across Carolinian Canada to produce educational pamphlets on the natural areas and assets of that region. She also led the update of the Ontario Tallgrass Recovery Plan and drafted parts of, and edited the Lambton County Natural Heritage Study before leaving these projects in 2010.

Vitold Kreutzer, semi-retired, avid gardener living in Chatsworth with a long history of environmental, renewable energy, sustainability and health advocacy. Bringing the Spirit, Mother Nature and Her rhythms and the health of all into everyday thinking and habits is my goal. Relevant education includes post-graduate work in math, statistics, natural science and physics.

Joyce Hall is a retired Public Relations professional community college instructor. She has worked as an advocate in the areas of tenants rights, electoral reform and climate change. She is currently chair of the Grey Highlands Climate Action Group and Co-Chair of Just Earth, which lobbies the federal government on climate change.

Bob Gray is a retired park naturalist and district ecologist. He has worked in Grey and Bruce Counties since 1977 and has resided in Georgian Bluffs all of that time. He is a long time maple syrup producer, and was research chair for the Ontario Maple Syrup Producers' Association.

With special thanks to:

Odette Bartnicki, a teacher and educational leader who has lived in both Grey and Bruce Counties since retirement. She has served as an elected member of both municipal and county councils and continues to work with various groups to increase awareness and to encourage others, including elected officials, community service groups and individuals, to take the necessary steps to reduce and eliminate the causes of Climate Change. Odette is committed to ensuring a sustainable future.

And many other members of GBCAN from Climate Action Groups in Grey County.

NOTE: Our recommendations and notes appear after quoted citations from the Plan.

1. Executive Summary: “Corporate target: 20% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, relative to 2018 levels. 60% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, relative to 2018 levels.

Community target: 15% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, relative to 2018 levels. 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, relative to 2018 levels.”

1.0 GBCAN recommendation: While we understand and appreciate that targets are going to be increased, we believe the Grey County should match or exceed targets set by other levels of government. Federal targets are much higher than ours, 40 to 50% below 2005 levels by 2030 and net zero by 2050. Given that, according to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, over 50% of emissions are under the direct influence or control of local governments, our targets need to be at least in line.

We note that the 50% FCM estimate does not distinguish between targets set by the County and those set by lower tier governments. We assume the County will put the CCAP into effect at the lower tiers to the full extent of its mandate. The plan should provide clarity on County targets to enable accountable measurement.

5.5 Grey County’s Commitment to Climate Change (p.20)

“· Updating Asset Management Plans

As part of the Provincial mandate, the County has updated their Asset Management Plan to include climate change considerations as part of risk management.”

5.5 GBCAN recommendation: We recommend that Grey County include natural assets/green infrastructure in their Asset Management planning. Utilizing existing natural infrastructure can replace the need for ‘grey’ infrastructure such as flood control structures, save money, reduce GHG emissions. Natural assets also sequester carbon as a bonus.

NOTE 1: The County is already under a provincial requirement for all Ontario municipalities to include green infrastructure in Asset Management Plans by 2023. The green infrastructure requirement, in existence since 2018, is phased-in and specifies that municipalities will evaluate,

enumerate and develop a budgetary requirement for replacement of trees etc. by 2023. Funding support has already begun.

NOTE 2: Natural assets such as wetlands and woodlands reduce flooding, filter air, build healthy soils. Natural assets can also be used instead of flood control structures or water treatment plants, replacing “Grey infrastructure” usually built with cement and steel requiring construction, fuel use, manufacturing, etc. All these processes, plus mining of materials, emit GHGs. Even building a stormwater pond to replace a wetland produces GHG emissions. Utilizing our existing natural assets-- building around them and integrating them into our planning--would reduce GHG emissions. In addition, natural assets sequester carbon, thus amplifying the advantage of using them and also improve in performance with age rather than deteriorating as does grey infrastructure.

Forest Management Plan:

“Grey County has recently updated its 20-year plan for how it manages the County-owned forests. The forests are managed using good forest management techniques while providing multiple recreational opportunities”

GBCAN recommendation: Evaluating our forests for their contribution to GHG absorption/carbon sequestration, and the value of leaving them to grow to maximize that absorption, should be taken into account, especially for mature trees in existing natural woodlots and hedgerows. The future value of forests left uncut should be factored into potential GHG reductions for the County. The sequestering value could be substantial if added in “Afforestation Strategy.” Currently the 43 County forests are not managed according to this strategy. If the harvest cycle is managed for sequestration, the County would show leadership to private owners. We recommend that the type of tree be considered when planting for sequestration purposes, as variation exists among species. (See attached, “Method for Calculating Carbon Sequestration by Trees in Urban and Suburban Settings.”)

5.5.1 Role of local and regional governments

“Local governments have the tools and mechanisms that are needed to design and implement approaches that mitigate the causes of climate change.”

5.5.1 GBCAN recommendation: Not all local municipalities in Grey County have a climate action plan. We recommend that, to bring them all up to speed, the County create an information exchange body to share ideas, data, low cost incentive programs, communication strategies, etc.

5.5.2 Vision Statement and GHG Targets (p. 22)

“The County recognizes the value of our charmed and irreplaceable natural setting. Residents value their cultural heritage...”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Insert “natural and” before “cultural.”

“The County of Grey is a clear and visible climate leader; taking actions to address climate change throughout municipal operations and in the community. By embracing energy conservation, **innovative solutions**, promoting awareness, and working with member municipalities, residents, and businesses, the County is creating a more prosperous, sustainable, and healthier future in Grey that is equitable, accessible, and inclusive of urban and rural lifestyles.”

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Specify 'nature-based solutions', to be more specific than “innovative solutions.” Grey is in a very good position to capitalize on its rich natural heritage while we still have it.

“Corporate target: 20% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, relative to 2018 levels. 60% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, relative to 2018 levels. Community target: 15% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, relative to 2018 levels. 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, relative to 2018 levels.”

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Increase targets to be in line with federal targets. In fact, the inclusion of sequestration opportunities can add significantly to the targets set in the plan.

