

RECEIVED
OCT 05 2010

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority

Full Authority Minutes

2:00 p.m.

Wednesday, September 8th, 2010

The Full Authority meeting was held at the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Administration Centre located on Inglis Falls Road.

1. Call to Order

Chair Hibma called the meeting to order.

Directors Present

Dick Hibma

David Clarke

Dwight Burley

Judy Gay

Deb Haswell

Ross Herron

Michael Martin

Terry McKay

Harley Greenfield

Jim McPherson

Directors Absent

Mark Wunderlich

Staff Present

John Cottrill, Doreen Robinson, Doug Hill, and Chris Hachey

Media Present

Erika Engel - Meaford Express

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion No.:

FA-10-087

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Terry McKay

Judy Gay

THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority approve the agenda of September 8th, 2010.

Carried

3. **Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest** – nothing at this time

4. **Approval of Minutes**

Motion No.:	Moved by:	Harley Greenfield
FA-10-088	Seconded by:	Dwight Burley

THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority approve the Full Authority minutes of July 28th, 2010, and the Arboretum Alliance minutes of August 3rd, 2010, with the following amendments

Full Authority minutes – On Page 10 – Item 10 d) – Playground equipment at Christie Beach – *change “Construction Authorities” to “Conservation Authorities”*

Arboretum Alliance minutes – In Resolution ARB-06-10 – *motion was both moved and seconded by Rod Saunders.*

Carried

5. **Business Out of Minutes**

A revised policy for the waiving of planning and Section 28 regulation permit fees was presented by John Cottrill.

Motion No.:	Moved by:	Judy Gay
FA-10-089	Seconded by:	Ross Herron

THAT the Board of Directors adopt the proposed policy for the waiving of planning and regulation permit fees as presented in Attachment #1.

Carried

6. **Correspondence** – nothing at this time

7. **Business Items**

a) **Water Management** – nothing at this time

b) Environmental Planning

- 1) Section 28 Permits – July 16th to August 31st, 2010

Motion No.:	Moved by:	Michael Martin
FA-10-090	Seconded by:	Jim McPherson

THAT the list of permits under Ontario Regulation 151/06 – “Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation”, for the period July 16th – August 31st, 2010, be approved.

Carried

c) Lands Update

- 1) Playground Equipment

The playground equipment at Christie Beach was removed in the spring of 2009 due to poor condition and safety concerns. The equipment was comprised of 1 slide/climber unit and 2 spring animals, both estimated to be over 20 years old. The equipment was deteriorating and the components did not adhere to current safety standards. A single set of swings remains on site.

The cost to replace the playground equipment removed is estimated at \$12,000.00 to \$15,000.00. The cost estimate is based on a standard slide with 2 climbing components and 2 spring animals. The estimate includes installation and surfacing material. Alternative funding options to purchase new playground equipment are limited. The Hydro One “PowerPlay” grant program offers up to \$25,000 for capital projects such as community centres, indoor or outdoor ice rinks, playgrounds, splash pads and sports fields where the primary purpose is to support children’s community sports and activities.

Grey Sauble Conservation has not purchased new playground equipment in the last 20 years. Conservation land management practices have also changed during this time with a focus on promoting the natural features of each property. Given the rising costs to maintain conservation lands, this approach is often more sustainable. Washrooms, trails, interpretive signage and parking facilities are currently maintained as amenities to accommodate visitors exploring the natural features of each park. Many Conservation Authorities from across the province have chosen not to install new playground equipment due to the capital cost, maintenance, changing CSA standards and liability concerns.

Jim McPherson and Harley Greenfield felt that the playground equipment should be replaced at Christie Beach as the beach is clean and well used by citizens of both the Municipality of Meaford and the Town of The Blue Mountains. Both Directors are disappointed that the equipment is not being replaced and feel that not replacing the equipment is inappropriate.

