



519.376.3076  
237897 Inglis Falls Road  
Owen Sound, ON N4K 5N6  
[www.greysauble.on.ca](http://www.greysauble.on.ca)

Protect.  
Respect.  
Connect.

**Grey Sauble Conservation Authority**  
**R.R. #4, 237897 Inglis Falls Road**  
**Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 5N6 (519) 376-3076; ext. 221**  
**[v.coleman@greysauble.on.ca](mailto:v.coleman@greysauble.on.ca)**

---

**The next regular meeting of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors is scheduled for Wednesday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2022, at 1:15 p.m. The regular meeting will occur via the Webex web-based application. Please notify Valerie Coleman if you are unable to attend.**

**Directors**

Greig, Scott (Chair)  
Matrosovs, Andrea (Vice-Chair)  
Burley, Dwight  
Greenfield, Harley  
Greig, Ryan  
Koepke, Marion  
Little, Cathy  
Mackey, Scott  
McKenzie, Paul  
Moore Coburn, Cathy  
Vickers, Paul

**Honourary Members**

Elwood Moore  
Betty Adair

Oosting, Lara, MNRF Peterborough  
Allison, Tracy, MNRF Owen Sound  
Walker, Bill, MPP Bruce Grey Owen Sound  
Ruff, Alex, MP Bruce Grey Owen Sound  
Dowdall, Terry, MP Simcoe-Grey  
Wilson, Jim, MPP Simcoe-Grey

---

**Member Municipalities**

Municipality of Arran-Elderslie, Town of the Blue Mountains, Township of Chatsworth, Township of Georgian Bluffs, Municipality of Grey Highlands, Municipality of Meaford, City of Owen Sound, Town of South Bruce Peninsula



519.376.3076  
237897 Inglis Falls Road  
Owen Sound, ON N4K 5N6  
[www.greysauble.on.ca](http://www.greysauble.on.ca)

Protect.  
Respect.  
Connect.

**Grey Sauble Conservation Authority**  
**R.R. #4, 237897 Inglis Falls Road**  
**Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 5N6 (519) 376-3076; ext. 221**  
**[v.coleman@greysauble.on.ca](mailto:v.coleman@greysauble.on.ca)**

---

**The next regular meeting of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors is scheduled for Wednesday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2022, at 1:15 p.m. The regular meeting will occur via the Webex web-based application. Public viewing of this meeting will be available via a live stream on YouTube at:**

**[https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCy\\_ie5dXG8aFYDYG8tV9Yg/videos](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCy_ie5dXG8aFYDYG8tV9Yg/videos).**

***Please note that this is a Notice of Meeting only for your information.***

The Sun Times  
Bayshore Broadcasting  
The Meaford Independent  
The Bounce  
The Wiarton Echo  
The Advance  
The Post  
The Thornbury Paper  
The Hub Owen Sound  
Blue Mountains Review  
South Grey News  
Collingwood Today

---

**Member Municipalities**

Municipality of Arran-Elderslie, Town of the Blue Mountains, Township of Chatsworth, Township of Georgian Bluffs, Municipality of Grey Highlands, Municipality of Meaford, City of Owen Sound, Town of South Bruce Peninsula

## AGENDA

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority  
Full Authority Meeting  
Wednesday, February 23, 2022, at 1:15 p.m.

---

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest**
3. **Call for Additional Agenda Items**
4. **Adoption of the Agenda**
5. **Approval of Minutes**
  - i. AGM/Full Authority – January 26, 2022 – Resolution – Attachment #1
6. **Business Out of Minutes** – None at this time.
7. **Consent Agenda**
  - i. Environmental Planning – Section 28 Permits – January 2021 – Attachment #2
  - ii. Administration – Receipts & Expenses – January 2021 – Attachment #3
  - iii. Correspondence – Letter from Elwood Moore – Attachment #4
  - iv. Conservation Ontario –
    - a. 2022 Provincial Budget Consultation – Attachment #5
    - b. Conservation Ontario Phase 2 Regulation Summary – Attachment #6
  - v. Minutes – GSC Foundation Meeting Minutes – November 10, 2021 – Attachment #7
  - vi. Media – Attachment #8
8. **Business Items**
  - i. Administration
    - a. 2021 Year-End Budget Report and Reserve Transfers – Resolution – Attachment #9 (20 min)
    - b. CAA Phase 2 Regulations Consultation Guide – Resolution – Attachment #10 (10 min)
    - c. Agricultural Advisory Committee Terms of Reference and Board Appointments – Resolution – Attachment #11 (20 min)
  - ii. Water Management – Nothing at this time.
  - iii. Environmental Planning – Nothing at this time.

- iv. Operations – Nothing at this time.
- v. Conservation Lands
  - a. Admin Building RFP - Ad Hoc Committee – Resolution – Attachment #12 (15 min)
- vi. Forestry
  - a. Skinners Marsh/McNab Lake Forestry Harvest Update – Information (10 min)
- vii. Communication/Public Relations – Nothing at this time.
- viii. Education – Nothing at this time.
- ix. GIS/IT – Nothing at this time.
- x. DWSP/RMO Report – Nothing at this time.