5.6.1 Benefits to Community Members

“· Our collective impact on climate change is reduced resulting in healthier local and global environments.”

GBCAN Recommendation: Implement a clear measurement and reporting framework for benefits, with timelines.

5.6.2 Benefit to business... (p 23)

“More diverse, resilient, and competitive local economy as other regions in Ontario and Canada begin to shift towards a more low-carbon economy.”

GBCAN recommendation 1: Remove “more” before “low carbon economy.”

“More economic growth in the agricultural industry as a result of more efficient agricultural practices (e.g., use of technology to support efficiency).”

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Insert the following after “use of technology”: “and/or the use of regenerative agricultural practices to sequester carbon in the soil” and continue “to support efficiency.”

“A growing tourism industry resulting from the expansion of electric vehicle charging stations, conservation of our natural heritage, and investment in more sustainable practices.”

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Amend to read:

“A growing tourism industry resulting from the expansion of electric vehicle charging stations, conservation of our natural heritage, and investment in more sustainable practices resulting from creating visible evidence on our roads and in our hamlets of a *Sustainable Grey* brand.”

Insert after “conservation” “and interpretation of...” to read “conservation and interpretation of our natural heritage....”

NOTE: A recent study by the Greenbelt Fund examining tourist activities in 2020 showed that the number one activity was hiking and number two was visiting natural wonders. Economically both activities returned \$910 per group travelling to the local economy. It pays in tourism dividends to retain and promote activities in green spaces and nature while helping to manage climate change.

5.7 Plan Approach (p 24)

GBCAN Recommendation: Update paragraph “While COVID-19...”

6.1 Current GHG Emissions

6.1.1 Profile of Community Energy and Emissions (p. 27, 28)

“Reducing energy consumption throughout the community, whether it is in the building or transportation sector, will reduce the cost that Grey’s

residents and businesses spend on energy each year *and keep* energy dollars within the community.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Add “could”: “and COULD keep energy dollars within the community.”

“The energy consumed throughout the County in 2018 resulted in an overall community energy expenditure of \$257,744,558, which on an individual basis is \$2,670 per person per year.”

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Develop a cost reduction argument to use as a selling point of the CCAP. Transitioning to low carbon energy sources will save dollars.

“Commercial and institutional buildings contribute most to energy use and costs in the building sector using 56 percent of the energy and 68 percent of energy expenditures, however, the residential sector generates more emissions due to higher natural gas usage in homes, which per gigajoule of energy has a much higher GHG emissions intensity.”

GBCAN Recommendation 3: In this regard, we point to the waste of dollars in approving Enbridge natural gas pipeline extension/doubling. We need to cease approval of new natural gas builds and transition to electricity from to zero emission carbon sources.

NOTE: Later on in the plan it is clearly stated that heat pumps in residences are to be encouraged for GHG reduction, and with Ontario’s favorable low-emissions electrical power grid, this makes even more sense.

GBCAN Recommendation 4: Regarding municipal energy use graphic (p. 30), update calculations to show how much GHG emissions were saved by Zoom meetings and telecommuting in 2020-2021 to promote continuation of these practices where appropriate.

GBCAN Recommendation 5: Given that streetlights are such a small fraction of the total emissions, converting outdoor lights should be lower on the list of corporate strategies, putting a priority on higher emission projects for greater impact.

Community Strategies 8.1

Strategy #1: Retrofits Residential (p 42)

“Target Participation Rate: By 2030, 17 percent of existing residential floor space is retrofitted or roughly 12,500 structures, and 20 percent of residential units utilize air source heat pumps.”

GBCAN Recommendation: Increase targets to align with previous federal and provincial targets. As per the Implementation Plan, the FCM Green Municipal Fund can be used to apply for dollars for retrofits.

Strategy #2: Commercial/Institutional Building Energy Efficiency Retrofit Program (p 42)

“Target Participation Rate: By 2030, 17 percent of the share of commercial and institutional buildings are retrofitted or roughly 171 structures, and 10 percent of commercial and institutional sector utilize air/ground source heat pumps. By 2050, 65 percent of the share of commercial and institutional buildings are retrofitted or roughly 660 structures, and 25 percent of commercial and institutional sector utilize air/ground source heat pumps.”

GBCAN Recommendation: Consider raising targets.

Strategy #3: Green Standard for new buildings (p 43)

“Target Participation Rate: By 2035, all new buildings are constructed to be net-zero ready and are at least 80 percent more efficient than new buildings built in the baseline year. Annual Reduction Potential at 2050

Energy Consumption (GJ); GHG Emissions (tCO₂e); Energy Cost (\$CAD): 524,700; 17,500; \$ 16,557,200”

GBCAN Recommendation: Fast track these targets. There are excellent initiatives with many municipalities to look to, including Toronto Green Standard.

NOTE: Toronto’s greenhouse gas reduction targets, based on 1990 levels:

- ☐ 30 per cent by 2020
- ☐ 65 per cent by 2030
- ☐ Net zero by 2050, or sooner

Achieving these targets will require transformational changes in how we live, work, commute, and build.

8.1.2 Transition to Low Carbon Transportation Modes (p 45)

Strategy #6: Electric Vehicle adoption

“Target Participation Rate: By 2030, 20 percent of all vehicles registered in Grey County are electric vehicles. By 2050, 80 percent of all vehicles registered in Grey County are electric vehicles”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Include hydrogen fuel cell technology as well as electric as this technology becomes available locally.” Adjust target as follows: “By 2050, 80 percent of all vehicles...*are zero emissions vehicles.*”

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Plan energy sources with this technology in mind: Smart charging stations work in such a way that electric batteries can be charged during low peak hours and then power the grid when needed; these batteries can then be used as a power source for a residence or, of course, used as fuel for the vehicle instead of a fossil fuel

NOTE: With electric vehicles to allow for more efficient and effective use of our existing grid in the near future, do we need an energy storage facility in Meaford if we are going to have so many car batteries to charge each night?!