Michael Martin noted that Christie Beach is a clean beach, well used and that a partnership could be arranged between The Town of The Blue Mountains and the Municipality of Meaford for purchasing new equipment. It is unfortunate that Grey Sauble Conservation will not be replacing the equipment, but Michael recognizes the reasons.

Terry McKay commented that a fund raising event to pay for new equipment at Christie Beach is not a good use of staff time and that Grey Sauble Conservation should not be putting money into playground equipment.

Motion No.:	Moved by:	Judy Gay
FA-10-091	Seconded by:	Dave Clarke

**THAT Grey Sauble Conservation Authority not install playground equipment on land directly managed by the Authority;
AND FURTHER THAT management activities continue to focus on the promotion of natural features of each property.**

Carried

Jim McPherson and Harley Greenfield were opposed to the motion.

2) Solar Energy Project – RFP Review

microFIT Solar Project – RFP review

A Request for Proposals for a microFIT solar energy project was advertised for 3 weeks during the month of July, 2010. The proposed project site was the Administration Centre area including the workshop roof but not the administration centre roof and the Arboretum area, near and including the barn. A total of 3 proposals were received upon closing of the request. The RFP offered one or all of the following options for proposals:

1. A roof mount solar energy project – maximum 10kW
2. A ground mount solar energy project – maximum 10kW
3. Land lease for a solar energy project – maximum 10kW

On August 19, 2010 the Solar Energy Project Review Committee comprised of Mark Wunderlich, Michael Martin, Terry Belton and Chris Hachey reviewed the submitted proposals. Upon initial review, a number of conclusions were made based on the information provided:

- The Province announced proposed changes to rates offered for ground mount solar systems during the RFP process. This seemed to limit the proposals submitted.
- There were no proposals to “lease” land. The size of the project offered and the proposed ground mount rate changes effected this option.

- The barn was not seen as a viable option for a roof mount system due to the age of the structure.
- Although 2 submissions were given for the workshop roof, overall it was not recommended due to the orientation, area tree cover and slope of the roof.

Upon narrowing down the proposals, the committee discussed the costs and options to install a ground mount tracking solar system. After a lengthy discussion the committee concluded that the proposal to purchase a tracking solar system was not viable. The upfront capital cost is likely to exceed \$100,000.00 for a 10kW project when additional costs such as fencing, equipment maintenance, and component upgrades are taken into consideration. The committee was also concerned that the solar energy market was just emerging in Ontario and such a large investment may be premature.

The committee further discussed the option to lease land for the production of solar energy. It was noted that a larger site would need to be offered along with the option for a larger scale kW project. In some cases, leased land can generate \$1,500.00 per 10kW project.

Considerable discussion on this project was held by the Directors.

Motion:	Moved by:	Michael Martin
	Seconded by:	Judy Gay

**THAT the report on microFIT Solar Project be received with the leasing option being brought back to the Board of Directors subsequent to exploring with the Ministry whether it is possible to lease land for the purpose of power generation;
AND FURTHER, THAT the C.A.O. report back to the Directors at the Full Authority meeting scheduled after the October 25th, 2010, municipal election.**

This motion was withdrawn by the mover and seconder.

Motion No.:	Moved by:	Dwight Burley
FA-10-092	Seconded by:	Terry McKay

THAT the report on the microFIT Solar Project be received and no further action be taken on this project.

Carried

Deb Haswell thanked the Committee for their work on the microFIT Solar Project.

3) Tom Thomson Art Gallery Partnership

Thanks to an idea by Merle Gunby, Grey Sauble Conservation has recently embarked on a unique partnership with the Tom Thomson Art Gallery in Owen Sound. A meeting was held in early August to discuss how the two organizations could collaborate with programs and special events. Discussions centred around ideas where each organization shared a common goal. It was agreed that all programs should be cost effective, utilizing existing budgets and alternative funding programs.