**9. CAO's Report**

**10. Chair's Report**

**11. Resolution to Move into Closed Session – Nothing at this time.**

**12. Resolution Approving the Closed Session Minutes – Nothing at this time.**

**13. Adjournment**

## **Grey Sauble Authority Board of Directors**

---

### **M O T I O N**

**DATE:** February 23, 2022

**MOTION #:** FA-22-015

**MOVED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECONDED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors approve the AGM agenda of February 23, 2022.**

GREY SAUBLE CONSERVATION AUTHORITY  
MINUTES  
Annual General Meeting & Full Authority Board of Directors  
Wednesday, January 26, 2022, at 12:45 p.m.

The Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors meeting was held via the internet on the meeting application, WebEx.

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Scott Greig called the meeting to order at 12:51 p.m.

Directors Present: Chair Scott Greig, Vice Chair Andrea Matrosovs, Dwight Burley, Cathy Moore Coburn, Cathy Little, Harley Greenfield, Ryan Greig, Paul Vickers, Marion Koepke, Scott Mackey, Paul McKenzie

Regrets: None

Staff Present: CAO, Tim Lanthier; Administrative Assistant, Valerie Coleman; Manager of Information Services, Gloria Dangerfield; Manager of Financial and Human Resource Services, Alison Armstrong; Manager of Environmental Planning, MacLean Plewes; Water Coordinator, John Bittorf; Forestry Coordinator, Operations Manager, Morgan Barrie; DWSP Coordinator Carl Seider

Guests: John Anderson, Dick Hibma, Jennifer Stephens, Paul McQueen, Bob Hann, Ron Savage, Don Sankey, Marie Knapp, Kim Wingrove, Brian Low, Mariane McLeod, Sally Leppard, Steve Hamell, John Tamming, Lorraine Sutton, Barbara Dobreen, Sonya Skinner

**2. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest**

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

**3. Call for Additional Agenda Items**

Nothing at this time.

**4. Adoption of Agenda**

Motion No.:  
FA-22-001

Moved By: Cathy Little  
Seconded By: Dwight Burley

THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors approve the agenda of January 26, 2022.

**Carried**

**5. Remarks from the Chair**

On behalf of the GSCA Board of Directors, Chair Greig extended greetings to all those who were able to attend the 2022 GSCA Annual General Meeting.

“We are genuinely thankful to have your support for the Conservation Authority and extraordinarily appreciative of your commitments aligned with our mission of promoting and undertaking sustainable management of renewable natural resources and to provide responsible leadership to enhance biodiversity and environmental awareness.

2021 despite all of its challenges was a year, while your Board of Directors wishes to be once again meeting together, of working extremely cordially together to advance Authority goals and to meet various challenges.

I hope that each of your municipalities knows that you are very well represented at the Conservation Authority by your appointed and committed officials.

Despite one court decision, which I respectfully disagree with, your Board of Directors is very pleased of the achievements in 2021, and tremendously appreciate the Conservation Authority staff who produce the results. We look forward to the year in review forthcoming.”

Chair Greig introduced Dr. John Anderson of the Georgian Bluffs Climate Action Committee. A retired marine scientist, Dr. Anderson has lived in the Owen Sound area since 2009 and has researched climate change in the region. Dr. Anderson co-produced “Resilience: Transforming our Community”, a local climate change film released in 2019 at a sold out show at the Roxy Theatre. Dr. Anderson serves as scientific advisor for several groups and has lectured on climate change at Georgian College.

**Member Scott Mackey joined the meeting at 12:54 p.m.**

## **6. Guest Speaker**

John Anderson of the Georgian Bluffs Climate Action Committee provided a presentation on climate action.

## **7. 2021 Highlights and Accomplishments**

CAO, Tim Lanthier thanked John Anderson for his presentation, the GSCA Board of Directors for their support, and the GSCA staff for all of their hard work in the past year.

Tim provided a presentation that reviewed GSCA’s mission, vision, values, strategic goals and highlighted some of GSCA’s accomplishments in 2021.

### **Flood Forecasting and Warning**

- Increase rain gauge access to 90 stations.
- Created monthly rain fall summaries and new crop heat unit maps.
- New water level Gauge on the Beaver River.

### **Environmental Planning**

- 488 Development Permit applications
- Nearly 600 Planning applications

### **Land Management**

- Launched GSCA Property Ambassador Program and contactless payment option.
- New playground feature at Hibou Conservation Area in partnership with Sydenham and District Optimist Club and several other community partners.

- First draft of the Inglis Falls Management Plan completed.
- A pilot project to tackle Emerald Ash Borer in partnership with Natural Resource Canada and the Canadian Forest Service.
- \$150,000 in grant funding for tree planting.

#### Improve Water Quality

- Completed Source Protection Plan amendments.
- Renewed service agreements with 13 out of 14 service partners.

#### Strengthen Environmental Education and Communication

- New GSCA Explore Guide property brochure.
- Upgraded the GSCA Augmented Reality Sandbox educational tool.

#### Other

- Completion and implementation of salary review.
- Implementation of new, more efficient payroll and time sheeting system.
- New online forms for development permits, tree orders, membership passes and MFIPPA requests.

GSCA staff created a video presentation to introduce themselves and gave some highlights of staff goals, favorite properties, and other fun facts.