Strategy #7: Active Participation

“Installation of visually appealing and colourful bicycle racks at all municipally owned properties; engagement with students from local community colleges and schools to participate in the design process.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Insert “*including parks*” before “all municipally owned properties.”

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Increase other bicycle supportive infrastructure: bike lanes, signage for bikes and information on biking.

Strategy #8: Rural Bus, Ride Share and On-demand Transit Program (p. 48)

“As part of the rural bus and ride share strategy, the following supporting components will also be included:

Monitoring of existing Grey Transit Route (GTR) Service and assessment of opportunities for further expansion of the service.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Include timely service to Toronto and other main centres south to link with GO service in Orangeville on a convenient and coordinated schedule.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Require all new bus purchases to be electric and/or zero emissions.

“Target participation rate and energy and emission reduction potential included in quantification of Strategy 8”.

GBCAN recommendation 3: Refer to a page number for quantification.

8.1.3 Divert Waste from Landfills and Promote a Circular Economy (p 49)

“e. The CCAP strategies build upon the waste policies in Recolour Grey by developing initiatives to divert waste from landfills include recycling, re-purposing of materials, reusing materials, and composting organic waste.”

GBCAN Recommendation: Add “reducing food waste” to the list of four methods of diverting waste from landfills. Methods can include food rescue apps such as the one used by Second Harvest

Strategy #9: Collaborate with member municipalities to support Waste Diversion (p 50)

“Advancement of organic waste diversion across the County. This can include the promotion of and support for backyard composting, encouraging pick-up of organic curbside waste for non-rural residents (member municipalities or private sector), as well as facilitation of education and awareness programs.”

Target Participation Rate: By 2030, there is a 10 percent decrease in waste going to landfill compared to the baseline. By 2050, there is a 30 percent decrease in waste going to landfill compared to the baseline.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Move to zero organic waste in landfills as soon as feasible. This is “low-hanging fruit,” entirely doable, and effective in reducing GHG emissions from methane. Carrots are good, but sticks may be needed: stronger measures to help people to take the issue of improper disposal of organic waste as seriously as smoking as a violation of community health.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Targets are low. They should be at the very least tied into the federal government’s targets.

Strategy #10: Re-Use It Centre & Re-Build It Centre

GBCAN Recommendation: Habitat for Humanity is identified in the implementation plan and is an excellent partner. Consider other ideas such as swap days and tool sharing reduce consumption and discarding to build community morale around climate change.

Strategy #11: Collaborate with Member Municipalities to Support Wastewater Efficiency

“Encourage the expansion of existing and new wastewater treatment plant biodigesters to include additional organics sources (agricultural waste, household organics, and yard waste).”

NOTE: The Georgian Bluffs biodigester is not operating to capacity, so pooling capacity between communities could be important for some disposal uses.

Strategy #12: Waste Reduction Education and Awareness Program (p 52)

“As part of the waste and reduction education and awareness strategy, the following supporting components will also be included:”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: To the existing waste reduction components add: Incentivizing repair shops and repairable, long-lasting appliances to diminish disposable thinking,

GBCAN Recommendation 2: In conjunction with Strategy #9, include promotion of public education and incentives to reduce food waste. And as per recommendation for Strategy #10, incentivize swapping/donating and sharing, especially of rarely used tools.

Strategy #13: Energy Efficiency Retrofits for the Farming Community

(p 53)

“As part of energy efficiency retrofits in the farming community, the following supporting components will also be included:

- Consultation with the agricultural community to establish a program design that effectively supports retrofit projects for farmers across Grey County.
- Identification of supportive technologies, including ground mounted solar photovoltaics and combined heat and power systems.
- Development of resources and tools for the agricultural community to support the identification and implementation of energy efficiency improvement in operational facilities unique to the agricultural sector, and which are made available through the County’s webpage.”

GBCAN Recommendation: Specify in the first bullet point above if the retrofits referred to are building retrofits so as to clarify where the opportunities are. The 2018 values of GHG emissions for agricultural buildings should be broken out separately (from other building retrofits) under an agricultural sector emissions total to show the decrease in emissions due to building retrofits in the ag sector separately. That way we can compare the value of doing building retrofits in the agricultural sector to doing them in County, commercial and residential buildings to determine the most bang for the retrofit buck.

8.1.4 Supporting Grey’s Agricultural Community (p 52)

GBCAN Recommendation 1: In the preamble to agricultural strategies, consider GHG emissions from vehicles and current unsustainable heavy chemical agricultural practices (“agricultural mining”) and monocrop farming methods that are prominent in large scale agri-business set-ups in southern and mid-Grey County.

NOTE: The large scale mono-thinking applies to both crops and livestock and shows up in higher GHG emissions (through larger equipment, more chemicals, and greater waste by-products, etc.), lower biodiversity, and the degradation of our natural assets; for example, animal, plant and microbial species in and around soil. Consider how the CCAP can address GHG emissions due to these unsustainable practices.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Increase inspections of industrial manufacturing occurring on land zoned as agricultural which exceed what is permitted. Ensure fines imposed are substantial and prohibitive.

Strategy #14: Promote Biogas Capture and Conversion

GBCAN Recommendation: Conduct further research into the economics and long- term results of implementing this strategy in the context of Grey County, especially given the strategy's inclusion of possible investment. Include an investigation into the relative advantages of devoting effort to connect farmers to make use of biogas capture and conversion as compared to the promotion of regenerative agricultural practices that are more sustainable to promote the rebuilding of the soil and reduce the dependence on nitrogen fertilizer.

