



**GREY SAUBLE CONSERVATION AUTHORITY  
MINUTES  
Full Authority Board of Directors  
Wednesday, May 22nd, 2019, at 1:15 p.m.**

---

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

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Cathy Little called the meeting to order.

Directors Present - Cathy Little, Sue Carleton, Ryan Greig, Scott Greig, Harley Greenfield, Scott Mackey, Andrea Matrosovs, Paul McKenzie, and Paul Vickers

Directors Absent – Dwight Burley and Marion Koepke

Staff Present – Sonya Skinner, Doreen Robinson, Andy Sorensen, John Bittorf, Alison Armstrong, Tim Lanthier, Carl Seider, Mike Fry, and Karen Gillan

Media – The Hub

**2. Adoption of Agenda**

<b>Motion No.:</b>	<b>Moved by:</b>	<b>Harley Greenfield</b>
<b>FA-19-049</b>	<b>Seconded by:</b>	<b>Sue Carleton</b>

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors approve the Agenda of May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019.**

**Carried**

**3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest**

The Directors were reminded to disclose any pecuniary interest that may arise during the meeting. No disclosures of pecuniary interest were expressed at this time.

**4. Adoption of Minutes**

<b>Motion No.:</b>	<b>Moved by:</b>	<b>Scott Greig</b>
<b>FA-19-050</b>	<b>Seconded by:</b>	<b>Ryan Greig</b>

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors approve the minutes of April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019.**

**Carried**

**5. Deputation – 1:20 p.m. – Hugh Simpson from Grey County Federation of Agriculture**

Hugh Simpson, President, Grey County Federation of Agriculture, spoke to the Board. The Federation represents 1500 farm families. There have been three priorities identified by the Federation – 1) Rural economic development; 2) Fair farm properties taxation; and 3) Environmental Stewardship.

He mentioned that Agricultural Advisory Committees have been formalized with Nottawasaga Valley CA and Saugeen Valley CA, and that he believes they are working well. He recommends that GSCA consider a similar model and that the Federation could help to identify a mix of farm participants. The Federation's members steward a large part of the land in the Watershed, and can bring benefits to land, water and air as environmental influencers. This is particularly true in Grey County as there is a greater proportion of farm owners than elsewhere in Ontario. Discussions will improve relationships and communication, and can include what is of interest to all parties, such as stewardship, tiles and regulatory approvals. Mr. Simpson recommended that the Chair be one of the farmer participants.

The ensuing discussion included:

- Discussion on the value of separate versus combined agricultural committees for local CAs, with some of the opinion that a larger group may diffuse the effectiveness of the relationships.
- It was asked if the Mennonite community is participating in other areas. They are not, but in the future this could be explored if deemed beneficial.
- The Town of the Blue Mountains also has an Agricultural Advisory Committee with young farmers and the Town appreciates this advice from the farmers.

The Chair thanked Hugh Simpson for his presentation.

<b>Motion No.:</b>	<b>Moved by:</b>	<b>Scott Mackey</b>
<b>FA-19-051</b>	<b>Seconded by:</b>	<b>Paul Vickers</b>

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors receive the deputation from Grey County Federation of Agriculture and request a report from staff on the feasibility of an Agricultural Advisory Committee.**

**Carried**

## **6. Board Training/Orientation: Drinking Water Source Protection and Risk Management – Roles, Committees, Responsibilities and Accountabilities**

Carl Seider, Project Manager, Drinking Water Source Protection, made a presentation to the Board. Topics reviewed included:

- the Source Protection Authority or SPA (including the Board sitting as the SPA; the multi-area North Bruce Peninsula, Grey Sauble and Saugeen Valley SPA Management Committee; and DWSP SPA staff),
  - GSCA as the lead SPA has administrative roles and responsibilities for technical support through staff.
  - Current funding is through the province. Each SPA has 3 members who sit on the Committee – Chair, Vice Chair, and CAO.
  - There are 21 municipalities under this DWSP region.
- Part IV - Implementation responsibilities of municipalities (including GSCA where they have been hired by municipalities to do Risk Management Plans),
  - Initial provincial funding for this work stopped at the end of 2018, and it is now a municipal funding responsibility.
- the Source Protection Committee which creates and updates the Source Protection Plan as to what Source Protection Plan policies are, and the areas around municipal wells where they apply. Policies are not necessarily bans. Landowners have been advised what can and cannot be done (for example if extra containment must be set up for fuel storage in sensitive areas), and the annual reporting process to MECP.