### 8. Greetings from Guests

Chair Greig offered guests the opportunity to introduce themselves and bring greetings from their respective organization. In order of appearance:

- Member Koepke on behalf of Mayor Ian Boddy of the City of Owen Sound.
- Marie Knapp of the Friends of Hibou
- Don Sankey on behalf of the Grey Sauble Conservation Foundation
- Mayor Steve Hamell of the Township of Aaron-Elderslie
- Chair Mariane McLeod of Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority
- Ron Savage of Sydenham Bruce Trail Club
- Robert Hann of Beaver Valley Bruce Trail Club
- Mayor Paul McQueen on behalf of the Municipality of Grey Highlands
- Vice Chair Barbara Dobreen of Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority

### 9. Board Appointments

#### i. Election of Officers

Chair Scott Greig and Vice Chair Andrea Matrosovs vacated their Chairs.

##### a. Appointment of Chair Pro Tem

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-002**

**Moved By:**  
**Seconded By:**

**Marion Koepke**  
**Scott Mackey**

**THAT Dick Hibma be appointed as Chair Pro Tem for the 2022 election of officers.**

**Carried**

##### b. Review of Voting Procedures

Dick Hibma reviewed the voting procedures and asked if there were any questions.



**c. Motion to Appoint Scrutineers**

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-003**

**Moved By:** Cathy Little  
**Seconded By:** Marion Koepke

**THAT Sonya Skinner and Don Sankey be appointed scrutineers.**

**Carried**

---

**d. Election of 2022 Chair**

Chair Pro Tem, Dick Hibma called three (3) times for nominations from the floor for the position of Chair for 2022.

1. Member Dwight Burley nominated Scott Greig for the position of Chair for 2022.
2. None declared.
3. None declared.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-004**

**Moved By:** Paul Vickers  
**Seconded By:** Paul McKenzie

**THAT nominations for the election of Chair for 2022 close.**

**Carried**

---

Scott Greig accepted his nomination for Chair for 2022 and thanked Member Dwight Burley for nominating him.

Dick Hibma declared Scott Greig as Chair for 2022 by acclamation.

**e. Election of 2022 Vice Chair**

Chair Pro Tem, Dick Hibma called three (3) times for nominations from the floor for the position of Vice Chair for 2022.

1. Member Scott Mackey nominated Andrea Matrosovs for the position of Vice Chair for 2022.
2. None declared.
3. None declared.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-005**

**Moved By:** Cathy Little  
**Seconded By:** Dwight Burley

**THAT nominations for the election of Vice Chair for 2022 close.**

**Carried**

---

Andrea Matrosovs accepted her nomination for Vice Chair for 2022 and thanked Member Scott Mackey for nominating her.

Dick Hibma declared Andrea Matrosovs as Vice Chair for 2022 by acclamation.

**f. Motion to Destroy Ballets – Nothing at this time.**

## **ii. Remarks by 2022 Chair Elect and 2022 Vice Chair Elect**

2022 Chair Elect Scott Greig extended his thanks to Member Dwight Burley for his nominations and to the Board for their continued support. Chair Greig also extended thanks to Dick Hibma for serving as Chair Pro Tem and to Sonya Skinner and Don Sankey for serving as scrutineers.

Chair Greig acknowledged the work the Board and staff have been doing to respond to the province's changes to the Conservation Authority Act and the work that is still to be done. It was noted that the Board and staff are continuing to move forward on the improvements that are needed for the administration offices. The Board will continue to assess the staffing needs to provide a high-quality level of service in a fiscally responsible manner. Chair Greig commended the Board for working well together and noted that 2022 will be a busy year with an election coming in the fall.

Chair Greig congratulated Vice Chair Matrosovs for her re-election and thanked her for extending her service for another year.

2022 Vice Chair Elect Andrea Matrosovs thanked Member Scott Mackey for his nomination and the Board for their support.

Vice Chair Matrosovs commended the forward thinking of the early work done on flood risk management and the creation of conservation authorities and watershed boundaries. GSCA is a leader in the field in responding to the directions from the province. It was noted that Conservation Authorities are an excellent example of how to contribute to all three pillars of sustainability: environmental, social, and economic.

## **iii. Appointments**

- a.** Conservation Foundation
- b.** Forestry Committee
- c.** Arboretum Alliance
- d.** Drinking Water Source Protection Management Committee
- e.** Agricultural Committee

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-006**

**Moved By:** Dwight Burley  
**Seconded By:** Andrea Matrosovs

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors make the following appointments to the Committees as listed:**

**Conservation Foundation: Cathy Little, Scott Greig**

**Forestry Committee: Paul Vickers, Dwight Burley, Ryan Greig, Harley Greenfield, Marion Koepke**

**Arboretum Alliance: Scott Greig**

**Indigenous Relationships Committee: Cathy Moore Coburn, Dwight Burley, Cathy Little, Paul McKenzie**

**Source Protection Region Management Committee: Scott Greig, Andrea Matrosovs**

**Carried**

---

Question regarding the Agricultural Advisory Committee and Board appointments. It was believed that the Terms of Reference did not include any Board Member appointments. Staff will confirm.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-007**

**Moved By:** **Scott Mackey**  
**Seconded By:** **Harley Greenfield**

**THAT the Agricultural Advisory Committee Terms of Reference be amended to include Board Member appointees and be brought back to the Board for approval.**

**Carried**

---

After review, it was confirmed that there are 2 Board Member appointments, and a motion will be brought to the February Full Authority Meeting for appointment and approval.

**10. 15 Minute Break**

Chair Greig called a 15-minute break at 2:25 p.m.

**11. Resume Full Authority Meeting**

Chair Greig resumed the meeting at 2:43 p.m.