NOTE 1: Biogas Capture and Conversion is an emerging technology where research is ongoing. It allows for the conversion of CO₂ to methane to eliminate waste CO₂ which, in fact, need not exist if efficient farming practice is employed, using composted manure as fertilizer. The systems used in the production of biogas are not efficient. The technology requires taxpayer dollars. There are as yet no new methods to simplify the process and make it accessible and low cost. "Although the biogas plants operating today are able to meet some energy needs, many governments are not willing to invest in the sector." <http://www.Homebiogas.com>

NOTE 2: Regenerative Agriculture is increasingly recognized as a way to develop healthier soil and particularly and particularly to sequester GHG rather than just emitting: CBC link:
<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/agriculture-emissions-reduction-strategy-1.5993201>

GBCAN Recommendation 2: That further consideration be given to the following questions:

1. Does the annual reduction by 2050 of 7200 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent in GHG emissions take into account the loss of soil sequestration and the increase in GHG due to fertilizer usage caused by this loss of natural compost fertilizer?
2. Does anaerobic digestion and then the burning of biogas emit less CO₂ than the natural composting process in the soil, including the aerobic activity occurring from animal waste and crop residues?

3. Do the reduction calculations consider CO₂ production of transporting the waste to digesters?
4. Would proper composting result in greater and healthier yields?

Strategy #15: Promote Locally Grown Food (p 54)

“As part of promotion of locally grown food, the following supporting components will also be included: ...

Facilitation of a local food hub to connect small local businesses with producers to sell local goods.

Promotion of existing organizations and initiatives that enable the purchase of locally produced products.”

GBCAN recommendation 1: Identify and map existing sources of local food access and work with existing initiatives such as Eat Local Grey-Bruce to diversify access and make local food more easily available to working folks who don’t have time nor the money to drive around to access local food.

GBCAN recommendation 2: Include tax incentives for local food growers and tax disincentives for cash croppers and out of county landowners who are operating on a rationale of short- term benefit derived from exploiting the land, cutting down hedgerows and unsustainable farming practices.

“Target participation rate and energy and emission reduction estimate not applicable for this strategy.”

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Research current participation rates and set targets to increase participation.

Strategy #16: Facilitate Capacity Building in the Agricultural Community (p 55)

“Collaborate with Grey Agricultural Services and other regional partner organizations to establish a capacity-building network that delivers forums, training sessions, resources, and supports knowledge sharing amongst farmers in the County and beyond.”

GBCAN Recommendation1: Include “demonstration areas” in addition to training sessions. Establish a Speaker Series, bringing in experts to speak in Owen Sound and Hanover. Subjects could include changing cattle feed

to reduce greenhouse emissions, water quality issues, green building, flood dangers and flood control.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Conduct a full-scale study based on the best available agricultural science, from the University of Guelph for example, to determine the farming activities/components which have highest GHG production, setting targets that can be implemented within the County and member municipalities, researching solutions, implementing a plan, and monitoring results.

NOTE: Agriculture is our largest emitting sector by far at 44.3%. It will be important to address agricultural emissions to know what practices are the highest carbon emitters.

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Investigate opportunities to use zoning, tax and other incentives to encourage carbon sequestration/nature-based solutions.

GBCAN Recommendation 4: Include targets for this multi-pronged strategy which includes major opportunities such as increasing carbon sequestration and storage in soil, advocating to the federal and provincial government in support of carbon credits for farmers, pesticide reduction, and several educational initiatives.

GBCAN Recommendation 5: In addition to targeting agricultural land for carbon credits, include also residential, industrial recreational and institutional.

GBCAN Recommendation 6: Several of the educational components of Strategy 15 and 16 could be offered in partnership with Georgian College to take advantage of provincial funding opportunities.

NOTE: The encouragement of local colleges to participate in training relevant to addressing climate change appears in Strategy 2 “Retrofit Program” and could also figure here.

“Assessment of the feasibility of improving telecommunication and internet infrastructure to allow use of advanced computerized systems for farm management.” (Tenth bullet point)

GBCAN Recommendation 7: Include an assessment of the size of the carbon footprint of the technological “fix” involved in improving the telecommunications and internet infrastructure to allow the use of computerized systems for farm management.

GBCAN Recommendation 9: Align Strategies 14 and 16. We much prefer Strategy 16, which includes improving the manure management and nutrient loss from livestock production systems, to strategy 14, which promotes the removal and burning of manure and operates in an entirely different direction. Strategy 16 also promotes the increase in carbon sequestration, which is also at odds with strategy 14.

“Target Participation Rate

By 2030, 25 percent of all livestock waste produced in Grey County is managed under best practice guidelines.

Annual Reduction Potential at 2050: GHG Emissions (tCO₂e): 27,500 tonnes”

GBCAN Recommendation 10: Targets for GHG reduction to be achieved by other components of the strategy--for example, “support for increasing the carbon sequestration and storage in soil and farmland” to allow for tracking and motivate success.

Note: It is important to clarify how the figure of 27,500 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent GHG emissions reduction potential by 2050 was arrived at along with the criteria for best practice.

8.1.5 Land Use Planning (p 56)

“The strategies below reinforce and expand existing policies on settlement intensification, complete streets, forest management, natural heritage systems, and naturalization efforts such as native tree and shrub planting, with a specific focus on the emissions reduction potential of continued compact, mixed-use development as well as increased carbon sequestration from expanded tree canopies, and natural areas,”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Add a focus on the use of natural infrastructure wherever possible; for example, wetlands for flood control, trees for cooling, water storage and cleansing, etc., preserve trees in new developments, reduce parking space, encourage the creation of new zoning that support smart homes: smaller, off grid/carbon neutral homes.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Allocate resources to support people who must deal with mitigation strategies created by advancing climate change (such as flood preparation, contaminated or dry wells, etc.)

Strategy #17: Reforestation/Afforestation, Habitat and Biodiversity Protection (p 57)

“The approach includes developing a tree planting program that provides guidelines...”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Clarify if this program is over and above what the CAs are already doing with federal funding.

“*Critical wildlife habitats* will be prioritized, especially for pollinator species essential for a healthy agricultural sector...”

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Add to “critical wildlife habitats” this phrase: “such as wildlife corridors and endangered species habitat.”

“Inclusion of natural assets, wetlands, ecosystems within the Climate Adaptation Plan.”

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Include the dollar value of all natural assets in land transactions because the numbers would be substantial and an incentive in themselves.