Discussion included whether a municipality could carry out a mandatory risk management plan action if the landowner was not willing to do it, and it was clarified that this power exists under the Clean Water Act.

When the DWSP program was first implemented, some board members were opposed in fear that funding would be cut and municipalities would be paying for services. With the recently-proposed changes under Bill 108 this service can now be part of a municipal levy, sending a signal that this could happen.

Ryan Greig thanked Carl for the presentation. Carl Seider's presentation will be forwarded to the Board.

## **9. Business Items**

<b>Motion No.:</b>	<b>Moved by:</b>	<b>Paul Vickers</b>
<b>FA-19-052</b>	<b>Seconded by:</b>	<b>Andrea Matrosovs</b>

**THAT Item No. 9 – Other Business – b) Environmental Planning – 3) Proposed Section 28 Permit Policy Variance – Georgian Bluffs – Springmount Area – be moved up in the agenda after Item No. 6.**

**Carried**

## 9. Business Items

### b) Environmental Planning – 3) Proposed Section 28 Permit Policy Variance – Georgian Bluffs – Springmount Area

Dave Munroe, Harold Sutherland Construction, attended the meeting for discussion of this item.

This decision is related to Permit Application GS19-028, 223026 Grey Road 17B, Part of Park Lot 8, Concession EHMS, Township of Georgian Bluffs (formerly Township of Derby), to re-develop the former Drive-in Theatre property in the Springmount industrial park area, including the construction of a new 1800 m<sup>2</sup> Main Building for truck maintenance, two 450 m<sup>2</sup> accessory buildings and associated driving and parking areas.

The property is a brownfield that is zoned General Industrial and generally allows the proposed use. This use is in alignment with the character of nearby properties and one would assume it will support economic development.

In the issuance of CA permits for the development, interference with wetlands and alterations to shorelines and watercourses under Section 28 of the CAA, each CA has an Ontario Regulation (GSCA's is 151/06), and policies for the administration of their regulation that are approved by the Board of Directors. The intent of the policies is to ensure a consistent, timely and fair approach, and efficient and effective use and allocation of available resources.

The policies set out their overall objectives, such as preventing loss of life and property damage, prohibiting development which may restrict riverine channel capacities or reduce storage capacities, avoiding degradation of ecological functions and promoting their restoration and enhancement, and preventing pollution of waters.

The subject property and surrounding area have a history of flooding and the GSCA asked the proponent to complete a Stormwater Management Report and a flood plain report. This flood plain report identified the majority of the site to be within the Regional Storm flood plain.

The relevant GSCA policy sections include the 8.1.1 "Policies for One-Zone Policy Areas (excluding allowances)" that are subject to a *Riverine Flooding Hazard*, which state that GSCA's regulation policy does not allow for new development within an identified flood plain.

The proponent requested that GSCA consider the use of a cut and fill scenario to demonstrate that this specific site could partially be developed. GSCA staff specified that technical analysis would be required by the applicant and must demonstrate that:

- 1) The proposed site re-development is to cause no negative impacts to the proposed development or to upstream or downstream properties.

- 2) Proposed Stormwater Management Facilities are to include no loss of flood storage and are to be excavated with minimal berms. The effect of flood plain flow regime on the intended function of the Stormwater facilities is to be incorporated into the siting and design.
- 3) Stage-storage -discharge relationships and floodplain flow regimes for rainfall events up to and including the Regional (Timmins) storm are to be maintained.

The applicant's engineering firm completed and stamped the requested technical analysis and provided supporting documentation showing that while fulfilling above criteria a portion of the site could be developed, providing reasonable due diligence that the policy objectives of GSCA's Regulation 151/06 would be fulfilled and showing alignment with the requirements for Development associated with existing uses in GSCA policies section 8.1.2.