**Member Cathy Moore Coburn did not return to the meeting.**

**12. Approval of Minutes**

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-008**

**Moved By:** **Marion Koepke**  
**Seconded By:** **Dwight Burley**

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors approve the Full Authority minutes of December 22, 2021.**

**Carried**

---

**13. Business Out of Minutes**

Nothing at this time.

**14. Consent Agenda**

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-009**

**Moved By:** **Cathy Little**  
**Seconded By:** **Scott Mackey**

**THAT in consideration of the Consent Agenda Items listed on the January 26, 2022, agenda, the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors receives the following items: (i) Environmental Planning – Section 28 Permits – December 2021; (ii) Administration – Receipts & Expenses – December 2021; (iv) Conservation Ontario – Letter from CO to Minister’s of Finance, and Environment and Climate Change; (v) Minutes – GSCA Agricultural Advisory Committee Minutes; (vi) Recent Media Articles**

**Carried**

---

## 15. Business Items

### i. **Administration**

#### a. **2022 Operational Plan**

The CAO, Tim Lanthier, presented the 2022 Operational Plan. It was noted that this plan is designed to forward the strategic goals of the GSCA. Additionally, each department has its own operational plan that extends beyond these tasks.

A Member asked with respect to the Board Engagement and Onboarding item.

CAO Lanthier responded that this item is largely to prepare for the potential appointment of new members following the 2022 municipal elections. Staff want to ensure that there is a strong orientation package of information available for new members. Additionally, having a package of information for all council members of all member municipalities to provide information about what conservations are and what they do.

A Member asked with respect to the personnel policy and when it was last reviewed.

CAO Lanthier responded that parts of it have been reviewed and updated as needed, however; it has not been reviewed in its entirety in a number of years and requires a holistic review.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-010**

**Moved By:**  
**Seconded By:**

**Marion Koepke**  
**Dwight Burley**

**WHEREAS the General Membership of the Authority has approved a Strategic Plan for the operations of the Authority;**

**AND FURTHER WHEREAS The Chief Administrative Officer of the Authority is responsible for developing short and long-term goals of the Authority to support the Strategic Plan;**

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors accept and approve the 2022 Priority Workplan as presented.**

**Carried**

---

#### b. **GSCA Programs and Services Inventory Report**

The CAO, Tim Lanthier, presented the GSCA Programs and Services Inventory Report as required by the province. It was noted that this report will act as a starting point for discussions with member municipalities.

The inventory is required to contain which programs and services are provided or planned to be provided, their approximate cost and funding sources, and what category they fall into. Category 1 are mandatory programs and services; Category 2 are programs and services provided on behalf of a municipality; and Category 3 are other programs and services that the Authority deems beneficial.

The inventory has been designed to be consistent with the GSCA Budget format to improve clarity and readability, and to assist in facilitating discussion.

The next step will be to circulate the inventory to member municipalities, local counties, and those municipalities with agreements in place.

MECP requires quarterly reporting starting in July of 2022 on the status of agreement discussions and any changes to the inventory.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-011**

**Moved By:** Scott Mackey  
**Seconded By:** Andrea Matrosovs

**WHEREAS on October 4, 2021, the Province of Ontario released Ontario Regulation 687/21 – Transition Plans and Agreements for Programs and Services Under Section 21.1.2 of the Act,**

**AND WHEREAS this regulation requires that, by February 28, 2022, conservation authorities develop an Inventory of Programs and Services,**

**THAT the GSCA Board of Directors endorse the attached “Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Programs and Services Inventory” as presented,**

**AND THAT this document be included in the broader Transition Plan as an appendix,**

**AND THAT the CAO be directed to forward a copy of this updated transition plan to each of GSCA’s participating municipalities and to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), as per the requirements of the regulation.**

**Carried**

---

**c. Staffing Update**

The CAO, Tim Lanthier spoke to need to hire an additional full-time position in the Environmental Planning Department. Due to the substantial increase in formal planning and permit applications that are not projected to decrease, staff recommended the inclusion of a full-time Regulations Officers position in advance of the completion of the Watson and Associates report, which will be presented to the Board in March or April. This position is intended to help manage permitting and the increasing number of violation reports. This was one of three additional positions to be added to the Department following the service rate review.

It is planned that 2021 surplus and/or deferred revenues generated through the increased applications in 2021 will cover approximately half of the first-year costs. Interim increases in service fees, as well as a change to these fees following the Service Rate Review is predicted to cover the majority of the remaining costs.

There was discussion around the likelihood of the current growth rate of applications continuing into the future and what would be done if the number of applications decreases. CAO Lanthier advised that it does not look likely that the volume of planning and permitting applications will decline in the near future, and should it become necessary, the department staffing could be re-evaluated at that time.

Several Member’s voiced support for expanding the staffing resources in the department, especially where staff wellbeing, longevity, and retention is concerned. Additionally, to support the high quality of work that the department produces.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-012**

**Moved By:** Andrea Matrosovs  
**Seconded By:** Dwight Burley

**WHEREAS GSCA is experiencing a trend of increased development and increases in applications within the Environmental Planning Department;**

---

---

**AND WHEREAS current staff capacity is unreasonably strained;**

**AND WHEREAS the GSCA is currently in the midst of a service fee review of the Environmental Planning Department service fees to ensure full cost recovery and to facilitate an expansion of the Department to address development pressures;**

**AND THAT the Board of Directors endorse creating and hiring a “Regulation Officer” position effective immediately.**

**Carried**

---

**ii. Water Management**

Nothing at this time.