Note: Since land-use planning is under county jurisdiction, you can specify the value of natural assets wherever new development is planned and incentivize conservation with tax programs on private property. Guidelines exist online for estimating the carbon sequestration of natural assets. The Escarpment Biosphere Conservancy, for example, measures and monetizes the ecological services of forests and wetlands they manage and sells carbon credits.

“...programs to promote naturalization and tree planting on institutional properties...”

GBCAN Recommendation 4: Insert after “tree” the word “preservation” to read “programs to promote naturalization and tree preservation/planting on institutional properties.”

GBCAN Recommendation 5: Include private-public partnerships with local “rewilding” businesses to demonstrate and model maximizing sequestration and food possibilities and pollinator habitat. The more public and well frequented the spaces, the better: libraries, parks, roadsides. Could replace/reduce heat-reflecting pavement in oversized public parking lots

and underutilized grey spaces or brownfields. Target also paved areas which are “dead” spaces between and around village buildings and encourage the participation of the public to create plans for beautification and greening.

GBCAN Recommendation 6: Investigate passing bylaws protecting fencerows.

NOTE: England has protected their “hedgerows”, as they are called, since 2014. Countryside hedgerows: protection and management - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) . DEFRA, the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK, even runs a stewardship grant program to encourage landowners to maintain hedgerows.

GBCAN Recommendation 7: Consider homeowner vouchers that can be used for purchasing trees.

NOTE: This is done in St. John's. The Municipal Act (2001): contains legislation which gives both upper- and lower-tier municipalities the responsibility to ensure laws and plans are in place to protect natural features, including the power to create tree by-laws (135(1)). Municipalities are allowed to prohibit or regulate the destruction or injuring of trees (135(1)), including on private land, and dictate that they shall have regard for Good Forestry Practices (135(5)). Both upper- and lower-tier municipalities can enact tree by-laws, though some restrictions exist (e.g. only lower-tier municipalities with a population greater than 10,000 can monitor and regulate tree cutting). Reference: Guiding Urban Forestry Policy: A private Tree Protection and Management Practice Guide, University of Waterloo

“Inclusion of natural assets, wetlands, ecosystems within the Climate Adaptation Plan.”

GBCAN Recommendation 8: Consider aligning language with the Provincial Policy (PPS) statement for the term for ESA (p 57). More up-to-date term would be Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs), provincially significant wetlands, etc.

“Development and enhancement of management plans for protected and *naturally sensitive areas* as well as collaboration with member municipalities on the creation of urban forest management plans.”

GBCAN Recommendation 8: Align term “naturally sensitive areas” with language from the PPS?

“Enhancement of *pollinator habitats on private lands* through the provision of guidelines, resources, and support for what, how and when to plant.”

GBCAN Recommendation 9: Insert “and public” lands following Change to “habitats on private **and public** lands ...”

Strategy #18: Compact, Mixed-Use Development in Designated Settlement Areas (p 58)

“As part of the strategy, continued support and implementation of complete street design will also be considered by municipal planners to ensure roadways are accessible and safe for all road users as well as complete communities where mixed used development allows for goods and services to be accessed efficiently from surrounding communities.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Insert “from both within the community and” before “from” to read “goods and services to be accessed efficiently from both within the community and surrounding communities.”

NOTE: Allowing walkable access to staple foods reduces the need for driving and builds community by adding to communal space.

“Further consideration will be given in Grey’s Official Plan update to zoning that supports sustainable growth principles, and that contain additional environmental, social, and economic benefits for the community, balancing community needs with financial viability.”

NOTE 1: Mayors from Squamish and Yellowknife speak in favour of mixed use zoning. Zoning changes in Squamish have been passed with no loss of development interest. Yellowknife is also building “up” and allowing for more diverse use of land by reducing zones: for example, urban agriculture so food can be grown close to home. They are competently dealing with resistance to change and [building community support](#).

NOTE 2: Regarding financial viability, continuing suburban-style sprawl as a housing model squanders precious infrastructure dollars needed for mitigation and adaptation.

As part of the compact, mixed-use development strategy, the following supporting components will also be included:...

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Eliminate minimum house size across the County, as has been done in Grey Highlands.

NOTE: Small older houses in Grey are getting a lot of potential purchaser traffic, according to real estate agents. “Sustainable” goes with both “small” and “affordable.” Expanding housing options impacts on affordability and therefore on economic viability in attracting workers to jobs in Grey County.

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Consider how the County can influence reduced house size and encourage planning the use of communal space for recreation, storage of personal goods and socializing to maximize effective land use.

GBCAN Recommendation 4: Reduce paved areas in new housing developments to reduce heat--for example, shared parking areas for housing clusters--and maximize climate-friendly and more communal land use.

GBCAN Recommendation 5: Allow for full consultation on dispensation of publicly owned lands, as these parcels are opportunities for community control of GHG emissions and, once sold, are irretrievable.

NOTE: Anne-Marie Shaw, Director of Housing for Grey County, speaks in favour of land banks to remove land out of speculative markets.

GBCAN Recommendation 6: Include community/future users in developing communities, as has been pioneered by eco-communities such as Ecovillage at Ithaca and Glassworks in Owen Sound.

NOTE: The housing crisis has created an accelerating wealth gap between owners and renters. The wealth gap increases social alienation.

“Target participation rate and energy and emission reduction estimate not applicable for this strategy.”

GBCAN Recommendation 7: Consider including a plan to establish targets. This crucial area is under County control and so estimated values would be a great incentive to keep them top and centre of planners’ minds.

8.1.6 Renewable Energy (p 59)

“As renewable energy technologies such as wind and solar do not require fuel and can be directly connected to the point of consumption, they

provide energy independence and security benefits by insulating the community....”

GBCAN Recommendation: In addition to “independence and security benefits” add “human health benefits...” The rapid reduction/elimination of GHG emissions is imperative to minimize the effects of climate change.

NOTE: “Security” could be called “resilience,” a term commonly used in climate change science.