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-19-053**

**Moved by:**  
**Seconded by:**

**Scott Mackey**  
**Ryan Greig**

**WHEREAS the GSCA Board of Directors sets out the policies for the issuance of CA permits for the development, interference with wetlands and alterations to shorelines and watercourses under Section 28 of the CAA and Ontario Regulation 151/06;**

**AND WHEREAS there has been an application for development of an existing site, where a flood plain study has shown the majority of the site is in the Regional Storm flood plan and this portion could not be developed under the current policies;**

**AND WHEREAS the applicant has provided engineered and stamped documentation for a design which provides reasonable due diligence that GSCA's overall policy objectives would be fulfilled and alignment with the requirements for Development associated with existing uses;**

**THAT the Board of Directors endorse an exception to policy 8.1.1 for the cut and fill approach outlined in permit application GS19-028 and direct staff to continue with the reviews and processes to issue a Permit for this application.**

**Carried**

## 7. **Business Out Of Minutes**

a) Update on Working Group Actions and Outcomes from Provincial Funding Cut and Proposed Legislative Changes per Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO) Postings

Cathy Little updated the Board on this item.

There was a Resolution from the April 24<sup>th</sup> BOD meeting, that a Working Group of staff, Cathy Little and Marion Koepke be set up to support the development of GSCA's response, and that they work with partners, stakeholders, and municipalities, to articulate the value of CA work, garner support for GSCA's position, and encourage these organizations to convey their support to the Province including via the online ERO commenting window.

Specifically:

1. Ask to present at County Councils: Complete.
2. Provide info, recommended motions and ERO input to Directors to carry to local Councils: Complete.
3. Appear at council meetings by invitation: Complete.
4. Prepare notice and information to stakeholders and partners requesting support: Complete.
5. Arrange discussions with local developers: In Progress.
6. Seek meeting with Minister Bill Walker: Complete.

In response to Provincial changes to CA funding and CAA legislation, and at the BOD's direction, GSCA has been advocating to municipalities, Counties, stakeholders and partners, and the public, every day for the last four weeks.

Despite a very tight timeline and other challenges including uncertainty, we have been successful in gaining active support for the GSCA position on funding and legislative concerns from the 8 member municipal councils and 2 county councils in our watershed, as well as active support from other partners and stakeholder groups.

I think we are one of a few CAs, who were proactive in tackling this challenge. We all, Staff and Directors, have contributed. So thank you one and all, for stepping up and pulling together to give ourselves the best chance of success.

Lastly, thank you to our CAO for her leadership in spearheading this campaign. With working group and other staff support, she arranged media interviews and social media roll-out, scheduled meetings and presentations, created the decks and speaking notes, coordinated with our neighbouring CAOs and GMs, and consulted broadly with other CA CAOs, and CO.

On behalf of the BOD, thank you Sonya and your staff for your extra-ordinary initiative.

## **8. Consent Agenda**

**Motion No.:**                      **Moved by:**                      **Scott Greig**  
**FA-19-054**                      **Seconded by:**                      **Harley Greenfield**

**THAT in consideration of the Consent Agenda Items listed on the May 22nd, 2019, agenda, the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors receives the following items: 1) Environmental Planning - Section 28 Permits – April 2019; 2) Administration - Receipts and Expenses – April 2019; 3) Minutes: 1) Foundation – April 10th, 2019; 4) Correspondence – 1) Letter to Watershed Municipalities, Counties of Grey and Bruce, and MPP Bill Walker, re: Effects on Municipalities due to Legislative Changes and Reductions in Provincial Funding to Conservation Authorities; 2) 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Reserves Investment Report; 3) Letter from Town of South Bruce Peninsula re: Conservation Authority Funding; 4) Letter from Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks re: Made-In-Ontario Environmental Plan; 5) Letter from MNRF re: 2019-2020 Transfer Payment Funding; 6) Letter from MNRF re: Summer Employment Opportunities; 7) Letter from DWSP to Municipal Clerks and Councils re: Bill 108; 8) Letter to Bill Walker, MPP, from Nora Toth, Stewardship Grey Bruce re: changes to Conservation Authorities Act;**

**Carried**

## **8. Business Items**

a) Water Management – nothing at this time

b) Environmental Planning

1) Update on planning agreements with Municipalities

Under the Planning Act and the related Provincial Policy Statement, municipalities must consider any impacts from the proposed work on Natural Heritage, on a watershed basis.