The Arboretum was discussed as an area where art can interact with nature in a barrier free environment accessible to everyone. The group also discussed opportunities for summer day camp programs, providing new elements to engage youth. The “Art in the Arboretum” initiative is already underway for September and new ideas are being discussed for 2011.

**“Culture Days” Art at the Arboretum - Art Installation with artist Stephen Hogbin
Sunday, September 26, 2010 – 2pm to 4 pm**

To celebrate the first-ever, nation-wide celebration of arts and culture, join us at the Inglis Falls Arboretum as artist Stephen Hogbin creates a site specific installation using materials at the site. Hogbin works primarily in wood on a wide range of projects including public, corporate and private commissions. For more information on Culture Days visit www.culturedays.ca

Arboretum & Art with artist Alan Glicksman - Saturday, October 2, 2010 – 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Join artist Alan Glicksman at the Inglis Falls Arboretum in creating an ephemeral, site-specific sculpture with found materials. The existence of these nature-based sculptures is dependent on the effects and passage of time and is part of the environmental or ecological art movement. Come and interact with the landscape in an artistic way.

Deb advised that on Friday, September 17th, George McLean, a local and well known artist will be hosting a display of his paintings at the Tom Thomson Gallery.

Motion No.:	Moved by:	Deb Haswell
FA-10-093	Seconded by:	Judy Gay

THAT the report on the new Partnership with the Tom Thomson Art Gallery be received and endorsed with congratulations.

Carried

d) Forestry, Fish and Wildlife

- 1) Tender for Sawlogs and Fuelwood – Kemble Mountain – Compartment 72 & 74
- 2) Tender for Sawlogs and Fuelwood – Kolapore Uplands – Compartment 97

Cam Bennett attended for discussion under this item and presented the following tender summary for sawlogs and fuelwood tenders received for Kemble Mountain – Compartments 72 and 74 and Kolapore Uplands – Compartment 97. Chair Hibma, John Cottrill, and Cam opened and reviewed the tenders on September 3rd, 2010.

Tender for Sawlogs and Fuelwood at Kolapore Uplands Management Area – Compartment 97
 Part Lot 2, Concession 8, The Blue Mountains (formerly Collingwood Twp) - Marked Area: 70 acres

Volume Tendered: Sawlogs – 80,065 fbm Fuelwood – 98 Full Cords
 Estimated Value: Sawlogs – \$59,5110.90 Fuelwood - \$2,940.00

Total Estimate: \$62,451.90

Tenders Received

Contractor	Fuelwood	Sawlogs	Total Bid
Klemmer Lumber Ltd.	\$3,000.00	\$70,000.00	\$73,000.00
Edgewood Lumber			\$56,764.00
J.H Keeso & Sons			\$39,336.00

Tender for Sawlogs and Fuelwood at Kemble Mountain Management Area – Compartment 72 & 74; Part Lots 41 & 42, Concession 22 & 23, Georgian Bluffs (formerly Keppel Twp) - Marked Area: 125 acres

Volume Tendered: Sawlogs – 82,698 fbm Fuelwood – 821 Full Cords
 Estimated Value: Sawlogs – \$42,298.70 Fuelwood - \$24,630.00

Total Estimate: \$66,928.70

Tenders Received

Contractor	Fuelwood	Sawlogs	Total Bid
Dinsmore Logging			\$81,503.00

Motion No.: **Moved by:** **Michael Martin**
FA-10-094 **Seconded by:** **Dwight Burley**

THAT Grey Sauble Conservation Authority award the tender for Sawlogs and Fuelwood at Kolapore Uplands Management Area - Compartment 97 to Klemmer Lumber for their total bid of \$73,000.00, subject to signing the agreement and award the tender for Sawlogs and Fuelwood at the Kemble Mountain Management Area - Compartment 72 & 74 to Dinsmore Logging for their total bid of \$81,503.00, subject to signing the agreement.