Strategy #19: Solar Photovoltaic Program (p 59)

GBCAN Recommendation 1: In addition to ground-mounted solar installations contracted to hydro, create an inventory of solar installations of all types including off-grid, mini-grid and micro-grid systems that are carbon friendly methods of protecting residents from electrical grid power interruptions.

NOTE: We might find that our current solar power inventory is far greater than we thought, and the participation rates (targets) of the plan can be adjusted accordingly.

“Prioritization of ground mounted solar on brownfields, parking lots, and less ecologically sensitive lands, including quality agricultural, special agricultural lands, naturalization areas, and greenfields.”

NOTE: Solar panels can be raised so as to double land use. There are pictures on the internet of cows grazing under panels.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Encourage farmers to install solar power equipment as an income generator. In Germany farmers are receiving 25% of their income from generating and selling renewable energy to the grid. This has been made possible because the German national government created a policy environment that enabled local renewable energy producers to flourish.

“Target Participation Rate: ...There are 10 MW of ground mounted solar installed throughout the County.”

“By 2050 there are 30 MW of ground mounted solar installed throughout the County.”

Note: In fact, we have far more than 50 MW already installed in the County as of now. Does the plan mean to say that there will be 10 **more** MW of ground-mounted solar installed by 2030 and 30MW more by 2050?

“By 2050...15 percent of the available residential roof space has solar panels and 25 percent of available commercial and institutional roof space has solar photovoltaic panels installed.”

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Consider working with Georgian College to train installers as the most significant limitation to reaching these targets in our area are a lack of competent installers and technicians and a poor supply chain of CSA approved solar photovoltaic panels and solar equipment. The target of 15 percent could be raised to 50% with increasingly available expertise.

Annual Reduction Potential at 2050 energy Consumption (GJ)	GHG Emissions (tCO₂e)	Energy Cost (\$CAD)
<i>Not applicable</i>	1,100 *	\$6,666,600

Note: These figures are unclear and require further explanation. Does this figure take into account the manufacturing cost of the panels? How were the two figures in the chart arrived at given the rapidly changing state of the solar industry?

Strategy #20: Renewable Energy Policy (p 60)

“Encourage the development of renewable energy in Grey County by providing clear and streamlined land use policies, bylaws, regulations, permitting, and procedures.”

GBCAN Recommendation: Add a strategy to allow citizens of Grey access to alternatives to heat our water through the use of solar panels.

Note: Traditional ways to heat water, including natural gas, electricity, etc., create GHG emissions. In Grey, Lee Manor in Durham uses an industrial size solar thermal system that heats water for staff and residents, making use of the large square footage on their flat roof.

Strategy #22: Prevention of Shoreline Erosion (p 62)

“Develop a monitoring program that helps manage current shorelines and identify areas that are prone to erosion. As part of the prevention of shoreline erosion strategy, the following supporting components will also be

included: · Collaborate with *Conservation Authorities* to strengthen mapping and County Official Plan policies that protect Grey's shorelines."

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Specify Grey Sauble and Saugeen Valley Conservation Authorities as collaborators.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Consider adding detail as to what is being suggested as a "monitoring program"

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Cease allowing permits for homes close to shorelines. Respect shoreline as fragile transition zones and critical wildlife habitat. Also cease permitting for building on otherwise fragile landscapes (ravines, slopes, etc.) where risks of mudslides are increasing due to greater precipitation.

NOTE: We note that millions of dollars have recently been spent shoring up coastline with huge concrete blocks, cement boat ramps, and huge piles of huge rocks, to protect the homes that should never have been allowed to be built there in the first place.

Strategy #24: Conservation and Protection of Wetlands (p 62)

"Identify through mapping, areas in the County where there is *significant* wetland loss and develop a program that encourages conservation."

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Omit "significant" and consider all wetland loss as significant."

NOTE: Using "more" is code for saying if a wetland is not classed as provincially significant, then it is not worth saving. This is morally and ecologically wrong. If all wetlands in Grey County have not yet been evaluated, then they do not exist in planning terms and have no protection as wetlands under The Planning Act. There may be some provincially significant wetlands that have not yet been evaluated.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: All this costs money. Advocate restoring funding at the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, who were doing the wetland inventories before cuts.

"As part of the conservation and protection of wetlands strategy, the following supporting components will also be included:"

GBCAN Recommendation 3: To the two existing bullet points consider adding the following: "strengthen policy and protection for remaining local

wetlands”; and “work with ALUS to compensate farmers for protected wetlands on farm properties, use tax incentive programs such as MFTIP for wetlands, etc.”

8.2 Aggregated Emission Reduction Potential (Community Strategies) (p 63)

“The current set of strategies would reduce emissions by 259,330 tonnes CO₂e annually by 2050. Emissions would be reduced by 15 percent by 2030 and by 27 percent by 2050 below the 2018 baseline (based on the business-as-planned projection). The strategies outlined allow Grey to meet the target identified for the community in 2030, however the current set of strategies would also leave a significant gap in achieving the 2050 target by 23 percent. The County recognizes that the strategies outlined in the CCAP set Grey on a pathway to achieving its targets that will include regular planning review in order to leverage future opportunities and make adjustments as required to meet the County’s 2050 reduction target.”

NOTE: Failing to meet 2050 targets by 23% and looking forward to future adjustments to do so is not acceptable in the face of the crisis.

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Establish a committee of multi-disciplinary, clear-thinking experts to forge real progress on a continuous basis, not just every five years.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Include in our emissions reduction calculations those strategies which take advantage of the massive potential of Grey’s huge natural assets.

NOTE: The graph, Figure 18, entitled “GHG Emission Reductions from Community Strategies,” needs to include our major rural advantage in reduction of GHG emissions. Given that 44% of our GHG emissions are from agriculture, it is important to include in our emissions reductions graphics/math the major advantage afforded by employing nature-based solutions such as sequestration and the promotion of regenerative farming to reduce GHG emissions. According to the graph, the majority of GHG reductions by 2050 of 60 to 70% depends on one element, electric vehicle adoption. The success or failure of this plan is totally dependent on this target level.