As Conservation Authorities have a Natural Resources-related mandate and are already dealing with many applications for a CA regulatory permit, GSCA has agreements and understandings with its counties and/or local municipalities to provide professional comments on Natural Heritage as well. Many of these agreements are dated and are being updated in 2019.

Andy Sorensen updated the Board that staff are starting with the agreement with Bruce County, who provides Natural Heritage services on behalf of their local municipalities.

We met with Bruce County, SVCA, and MVCA on March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2019. The County provided a draft agreement for CAs to review. SVCA may be completing a Natural Heritage Review in the small portion of the MVCA, and GSCA will cover North Bruce Peninsula. We have reviewed the updated draft agreement and staff are generally satisfied with the wording. The agreement updates some references to the Provincial Policy Statement and includes the Dispute Resolution Procedure. SVCA suggests a base fee of \$360 per application. In light of a response Bruce County received on their publicly-tendered RFP for Natural Heritage services, the increase appears to be justified and brings GSCA closer to full cost recovery. The current approved GSCA base fee is \$280.00. Fees are still being discussed and we hope to meet next week to finalize wording and recommendations. MVCA is still reviewing.

Once the wording and agreement are worked out with Bruce County, the agreement will be provided to the Board for their input and ratification, and staff will start the conversation with Grey County and their local municipalities for implementation in January 2020.

To support consistent application of Natural Heritage principles, and provide a better understanding county-wide, Bruce County is also embarking on a County Wide Natural Heritage Study (similar to the Green in Grey study) and have an RFP being advertised. There is an offer for GSCA to sit on the Steering Committee.

## 2) Proposed Species at Risk changes by provincial government

The list of Species at Risk for Ontario (SARO list) is updated by the Committee on the Status of Species at Risk in Ontario (COSSARO). They also have lists that are specific to individual counties, and GSCA typically follows the lists for Bruce and Grey Counties.

If GSCA sees a SAR or their habitat on a site proposed for development, it will be noted in the Natural Heritage report to the municipality. However, it is MECP who is accountable for enforcing/reviewing the SAR and they generally rely on the self-reporting of landowners. GSCA staff perceived a lack of MNRF resources allocated to this portfolio in the past, and it is not clear if the move of accountability from MNRF to MECP will improve this.

The province has proposed changes to the Endangered Species Act, and MECP put out a quick one-month opportunity for comments via the Environmental Registry of Ontario website, which closed on May 18<sup>th</sup>. GSCA did not get the chance to comment given our other EROs and funding challenges. However, in addition to Grey County, many stakeholder interest groups such as Ontario Nature provided comments.

Changes proposed include:

- Reducing protections if the species exist outside of Ontario



- Multiple timeframe changes that would delay listing, planning for and reporting on SAR
- Minister can veto committee's decisions to list species, and committee membership opened to non-scientists
- Create a new independent Crown agency, known as the Species at Risk Conservation Trust (SARCT). This agency would allow municipalities and other infrastructure developers the option to pay a fee, in lieu of completing some activities required by the ESA. The option to "pay-in-lieu" would only be available on certain species, as prescribed by regulation. The funds collected by SARCT would then be used to assist in the recovery and protection of species at risk.

The overall assessment of the changes by staff, is that the solid protections for Species at Risk have been decreased. However, the ultimate outcomes will depend upon how this is implemented, and the intentions and skills of those doing so. Staff would like to see CAs reviewing proposed projects and allocating SAR funding, in lieu of creating a new SARCT agency to do so.

Next steps – The ESA changes are part of Bill 108 (Schedule 5), which is going to the government's Justice Policy Committee around the end of May.

#### c) Lands Update

##### 1) Indigenous Committee Report Back

Tim Lanthier, Lands and Habitats Coordinator, made a presentation to the Board on this item, based on a request from GSCA's *Indigenous and GSCA Relationships Committee* (hereinafter, "the Committee").

On November 7, 2017, GSCA Staff members and several Board members met with representatives from the Metis Nation of Ontario (MNO) during the GSCA strategic plan consultations. During this meeting, several verbal requests came forward from MNO:

1. For the signing of a General Relationship Agreement (GRA) between MNO and GSCA;
2. For GSCA to waive parking fees for members of the MNO community;
3. For GSCA to allow MNO community members to hunt at Hibou Conservation Area. MNO is referring to this hunt as a limited harvesting season.