**iii. Environmental Planning**

Nothing at this time.

**iv. Operations**

Nothing at this time.

**v. Conservation Lands**

Nothing at this time.

**vi. Forestry**

**a. 2022 Forestry Fee Schedule Update**

The Forestry Coordinator, Mike Fry presented the proposed fee schedule for the Forestry Department for 2022. There is an average of 9% increases in fees to cover the increased costs of the department. Forestry is a self-funded department that receives no levy funds.

A Member asked when the fee schedule was last reviewed. Mike Fry answered that the tree sales fees are reviewed annually and that most fees were last reviewed two to three years ago.

A Member asked if Forestry services could be a revenue generator for the GSCA. Mike Fry explained that the tree sales and planting, and Forest Management Plans (MFTIPs) are busy, and pricing is in line with the costs to fund that work. GSCA does not engage in a great deal of tree marking unlike many of the competitors in the region.

A Member asked if GSCA has relationships with municipalities to generate additional revenue. Mike Fry explained that GSCA does have relationships with municipalities and private landowners. This is an area that could be expanded to generate additional revenue.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-013**

**Moved By:** Marion Koepke  
**Seconded By:** Cathy Little

**WHEREAS, the GSCA Forestry department provides forest management services to private landowners throughout GSCA’s jurisdiction;**

**AND WHEREAS, the fee schedule is reviewed on an annual basis to ensure fees are consistent and appropriate;**

**THAT, the GSCA Board of Directors approve the 2022 Forestry Fee Schedule as presented in Appendix A.**

**Carried**

---

**vii. Communications/Public Relations**

Nothing at this time.

**viii. Education**

Nothing at this time.

**ix. GIS/IT**

Nothing at this time.

**x. DWSP**

Nothing at this time.

**16. CAO's Report**

The CAO, Tim Lanthier welcomed the Board back from the holiday season. CAO Lanthier gave an update on COVID-19 status at GSCA. Staff were asked to work remotely for the two weeks after the holiday break, this has been extended in response the increased numbers and in accordance with provincial and health unit recommendations. GSCA will continue to monitor the situation and will bring back staff when appropriate. GSCA staff have made arrangements with the County of Grey to utilize their council chambers to host hybrid meetings when appropriate. Office has been closed to the public since the holiday break but will open again when deemed appropriate.

Staff have put in a lot of time and effort into creating the inventory of programs and services and formatting it in a way that is clear and transparent.

GSCA provided two parking passes in 2021 to the Owen Sound Public Library that could be checked out by library card holders. This was well received. Staff are reaching out to additional local library branches across both counties to provide parking passes that can be lent out.

Staff have already started working on operational plan items.

CAO Lanthier commended the staff for their work on the staff video with a special mention to Manager of Conservation Lands, Rebecca Ferguson, for putting it all together.

A Member asked about the \$10,000 donation noted in the December receipts and where it will be allocated. Tim explained that this was a private donation in response to Forestry Coordinator Mike Fry's excellent customer service. With non-specified donations, staff will determine where best to utilize the funds. They are typically used where no other funding would cover the expenditure, equipment needs for example.

**17. Chair's Report**

Chair Greig noted that the GSC Foundation has raised concern over space for the Memorial Forest program. The current properties are getting full and new space will need to be found. Chair Greig asked if any Members had any ideas to please speak with Chair Greig or Member Little.

**18. Other Business**

Nothing at this time.

**19. Resolution to Move into Closed Session**

**20. Resolution Approving the Closed Session Minutes**

Nothing at this time.

**21. Next Full Authority Meeting**

Wednesday February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2022

**22. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-22-014**

**Moved By:** **Paul Vickers**  
**Seconded By:** **Andrea Matrosovs**

**THAT this meeting now adjourn.**

**Carried**

---

---

Scott Greig, Chair

---

Valerie Coleman  
Administrative Assistant



## **Grey Sauble Authority Board of Directors**

---

### **M O T I O N**

**DATE:** February 23, 2022

**MOTION #:** FA-22-016

**MOVED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECONDED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors approve the Full Authority minutes of January 26, 2021.**

# Permits Issued from January 1, 2022 to January 31, 2022

Permit #:	Date Applied:	Date Issued:	Lot:	Conc:	Municipality:	Former Municipality:
GS21-447	22-Oct-21	05-Jan-22			Town of Collingwood	Town of Collingwood
Approved works:		Demolition of existing dwelling, construction of new dwelling and associated site alterations		Project Location: 209675 Highway 26 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Jake Bousfield-Baste		
GS22-007	05-Jan-22	06-Jan-22			Township of Georgian Bluffs	Keppel Township
Approved works:		replacement of a shore well		Project Location: 196 Old Mill Road <input type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Olivia Sroka		
GS21-470	25-Nov-21	07-Jan-22	LOTS 2 4		Township of Georgian Bluffs	Sarawak Township
Approved works:		Construction of a single family dwelling with associated site alterations and stormwater management pond		Project Location: LOTS 4 AND 6 W Carney St <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fill    Olivia Sroka		
GS21-471	16-Nov-21	10-Jan-22	5	8	Town of Collingwood	Collingwood Township
Approved works:		Construction of a new barn		Project Location: 555262 6th Line <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Jake Bousfield-Baste		
GS21-453	12-Nov-21	10-Jan-22			Town of Collingwood	Collingwood Township
Approved works:		Construction of a residential dwelling, septic and associated site alterations		Project Location: 788113 Grey Road 13 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Jake Bousfield-Baste		
GS22-012	05-Jan-22	14-Jan-22			Municipality of Grey Highlands	Artemesia Township
Approved works:		70m3 fill within regulated area for new driveway		Project Location: Lot 41 Harold Best Parkway <input type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fill    Jake Bousfield-Baste		