Carried

e) Cultural Access Pass

The Institute for Canadian Citizenship (ICC), a national, non-profit organization was founded by the right Honourable Adrienne Clarkson in 2005. The objective is to engage all Canadians in citizenship through ICC programming to experience Canadian Cultural Institutions and spaces for free, covering one year from the day they receive their citizenship. (There are exemptions such as special events that are not covered by the pass.)

Grey Sauble Conservation was approached through Conservation Ontario by the ICC. The ICC is in the process of piloting an “outdoor” component of the Cultural Access Pass program in Ontario.

The ICC has asked Conservation Authorities to consider the many mutual benefits of our involvement.

- Give Conservation Authorities the opportunity to reach out to new citizens
- Provide a potentially transformative experience with Canada’s natural landscape
- Build an appreciation for our environment among new Canadians
- Cultivate this appreciation within their families for generations to come.

In conversation with Grey Sauble staff, we have proceeded in joining the new “outdoor” component of the Cultural Access Pass for Ontario. The new pass will waive the Inglis Falls Conservation Area parking fee of \$3.00.

This new venture will benefit Grey Sauble Conservation in marketing our name in the Greater Toronto Region as well as assisting local businesses in the area.

f) Administration

Marg Johnston attended the meeting for discussion on the items listed under Administration.

1) Receipts and Expenses – July and August 2010

Motion No.:	Moved by:	Judy Gay
FA-10-095	Seconded by:	Dave Clarke

THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority approve the receipts and expenses for July 2010 and August 2010 with the following amendment.

In the August Expenses, Direct Withdrawal for Hydro One is listed incorrectly as \$28,973.14. The dollar amount should be listed as \$2,206.30.

Carried

2) Budget to expenses – July 31/10

The 2010 budget as of July 31st, 2010, was presented for information.

3) New Budget Format and 4) Cash Flow/Levy Payment Options

A budget format presently used by Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority was reviewed. The Directors liked the straight forward facts shown in dollars and cents. Also reviewed were various scenarios on levy payment options and cash flow requirements with the fiscal year of 2009 being used for comparison. The proposed new format for the Grey Sauble Conservation 2011 budget and the cash flow/levy payment options will be circulated to the Clerks and Treasurers in the watershed municipalities with further discussion being held at the October 13th Full Authority meeting.

8. **In Camera Items** – nothing at this time

9. **Chairman's Report**

Since the July 28th Full Authority meeting, Dick attended the Grey Sauble Conservation Foundation Executive Committee meeting on August 6th. With Conservation Authority staff, Dick hosted the member municipalities meeting on August 24th. At this meeting there was a good exchange and dialogue on issues. There was also good feedback from municipal staff and elected people as well. Dick met with John Cottrill and Cam Bennett on September 3rd to open and review Forestry tenders.

Peter Middleton, of the Owen Sound Field Naturalists, has been a guest speaker at various venues. He has approached Dick to see if it would be appropriate to have him attend a Full Authority meeting and present a slide show. 2010 is the year of biodiversity. Dick will talk to Peter to see if he would be available to present a slide show after the Christmas luncheon prior to the December 8th Full Authority meeting.

10. Other Business

a) Meeting with Member Municipalities

A summary of the meeting with member municipalities held on August 24th, 2010, is listed in Attachment #2 of this set of minutes. The summary is based on John Cottrill's recollection of the meeting.

Deb Haswell thanked the Chair and staff for hosting the event. Deb felt that perhaps in future the Authority would consider an information meeting for developers. Small scale developers do not know what is required by Grey Sauble Conservation.