Following the meeting, MNO provided GSCA with a draft of a proposed GRA.

We have had further discussions with MNO representatives regarding items '2' and '3' and have not provided a formal response.

Based on a Staff level review of the request, and follow up discussions at the Committee level, we offer the following analysis of each request. Overall the Committee

used a fair and consistent treatment lens in reviewing the requests, considering how we would treat a similar request from any Indigenous or other partner or stakeholder.

1. The proposed GRA contains a number of statements that are positive for and may be gains for MNO, with no apparent gains for GSCA. As such, GSCA staff and the Committee are recommending that the relationship proceed in good faith, but without the signing of a formal agreement. Over time and with collaboration, GSCA may be able to suggest appropriate content for a balanced agreement and may wish to enter into similar agreements with all our Indigenous partners at around the same time.
2. The request to waive parking fees is not supported by GSCA Staff or by the Committee. As explained by MNO members during our initial meeting, they believe that any barrier to water access (on land owned by any entity) impedes access to their water rights. The MNO members articulated that they perceived GSCA's charging of parking fees to be such as barrier.

GSCA owns over 200 properties, in roughly 80 property groupings. GSCA does not charge an entrance fee for access to any of our properties. GSCA does charge a parking fee to park a car or bus in eight of our parking areas:

- Inglis Falls Conservation Area (only at the waterfall parking area);
- Hibou Conservation Area (only at the main beach parking area);
- Ainslie Woods Conservation Area (only at the pavilion parking area);
- Bognor Marsh Management Area;
- Old Baldy Conservation Area (only at the upper lot);
- Eugenia Falls Conservation Area;
- Spirit Rock Conservation Area; and,
- Bruce's Caves Conservation Area.

There is no restriction on people being dropped off at these properties, entering the properties on foot or bicycle, or on parking at a different location on the properties for those that have multiple parking areas. Additionally, there are roughly 72 other property areas that do not have paid parking, that are open to the public within the bounds of the permitted uses and the Conservation Authorities Act.

For these reasons, GSCA Staff and the Committee do not interpret the payment of parking fees at certain GSCA properties as a barrier to access.

3. The request to allow hunting at Hibou Conservation Area is not supported by GSCA Staff or the Committee. Hibou Conservation Area is a well-used property in close proximity to the City of Owen Sound and the Hamlet of Leith. This property is privately owned by the GSCA and does not currently permit hunting. The property is used extensively by walkers, hikers, and families for passive recreation, and has multiple access points. Further, GSCA, with the Friends of Hibou and the Grey Sauble Conservation Foundation, with support from the

Owen Sound Field Naturalists, Community Foundation Grey Bruce, and the Kiwanis Club, recently opened an interpretive trail that is being promoted on our website and in our brochure.

We note that members of the public have carried out illegal hunting on the Hibou property, and MNR Conservation Enforcement staff have been involved.

GSCA allows hunting at approximately 57 of its other property groups, including several in more rural areas not far from Hibou, where we encourage the MNO to consider for their hunts. A map of these locations is available at the GSCA offices and can be provided to the MNO upon their request.

**Motion No.:                      Moved by:                      Paul McKenzie**  
**FA-19-055                      Seconded by:                      Sue Carleton**

**WHEREAS GSCA has received a verbal request from members of the Metis Nation of Ontario (MNO) to Waive Parking Fees for members of the MNO Community and Allow MNO Community Members to hunt at Hibou Conservation Area, and were invited to enter into a written General Relationship Agreement;**

**AND WHEREAS GSCA Staff have reviewed this request with GSCA's Indigenous and GSCA Relationships Committee (the Committee);**

**THAT the GSCA Board of Directors and Staff continue to foster an informal positive relationship with representatives from the Metis Nation of Ontario and not a written General Relationship Agreement at this time;**

**AND FURTHER THAT the GSCA Board of Directors ask the Committee and staff to be open to mutually-beneficial discussions between GSCA and the MNO about the trade of natural resource-related input and services for free parking or other benefits, and respectfully decline to offer a waiver of parking fees for MNO members on GSCA properties;**

**AND FURTHER THAT the GSCA Board of Directors suggest the MNO consider hunts at GSCA properties where hunting is a Permitted Use in accordance with Provincial hunting regulations, including those in the more rural areas near Hibou, and respectfully deny the MNO members request to hunt at Hibou Conservation Area.**

**Carried**

**d) Forestry**

- 1) Emerald Ash Borer Parasitoid Release on GSCA Property

Mike Fry, Forestry Coordinator made the following presentation.