Permit #:	Date Applied:	Date Issued:	Lot:	Conc:	Municipality:	Former Municipality:
GS21-487	21-Dec-21	17-Jan-22			Town of South Bruce Peninsula	Amabel Township
Approved works:		Construct a deck onto existing cottage		Project Location: 26 Kimberley Lane <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Olivia Sroka		
GS21-480	30-Nov-21	18-Jan-22			Town of Collingwood	Collingwood Township
Approved works:		Residential dwelling, septic and associated site alterations		Project Location: 728228 21st Sideroad <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Jake Bousfield-Baste		
GS22-013	21-Dec-21	18-Jan-22			Municipality of Grey Highlands	Artemesia Township
Approved works:		Residential dwelling, septic system and associated site alterations		Project Location: 154 Peters Crescent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fill    Jake Bousfield-Baste		
GS22-021	18-Jan-22	21-Jan-22			Town of South Bruce Peninsula	Amabel Township
Approved works:		Alteration to a watercourse, placement of fill material and site grading		Project Location: 32 Cammidge Crescent <input type="checkbox"/> construct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fill    Mac Plewes		
GS21-450	09-Nov-21	21-Jan-22			Town of Collingwood	Collingwood Township
Approved works:		Addition to existing dwelling and associated site alterations		Project Location: 126 Timmons Street <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Jake Bousfield-Baste		
GS21-352	26-Aug-21	22-Jan-22	12	8	Municipality of Meaford	St Vincent Township
Approved works:		Construction of a single-family dwelling on private services and associated site alterations		Project Location: 13th Sideroad <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fill    Jake Bousfield-Baste		
GS21-031	25-Jan-21	26-Jan-22	25	14	Municipality of Grey Highlands	Artemesia Township
Approved works:		Construction of a sun room and kitchen addition		Project Location: 174681 Grey Road 30 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Mac Plewes		

Permit #:	Date Applied:	Date Issued:	Lot:	Conc:	Municipality:	Former Municipality:
GS22-041	10-May-21	26-Jan-22	28	11	Municipality of Grey Highlands	Artemesia Township
Approved works:			Installation of a dock		Project Location: 194487 Grey Road 13 <input type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input type="checkbox"/> fill    Mac Plewes	
GS22-040	15-Jan-22	31-Jan-22			Town of South Bruce Peninsula	Albemarle Township
Approved works:			Addition of fill for grading associated with new single family residence		Project Location: 39 REID'S POINT ROAD, INSTR#347336 <input type="checkbox"/> construct <input type="checkbox"/> alter watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> shoreline    Reviewed by: <input type="checkbox"/> alter structure <input type="checkbox"/> alter wetland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fill    Olivia Sroka	

**Grey Sauble Conservation Authority  
Receipt Report  
January 1st - 31st, 2022**

Regulation Permits	\$	6,810.00	
Planning	\$	15,810.00	
Land Use Agreements	\$	226.00	
2022 Season Passes	\$	2,870.00	
Town of The Blue Mountains	\$	12,990.00	Pease Marsh Parking Revenue
Forestry	\$	2,524.30	
Timber Sales	\$	47,700.00	
RMO	\$	36,100.00	
General GSCA Donations	\$	546.45	
Miscellaneous	\$	100.40	MFIPPA, Aerial Photos

<b>Total Monthly Receipts</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>125,677.15</b>
-------------------------------	-----------	-------------------

**Grey Sauble Conservation Authority**  
**Expense Report**  
**January 1st to 31st, 2022**

11698	Accountability	\$	791.00	Adagio Module Renewals
11699	Bayshore Broadcasting	\$	678.00	2022 Day Camp Advertisements
11700	Bell Canada	\$	468.83	Phone Services
11701	The Cleaning Brigade	\$	361.60	Office Cleaning Services
11702	Staples Advantage	\$	117.15	Office Supplies
11703	Earth Power Tractors	\$	305.77	Shop Supplies
11704	Township of Georgain Bluffs	\$	230.58	Water Charges
11705	Hastie Small Engines	\$	451.09	Shop Supplies
11706	Hatten Building Centre	\$	1,359.56	Dam Supplies
11707	John Bates Roofing	\$	135.60	Bognor Marsh Snow Plowing
11708	MacDonnell Fuels Limited	\$	785.59	Vehicle Fuel
11709	J.J. MacKay Canada Limited	\$	31.92	Self Serve Transaction Fees
11710	Middlebro' & Stevens LLP	\$	239.67	Legal fees
11711	Purolator Inc.	\$	24.52	Shipping Charges
11712	Qlab Systems Ltd.	\$	96.05	PayDirt Webinar
11713	Rogers Wireless Inc.	\$	221.72	Cell Phone Charges
11714	Saugeen Valley Conservation	\$	998.15	SPC Per Diems
11715	Scott's Industrial & Farm Supplies	\$	24.55	Shop Supplies
11716	Watson & Associates	\$	9,281.82	Planning Fee Review
11717	Xerox Canada Ltd.	\$	136.99	Printing Charges
11718	Georgian Bay Chemical	\$	3,310.30	Shop and Covid Supplies