Dwight Burley left the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

-
- b) Foundation Minutes – July 14th, 2010 – for information
 - c) Staff Minutes – July 29th, 2010 – for information
 - d) DWSP Report – for information
 - e) Resolution from Town of Blue Mountains re: WECI Funding

The Town of the Blue Mountains Council passed a motion expressing their concern to the Ministry of Natural Resources with regards to the reduction in capital budget funding to Grey Sauble Conservation Authority. The motion urges the Minister of Natural Resources to reconsider the 10% reduction in Water and Erosion Control Infrastructure Program (WECI) as this reduction may reduce maintenance and may cause premature infrastructure failure and result in a longer time frame to undertake repair projects due to funding shortfalls. Similar motions from the other watershed municipalities would be appreciated.

- f) Next Meeting – Wednesday, October 13th, 2010 at 1:15 p.m.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Dick Hibma, Chair

Doreen Robinson, Administrative Assistant

Attachment #1 - Policy for Waiving of Planning Application and Regulation Permit Fees

Memo To: GSCA Board of Directors

From: R. John Cottrill, C.A.O., GSCA

Date: August 30, 2010

Requests: This year, we have received three requests to have our normal fees either reduced or waived.

1. Within the municipality of Grey Highlands, a family had a house fire. They were not insured. A request was received to reduce or waive fees associated with the rebuilding of the home.
2. Habitat for Humanity is building a house in Owen Sound. They have requested the associated fees be reduced or waived.
3. The Institute for Outdoor Education and Environmental Studies at Boat Lake has applied for a permit for a new dock. Although they are associated with the Bluewater District School Board, they are considered a not – for - profit institution and have requested the fee be waived.

In the past, I understand these have been dealt with on a case by case basis. Past examples include Ducks Unlimited and the Bruce Trail Association. I also understand that our auditors are aware of this practice, and have suggested a Board policy may be appropriate to guide this matter.

Options: Option One: No waiving of planning application and regulation permit fees.

Option Two: Leave to staff to determine where a planning or regulation fee could be reduced or waived.

Option three: Have each request brought to the Board of Directors for approval, based on its own merits.

Option Four: Develop a policy to guide staff in dealing with such requests, and have these requests presented to the Board for approval when requests are received.

Recommendation:

That the Board of Directors adopt Option Four as a policy of planning application and Regulation Permit fee reduction or waiving of fees in the following situations:

1. In the case of personal hardship to the applicant.
2. For not-for-profit organizations with similar conservation or resource management objectives as GSCA. And further,

3. That the CAO bring forward applications for fee reductions to the Board of Directors for their approval.

Policy Proposal –Waiving of Planning Application and Regulation Permit Fees

Proposal: To establish a policy to address requests for reductions or waiving of planning application and regulation permit fees set by the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.

Planning Fees:

Under Section 21 (1) (m.1) of the Conservation Authorities Act, fees can be charged for services approved by the Minister of Natural Resources.

Included are fees for planning services as undertaken by CA staff when commenting on development applications as circulated by municipalities under the Planning Act.

The fee schedule is reviewed on an annual basis by the Board of Directors.

At the time of review, the fees charged by other conservation authorities and by our member municipalities are also reviewed to ensure our fees are comparable with those of our neighbours.

In most jurisdictions, exceptions are made to the normal fee schedule where warranted.

Guidelines: It is recommended that a policy be approved which permits the CA to waive or reduce the normal fees charged for planning services under the following circumstances:

1. In the case of personal hardship where the applicant may not have the financial resources to undertake the works associated with the planning application.
2. When the applicant is a not for profit organization with similar conservation or resource management objectives as the GSCA.

Notification: The CAO will advise the Board of Directors when a request has been received for the reduction or waiving of planning application and regulation permit fees, and will recommend a position for the Board to ratify. Once a Board decision is made, the CAO will be authorized to advise the applicant of the Board's decision. Any fees already submitted with the application will be returned by the GSCA to the applicant.

Attachment #2 – Meeting with Member Municipalities re: CA Funding

The meeting began at 4:40 p.m. with introductory remarks from Chairman Dick Hibma. John Cottrill, with the aid of slides, provided an overview of the GSCA role and mandate. This included a summary of the powers of conservation authorities as outlined in the *Conservation Authorities Act* and the related Ontario Regulation 151/06.