The Emerald Ash Borer (*Agrilus planepennis*) was detected in North America (near Detroit, Michigan) in 2002 and shortly after in Essex County, Ontario. It is believed it was present for at least a decade before detection and has spread rapidly throughout Ontario and into Quebec through the movement of wood products. EAB has been detected within the GSCA watershed and is believed to be more widespread than the currently known locations. It is estimated that ash makes up approximately 5-10% of the forest trees on GSCA properties. Some areas are as high as 100% ash.

The emerald ash borer is a small (~1/2 inch) metallic green beetle that is native to Asia where natural predators exist to keep populations under control. It is known to kill all North American species of ash (*Fraxinus spp.*). Adults feed on the foliage while the larvae feed on the tissues. The tree normally dies within four years, and more than 90% will be killed within six years.

EAB will impact the biodiversity of our forests, reduce the forest cover, have substantial impacts on the forest industry and First Nations/Indigenous culture through the loss of black ash which is used for basket making.

Control of EAB has been very difficult as the beetle is small and it is difficult to identify infected trees until adults emerge, when the tree is already under stress. One can inject a systemic insecticide into the tree, and this can be an effective, yet expensive, strategy to protect individual trees but is not possible for GSCA across an entire watershed.

Scientists from Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)/Canadian Forest Service (CFS) have proposed to release three different parasitoids as alternatives to chemical pesticides on GSCA properties, where they would identify sites, coordinate and release the parasitoids. This project will help to inform best management practices for controlling EAB populations, impacts of EAB parasitoids on EAB populations and the impacts of EAB on forests, and is intended to control the spread of EAB as well as develop a Canadian population of the three parasitoids for future releases. The parasitoids have been approved for release in Canada by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), and have already been released in southern and eastern Ontario

As this is not a permitted use currently identified on GSCA properties (as per GSCA's Permitted Uses Guideline, March 2019), GSCA Board of Directors approval is required to allow the project to proceed.

Paul McKenzie noted that he supports this proposal, and he has seen property near John Lake that had no EAB last spring, and now 65 acres of hardwood has been destroyed, with more visible south to Oliphant. Several others also supported this action to control EAB. Harley Greenfield asked whether we knew where it is in Grey County, and Mike Fry advised that it is widespread but the exact extent is not known. It has not been observed in the Beaver Valley.

Several Directors asked about the risk of bringing in the wasps, and Mike reiterated the federal government approval, and that the wasps were introduced as early as the mid 2000's.

**Motion No.:                      Moved by:                      Paul McKenzie**  
**FA-19-056                      Seconded by:                      Scott Mackey**

**WHEREAS Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) owns and manages over 28,000 acres of land comprised of 209 individual properties organized into 79 groupings;**

**AND WHEREAS, GSCA manages nearly 13,000 acres of forested area to ensure healthy forests and to offset the operating expenses of the Forestry department and GSCA;**

**AND WHEREAS, the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) is an invasive insect that is quickly spreading throughout Ontario, with few known predators;**

**AND WHEREAS, this project will help to inform future research opportunities regarding the impacts of EAB parasitoids on EAB populations, best management practices regarding controlling EAB and the impacts of EAB on the forest ecosystem;**

**AND WHEREAS, amendments and exceptions to the approved Permitted Uses on GSCA land requires endorsement of the Full Authority Board of Directors by way of Resolution, except for specified delegations which do not apply in this case;**

**AND WHEREAS, Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)/Canadian Forest Service (CFS) have approached GSCA staff to identify and allow for the release of known EAB parasitoids approved by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency to control the spread of EAB;**

**THAT the GSCA Board of Directors approve an exception to the current GSCA Permitted Uses to allow for the release of parasitoid wasps to control the EAB and to research the impacts this has on the EAB population.**

**Carried**

**Motion No.:                      Moved by:                      Andrea Matrosovs**  
**FA-19-057                      Seconded by:                      Scott Greig**

**THAT Item 9 g) – Other Business – DWSP/RMO Report 1) Risk Management Official Appointment – be moved up in the agenda after Item 9 d)**

**Carried**

g) DWSP/RMO Report – 1) Risk Management Official Appointment

Risk Management Officials (RMOs) and Risk Management Inspectors (RMIs) need to be appointed under Part IV of the *Clean Water Act, 2006 (the Act)* to carry out the duties and powers under *the Act*. Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) has entered into agreements with thirteen municipalities to perform RMO/RMI duties on their behalf. Due to the recent staffing change, Karen Gillan has now taken on the role of Source Protection Supervisor/Risk Management Inspector and a new appointment is required.