Mastercard Payments	\$	17,675.73	
Amilia	\$	344.12	
Bruce Telecom	\$	526.09	Monthly Service
Pickfield Law	\$	355.95	Legal Fees
Gallagher Benefit Services	\$	2,856.50	Salary Review
DWSP Copier Lease	\$	163.85	
Office Moneris Fees	\$	123.74	
Self-Serve Moneris Fees	\$	43.59	
Hydro, Reliance	\$	2,680.56	
Receiver General, EHT, WSIB	\$	53,896.67	
Group Health Benefits	\$	9,341.15	
OMERS	\$	33,513.96	
Employee Expense Claims	\$	2,087.87	
Monthly Payroll	\$	94,267.42	

<b>Total Monthly Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 237,927.66</b>
-------------------------------	----------------------

RECEIVED  
JAN 28 2022

Jan 25, 2022

---

ATTACHMENT #4

Tim Lanthier  
Chief Administrative Officer  
Grey Sauble Conservation

Dear Tim:

I wish to express my thanks to Grey Sauble Conservation for the tribute paid to me by the installation of the commemorative bench. I feel honored to have the bench with the plaque in my name.

I was overwhelmed by the appreciation from yourself and the directors as well as past directors and staff.

I wish to point out that we owe gratitude to many for the achievements in the early years of the Conservation Authority. They include Julius Kuhl, the first Chairman, and Mac Kirk, who was so active in finding properties to be preserved for conservation. Also, I cannot forget Tommy Cooper, who visited councils asking them to take part in what would hopefully be an organization meeting.

I wish Grey Sauble the best as it continues the very important work of conservation.

Yours truly,



Elwood Moore



## 2022 Provincial Budget Consultation Minister of Finance

Submitted by Conservation Ontario  
January 20, 2022

### **Conservation Authority Programs Help to Build Ontario's Resilience**

Extreme weather and other climate change impacts take a costly toll on the well-being of Ontario's residents, on our infrastructure and with the functioning of business and industry.

One need only look at the recent and tragic events in British Columbia where flooding had a major impact on people's homes and livelihoods, as well as on drinking water infrastructure, food supply and the environment.

The key to a more resilient Ontario lies in understanding how nature is so closely connected to our own well-being and to our economy; and then doing everything we can to protect, restore and conserve our environment and its natural systems. We need to re-imagine the value of nature.

**Conservation Authorities are key delivery agents for the Province**, particularly around flooding and erosion, the management of conservation lands and drinking water source protection. Conservation authority programs protect the Great Lakes, support a healthy agricultural industry, protect water quality and quantity and provide the local science that helps Ontario to adapt to climate change impacts. They use an integrated watershed management approach to managing the impacts on natural resources in order to ensure the long term viability of our environment.

Conservation Ontario and the conservation authorities (CAs) gratefully acknowledge the Province's recent commitment to two-year multi-year funding for the Ontario Drinking Water Source Protection Program. This meets one of the important objectives of this work which is the long term planning and implementation of drinking water source protection.

However, other provincially mandated programs are woefully underfunded. Additional and new strategic investments are needed in natural hazards, conservation lands, nature-based programs and watershed science.

### **Conservation Authorities Are Important Partners for the Province**

Conservation authorities are effective, cost efficient partners for the Province, particularly around key provincial environmental, economic and social policy priorities.



They **facilitate a provincial housing strategy** by balancing growth and environmental pressures. Since April 2019, Conservation Ontario (CO) has been working with Ontario's conservation authorities (CAs) to make improvements to CA plan review and permitting activities through the [\*Conservation Ontario Client Service and Streamlining Initiative\*](#). The Initiative was created to support actions outlined in the provincial *Housing Supply Action Plan*, and identifies a number of actions to improve client service and accountability, increase speed of approvals and reduce red tape to help the Province address the lack of housing supply, while at the same time not jeopardizing public health and safety or the environment in the process.

Conservation Ontario applauds the Government's establishment of a Streamline Development Approval fund to modernize, streamline and accelerate housing applications. We believe expanding its scope to include planning interactions between municipalities and conservation authorities will positively enhance the impact of this initiative.

**Conservation authorities also contribute significantly to the health and well-being of residents** by protecting safe drinking water sources, using conservation lands to address climate change impacts and providing almost 300 conservation areas for 8 – 10 million people to visit annually.

And, finally **conservation authorities are well-known for their watershed expertise**. This was evident last November (2021) when they were asked to immediately send as many natural hazard experts as possible to British Columbia to assist during its state of emergency due to devastating flooding. A total of 53 CA staff from 18 conservation authorities quickly volunteered to help out. Fortunately, flooding impacts began to subside and conservation authorities stood down.

We appreciate the recent letter from the Honourable Greg Rickford, Minister of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry expressing his appreciation for the support shown by conservation authorities.

## **What Conservation Authorities Need to Ensure This Work Continues**

### **1. Investments in Natural Hazards Programs**

Flooding is the most costly natural hazard and the leading cause of public emergency in Ontario. For every dollar paid in insurance claims for damaged homes and businesses, the Insurance Bureau of Canada tells us that Canadian governments and taxpayers pay out much more to repair public infrastructure that severe weather has damaged. And these costs are rising as climate change impacts grow.