8.3 Corporate Strategies

8.3.1 Stationary Energy (p 65)

Strategy #1: Outdoor Lighting Conversion to LEDs

“Encourage member municipalities to retrofit existing outdoor lighting, including streetlighting, traffic signals, decorative lighting, and park lighting, from incandescent bulbs to light emitting diode (LED) bulbs, building on Grey County’s past experience with retrofitting County owned outdoor lighting to LED.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Assess each location so as not increase levels of lighting where already adequate.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Remedy situations where on the main roads of Grey the lights become much brighter so that, even though they are focused down, the reflection off the road is so high that dark sky modifications are negated.

NOTE 1: Reflections are also annoying and possibly dangerous to drivers to encounter these suddenly bright lights which interfere with their night vision.

NOTE 2: This first strategy results in savings that are quite a low number and have been largely achieved already.

“Target participation rate and energy and emission reduction estimate not applicable for this strategy.”

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Include targets.

Strategy #2: Operations and Maintenance (p 66)

“Completion of energy audits on County owned facilities and buildings to identify areas with the greatest opportunity for energy efficiency improvements.... Development and implementation of energy management plans that include reactive, preventative, and predictive maintenance to prevent common sources of energy waste in building energy.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Include, and factor, in energy efficiency retrofits for institutional buildings.

“Target Participation Rate: By 2030, 15 percent of existing buildings have had increased operational and maintenance improvements. By 2050, 40

percent of existing buildings have had increased operational and maintenance improvements.”

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Increase target to 100%? See opportunities through FCM Green Municipal Fund.

Strategy #3: Energy Efficiency Housing Retrofits

“Annual Reduction Potential at 2050 Energy Consumption (GJ) GHG Emissions (tCO₂e) 500”

GBCAN Recommendation: Consider why the GHG emissions reduction seem so little for this effort and ways to increase impact.

Strategy #6: Renewable Energy (p 68)

“Target Participation Rate:

By 2030, 10 percent of available roof space has solar photovoltaic panels installed. By 2050, 25 percent of available roof space has solar photovoltaic panels installed.”

GBCAN Recommendation: Increase targets for both 2030 and 2050.

Strategy #7: Reduce Single Passenger Commuting & Private Vehicles (p 69)

“Target participation rate and energy and emission reduction estimate not applicable for this strategy.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Consider including targets.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Encourage meetings by Zoom where possible to reduce travel

Strategy #8: Fleet Operations Maintenance (p 69)

“Annual Reduction Potential at 2050 GHG Emissions (tCO₂e) 75”

** Recommendation: Verify emissions reductions which seem very low.

8.4 Aggregated Emission Reduction Potential (Corporate Strategies) (p 73)

“The current set of strategies would reduce emissions by 1763 tonnes CO₂e annually by 2050. Emissions would be reduced by 24 percent by

2030 and by 51 percent by 2050 below the 2018 baseline (from the business-as-planned scenario). With the successful implementation of the strategies outlined, it will be possible to surpass the County's corporate target by 4 percent by 2030. While the strategies outlined leave a gap to achieving the 2050 corporate target by 9 percent, the plan will lead Grey on a pathway to achieving its targets that will include regular planning review in order to leverage future opportunities and make adjustments as required."

GBCAN Recommendation: Build in success at achieving the corporate reduction target and align targets to the 60% by 2050 as per the overall corporate plan. Failure to meet strong targets is not an option but failure to meet weak targets is unacceptable and does not take the climate emergency seriously.

9.2 Implementation Plan (chart) (p. 79)

1. Residential Building Energy Efficiency Retrofit Program

"Supporting Partners Enbridge, Westario, Hydro One, Member municipalities, Deep energy retrofit specialists, Energy contractors, Neighbouring municipalities, Housing Non-Profits, Grey Bruce Sustainability Network"

GBCAN Recommendation: Under "supporting partner" the only role for Enbridge should be to clean up fugitive emissions and then either gracefully withdraw or invest in local renewable energy as heating options change to heat pumps, etc. for zero emissions.

9.2 Monitoring and Review: (p 76)

"... it is suggested that the CCAP be reviewed every five years."

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Formally review the CCAP every two years or two times per municipal mandate of Council to allow each term of Councils to be accountable to constituents for the implementation of the plan. Establish review guidelines and publish the review.

"The recommended organizational model for implementing the CCAP is a 'County led and Community Supported' model. This model enables the County to take a leadership role while sharing responsibilities for

implementation with the community and member municipalities, while leveraging community capital to implement strategies that are beyond municipal control or responsibility. To coordinate and guide the implementation of the CCAP, it is recommended that the County establish an Implementation Working Group. This group can be comprised of County staff from identified departments, organization leads and supporting partners, Indigenous communities, members of the ECCWG, ICCWG, and the CCTF, as well as interested stakeholders and members of the community.”

GBCAN Recommendation 2: We agree that widening the net of expertise to include a multi-disciplinary group is absolutely necessary to access the best advice on conserving the health and well-being of the communities of Grey. Consider experts from within and outside of the community who have access to the latest science in their areas of expertise.

“The Working Group should meet regularly to discuss and report on implementation activities including development of annual workplans and reporting on year-end progress in their respective strategic areas, which should include quantification of GHG and energy savings as a result of implementing individual projects where feasible.”

GBCAN Recommendation 3: Direct year-end progress reports by the Working Group to stakeholders and the general public to build in transparency and accountability.

10. Conclusion: (p 92)

“Additional efforts will be needed to engage the wider community outside of the community climate and sustainability leaders, and it will be important to report on progress and share success stories regularly to demonstrate co-benefits and emerging business opportunities to the community.”

GBCAN Recommendation 1: Why specify “business opportunities”? Employ many other opportunities available such as policy changes, by-law changes, taxation changes, community health and well-being opportunities. We need to start thinking outside the box. Take a whole community approach.