RMOs are responsible for negotiating risk management plans under s.58 of *the Act*, as well as issuing s.59 screening (restricted land use) notices.

RMIs are responsible for ensuring compliance through inspections and have the authority to collect documents and data related to an activity subject to a risk management plan.

Karen Gillan is currently a designated Risk Management Inspector and has completed the necessary Director-approved RMO/RMI training course to be eligible for appointment. It is important to have Karen also appointed as a Risk Management Official for back-up purposes and to assist in the issuance of Section 59 screening notices.

**Motion No.:**                      **Moved by:**                      **Scott Greig**  
**FA-19-058**                      **Seconded by:**                      **Andrea Matrosovs**

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors appoint Karen Gillan, by Certificate of Appointment, a Risk Management Official/Risk Management Inspector.**

**Carried**

e) Communications/Public Relations – nothing at this time

f) Administration

1) Q1 Financial Report and Year End Forecast

Alison Armstrong, Finance Coordinator, noted that the first Quarter Financial Expenditures and Revenue Report and Year End Forecasts are in the board's package. Finances are generally on track, and there are several items that are of note:

- Stewardship has an additional \$10,931 in revenue from MECP, as the funding for Indian Creek was un-frozen
- \$7K of revenue was removed for the Summer Experience Program student, as the province cut this program.
- The Forestry department is currently projecting to need \$60K from reserves, doubling the \$30K need that was expected at the start of the year. Staff will work on this over the next quarter to confirm and recommend any in-year actions

- Lands Policy and Strategy achieved over \$17K additional revenue due to the retendering of the agricultural land leases
  - In GIS/IT there was an overall reduction in both expenditures and revenue for the GSCA/Owen Sound climate change collaboration, as the Canadian Federation of Municipalities funding is being routed through Owen Sound and not GSCA as was originally intended.
  - Drinking Water Source Protection funding has not changed, but staff note that the agreement has not yet been signed with MECP for the 2019/20 funds.
- 2) 2019 Continuous Improvement Proposal for GSCA's Board, Staff, Committees, Volunteers, Donors, and Partners Event – This Item was deferred.

## 9. CAO's Update and Monthly Calendar

- The LiDAR funded under the Natural Disaster Mitigation Program started flying this week.
- Mill Dam was put in, and water levels at other dams are being actively monitored to optimize installation timings.
- A WECl application to subsidize capital costs for Clendenan Dam for railings and signage was submitted to MNRF for \$22,000.
- The beginning of the pilot to have gate staff present at Eugenia started on the past weekend, and the lot was quite busy. GSCA and Municipal staff are talking about parking on the road.
- The Ainslie Wood washroom replacement is complete, and staff are planning to cut less grass at the Arboretum going forward.
- Sonya expressed appreciation to Drean Robinson for always getting the BOD's reports compiled and out to the Board on time and all the other many things she does for her and GSCA.

## 10. Chair's Report – nothing at this time

## 11. Other Business

- a) Committees – Minutes – nothing at this time for the following:
- 1) Forestry Committee;
  - 2) Indigenous and GSCA Relationships Committee;
  - 3) Friends of Hibou;
  - 4) Arboretum Alliance;
  - 5) BRWI;
- b) Next Meeting: **Wednesday, June 26th, 2019, at 1:15 p.m.;**  
**Bus Tour – Wednesday, July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019, leaving GSCA Administration Centre at 9:00 a.m.**

**12. Closed Session** – nothing at this time

**13. Adjournment** – The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

---

Cathy Little, Chair

---

Doreen Robinson  
Administrative Assistant

This set of minutes was adopted by the GSCA Board of Directors at the BOD's meeting held on June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2019.