Marg Johnston and John Cottrill then provided an overview of Revenues and Expenses, using the 2009 audited financial statement as the example.

Marg then outlined how the municipal levy is set, using the Current Value Assessment figures as provided annually by MNR.

We then discussed the draft Budget circulation procedure, and the 4 motions which need to be passed by the Board of Directors, as set out in the legislation. Also provided was an explanation of the procedure for setting the weighted vote, with an example of what happens when one municipal representative is not in attendance, and how that impacts the value of each vote.

The final slide outlined how each municipality is officially notified of the levy amounts, and sets out the payment options available.

A Question and Answer Session began at 5:10 p.m., lasted about an hour, and was followed by dinner.

The series of questions related to:

1. The fee for services charged to municipalities, and whether the rate should differ between member and non-member municipalities.
2. A discussion of Forestry revenues and costs, related to the GSCA overall land base of 28,000 acres.
3. A question about planning policies in the Oliphant area as it relates to an existing lot of record near the shoreline. (Doug Hill provided clarification)
4. A question as to whether all members needed to be present for a budget vote, which led to a discussion on the use of alternates. Need clarification from MNR.
5. A question about CA expenditures on recreational properties by municipality.
6. A request for washroom facilities at Peasemarsch CA in the Town of Blue Mountains.
7. A request from Bill White for a better illustration of where the budget pressures are, which lead to a need for budget increases, and corresponding levy increases.
8. A discussion on how the CA expresses the costs in terms of dollars per \$100,000 of assessment.

There appeared to be some dissatisfaction with this method. Some want to see actual figures of cost increases and how that impacts the overall levy amounts.

9. A general question related to Natural Heritage, who comments on Natural Heritage matters, and the perception that some duplication exists between the County planners, the municipal planners and the planners from agencies such as GSCA. *I think we missed an opportunity to make a case for CA role in Natural Heritage protection. We spend a great deal of time reviewing new development proposals, and actually visit the sites, so we have a good understanding of the natural heritage features that are present in the areas under consideration. Many CAs in the Province provide natural heritage services to their member municipalities since they have the experts on staff already.*

10. A general question started out with a discussion of the Timmins Storm flood standard, but quickly turned to a question related to the height of bridges over stream crossings. In the example given (Twp. of Chatsworth), the height adjustments were the result of input from Transport Canada and did not directly relate to the CA floodplain standards.
11. A question was raised on the process for dissolving a conservation authority.
12. A question related to compensation for Board members.
13. Comments were made about the lack of adequate funding from the Province, and how this impacted the levy request to municipalities.
14. A question was raised concerning the CA role in County forests and on CA lands, and who paid for forestry work in each case.
15. There was a general question about duplication of services, and what impact the Clean Water Act will have on staff needs within both the municipality and conservation authorities.
16. General discussion took place on payment options, discounted versus 2 or 4 payment periods spread out over the year. Marg provided a slide showing the impact of payment options on the monthly cash flow to the CA.
17. The Mayor of Owen Sound had a comment about the permit process, timely approvals, and that all approval authorities should be clear on the process and strive for timely review of development applications.
18. There was general discussion on the format of the Budget and what changes could be made to clarify budget needs, where the pressures are, and what changed from previous years, such as increases to costs, or changes to revenue received.
19. GSCA agreed to send a copy of the presentation package to each municipal clerk and mayor.
20. There was general agreement to the benefit of this meeting, and a desire to hold regular meetings between the CA and its member municipalities.
21. There was some concern expressed about the level of reserves available to the CA, who will pay for future capital projects, and how best to raise the funds to do work.
22. Gerald Shortt had the last question relating to some existing erosion on the Big Head River in the west end of Meaford. He thought an easy solution was to move some gravel from the bed of the river to the bank where it is eroding near the Miller Street road allowance. CA staff will check it out.