GBCAN Recommendation 2: Include GBCAN in regular engagement activities, along with other stakeholders such as OMAFRA, Ag Services, ALUS, GSCA and SVCA, NFU, OFA, CFFO, Chambers of Commerce and

others. Given the crisis and urgency, members of the Implementation Working Group need to actively pursue and integrate up-to-date information from researchers and scientists engaged in climate action, whether in government (provincial, federal, international), academia or volunteer energy and know-how.

“The vision, strategies and actions in this plan are an opportunity to work together for a better future, while upgrading and building new homes, business and social infrastructure that saves money...”

NOTE: The Grey County Climate Action Plan is a survival plan that will certainly have an outcome of saving money as a by-product of building a sustainable future.

Addendum

Federal Ag Climate Action programs that Grey County can tap into

Agriculture Clean Technology Program -

<https://agriculture.canada.ca/en/agricultural-programs-and-services/agricultural-clean-technology-program-adoption-stream>

- Cleaner fuel driers
- Supports the purchase of energy efficient and climate friendly technology to reduce energy use on the farm
- Non-repayable grants available. Uptake has been high.
- Research and Innovation are also funded

The Research and Innovation Stream will support pre-market innovation, including research, development, demonstration and commercialization activities, to develop transformative clean technologies and enable the expansion of current technologies, in 3 priority areas:

- Green energy and energy efficiency
- Precision agriculture
- Bioeconomy

Eligible activities under the Research and Innovation Stream are of the following nature and type:

- Applied research and development of clean technologies
- Piloting and evaluating clean technologies
- Demonstration and knowledge and technology transfer activities
- Commercializing and scaling up clean technologies
- Other activities that support the Research and Innovation Stream as determined by the program

Support is available in the form of repayable and non-repayable contributions from Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

Ag Climate Solutions Initiative – both Cdn fed gov't initiatives

<https://www.canada.ca/en/agriculture-agri-food/news/2021/03/backgrounder-agricultural-climate-solutions.html>

[Agricultural Climate Solutions](#) (ACS) is a \$185 million, 10-year program that will help develop and implement farming practices to tackle climate change. Through agricultural practices such as shelterbelts or cover crops, farmland can trap and store carbon and reduce greenhouse gases.

ACS is a program under the more than \$4 billion Natural Climate Solutions Fund. AAFC is partnering with Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) and Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) to develop projects that invest in natural climate solutions, including NRCan's [Growing Canada's Forests](#) program and ECCC's [Nature Smart Climate Solutions Fund](#).

From: [Mike Fry](#)
To: [Linda Swanston](#)
Subject: GSCA Comments for Climate Action Plan
Date: November 12, 2021 4:19:40 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-hjvlluyk.png](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Good afternoon Linda,

Thank you for letting us comment on the Grey County Climate Change Action Plan. Below are our comments. If you need clarification on any of them, please do not hesitate to ask.

General Comments

There should be much more in here about leveraging the existing relationships with CAs and the programs that they already undertake.

Overall, there should be more information about leading and assisting with lower tier action or other related climate change policies or plans. This is to ensure some consistency across the county.

Strategy #1/2 - Commercial/Residential Building Energy Efficiency Retrofit

- if funding is available include green infrastructure/nature-based solution such as maintaining trees around buildings to reduce energy use

Strategy #3 - Green Standard for New Buildings

- promote mass timber and wood products in new buildings over concrete/high carbon emission products
- if funding is available include green infrastructure /nature-based solution such as maintaining trees around buildings to reduce energy use
- promote/incentivize leaving as much existing green infrastructure during construction

Strategy #14 and 16 - Agricultural Community

- establish collective led by CAs (GSCA and SVCA) as resource hub. Able to provide advice, funding, resources, etc... to community

Strategy #17 - Afforestation/Reforestation

- this should probably only be Afforestation (reforestation is replanting an area, afforestation is planting areas not previously a forest)
- work with CAs to offer incentive programs? CAs could administer a program on your behalf.
- Establish protection for hedgerows/fencerows within fields as these are key wildlife corridors and help to reduce

windspeed and erosion in fields.

Strategy #22 - Prevention of Shoreline Erosion

- could this be run through GSCA and hosted on GSCA website with links from Grey County site?
- Work on strengthening tree planting initiatives that target areas prone to flooding and erosion

Strategy #23 - Reducing the Risk of Flooding

- Promote assorted water related LIDs and stormwater LIDs over permeable pavement
- Need to establish and outline strategies for protecting and promoting natural infrastructure as a means of flood protection and mitigating the risks associated with climate change.

Strategy #24: Conservation and Protection of Wetlands

Add initiatives to support and improve on existing PSW policies by promoting improved and expanded wetland evaluation and mapping. Mapping is very out of date and many wetlands have not been evaluated given limited provincial MNRF resources. Is there a way to update this at a county level Or Train staff and promote training of key CA staff on OWES so that these updates can occur and be provided to MNRF by these agencies.

Strategy #25: Monitoring Water Quality within Waterways

There are obvious links to the work CAs do here but is there a link through Source water protection and risk management? We should be leveraging this data and information.

All the best,
Mike

Michael Fry, R.P.F.

Forestry Coordinator

Office: 519.376.3076 Ext. 280

Cell: 519.387.2694

237897 Inglis Falls Road

Owen Sound, ON N4K 5N6

www.greysauble.on.ca



Please note that GSCA's Administrative Office has re-opened to the public. The front desk is open from 9 am to 12 pm and 1 pm to 4 pm for drop offs, pick ups, and payments. All visitors are asked to self-screen prior to entering and to wear a mask while in the building. Meetings with staff are by appointment only and should be scheduled at least 3 days in advance with the appropriate department. Many GSCA staff continue to work remotely and may not have access to office phones. Please utilize email as the most reliable way to reach our staff. A full staff directory is available on our website.

Rest assured that GSCA is committing to continuing to provide a high level of service and staff will be

doing their best to ensure this.

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail contains legally privileged information intended only for the individual or entity named in this message. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of the communication is prohibited. If this communication was received in error, please notify us by reply e-mail and delete the original message.