Land use planning is a critical component of an integrated approach to flood risk management. Conservation authority regulations as well as their planning and review

process are key to keeping development safely away from flooding and erosion, and they prevent development from creating new natural hazards. Conservation authorities support the provincial housing strategy by continuing to improve the planning application review and approval processes working under Conservation Ontario's Client Service and Streamlining Initiative.

However, to continue to meet the growing challenges, conservation authorities need:

- ✓ more financial and technical support for natural hazard programs
- ✓ continued and improved funding is needed for aging natural hazards infrastructure that prevents flooding and erosion. Continued or increased funding for the provincial Water and Erosion Control Infrastructure (WECI) Program is needed. This program is delivered through a municipal – provincial – conservation authority partnership. Province provides \$5M; municipalities match this with another \$5M and CAs implement the projects. CA water and erosion control infrastructure helps to avoid more than \$150 million in damages to properties
- ✓ new funding for the development of CA natural hazard asset management plans as required by changes to the *Conservation Authorities Act*
- ✓ provincial top up of current federal natural disaster funding opportunities for additional infrastructure projects as well as floodplain mapping improvements

These programs allow CAs to implement both small scale projects (dykes and erosion control, storm water /low impact development) and multiple infrastructure projects that benefit both urban and rural municipalities.

Floodplain mapping provides significant returns on investment because it keeps people and businesses out of flood-prone areas. Floodplain maps inform and delineate risk assessment as well as guide land-use planning.

## **2. Protect The Value of Conservation Lands and Increase Protected Land**

Greenspaces such as conservation lands provide multiple benefits: their biodiversity help us to adapt to climate change impacts, they protect drinking water sources and they provide recreational opportunities for Ontario residents. Conservation authorities are requesting:

- ✓ new funding to support the infrastructure and operational needs of conservation areas

A one-time investment of \$15M into infrastructure improvements would enable conservation areas to accommodate higher visitor numbers more safely. It would also provide local employment incentives and support for local

supply chains. The types of projects could include: construction of sanitary stations and signage, upgraded washrooms, parking improvements, touchless gates systems, bridge widening, visitor monitoring technologies in order to track users to maintain social distancing and trail expansion/reconstruction to accommodate safer one-way and looped hikes with safely distanced pullouts for resting.

- ✓ a return of provincial support to acquire more conservation lands

### **3. Invest in Nature-based Climate Solutions**

- ✓ provide financial support for the protection, restoration and rehabilitation of watershed natural assets such as trees, forests and wetlands. These assets provide important nature-based climate change solutions that absorb carbon, reduce temperatures, support a healthy agricultural economy, and protect drinking water sources.

### **4. Support the Continued Development of Local Watershed Science**

- ✓ invest in conservation authority watershed studies and research, improve CA technical capacity and expand partnerships in conservation authority monitoring programs.

## **Outcomes Achieved in Partnership with Conservation Authorities.**

- Reduced risk and costs from flooding events
- Less red tape and more sustainable growth under the provincial housing strategy
- From January 1st – December 31st, 2020, the high-growth CAs issued a combined total of 6652 permits. The CAs were highly successful – issuing 91% of permits within the provincial timelines and 83% within the significantly reduced CO best practices timelines.
- Increased resilience to climate change through CA nature-based solutions such as green infrastructure, watershed stewardship and source protection programs. Watershed natural assets provide important nature-based climate change solutions that absorb carbon, reduce temperatures, support a healthy agricultural economy, and protect drinking water sources.
- Improved public health of Ontario residents and reduced healthcare costs through drinking water source protection and enabling people to be active in nature at over 300 conservation areas
- Resilient Ontario economy

Conservation authority watershed management programs such as stewardship initiatives, agricultural beneficial management practices and water quality and

quantity improvement projects ensure sustainable and resilient water resources for a wide variety of industry

### **Advantages of Working with Conservation Authorities**

- ✓ Known and valued for their watershed-based approach to managing flooding & erosion
- ✓ Watershed management model is scientifically solid
- ✓ Cost effective partners using science to guide priorities and identify targets
- ✓ Governed by member municipalities and fosters collective actions at the local and community level
- ✓ Ability to leverage partnerships for greater resources and broader outcomes

### **More Information**

Kim Gavine, General Manager, Conservation Ontario  
Tel: 905-895-0716 ext. 231; [kgavine@conservationontario.ca](mailto:kgavine@conservationontario.ca)

Conservation Ontario  
120 Bayview Parkway, Newmarket ON L3Y 3L5  
[www.conservationontario.ca](http://www.conservationontario.ca)



Conservation Ontario – February 1, 2022

## Overview of *Conservation Authorities Act* Phase 2 Regulatory and Policy Proposal

This document represents a summary of the Phase 2: [Regulatory and Policy Proposal Consultation Guide: Regulations regarding Municipal levies, Conservation Authority Budget Process, Transparency, and Provincial Policy for the Charging of Fees by Conservation Authorities](#). This summary provides best advice based on available materials and current understanding of the proposed regulations. This document may be subject to change upon the release of the Phase 2 regulations.

### Part 1: Proposed Municipal Levies Regulation

There are 3 basic components being addressed in the proposed regulation: 1) levy: incorporation of the two current levy regulations and updated as appropriate; 2) inclusion of standards and policy for the authority budget process; and 3) apportionment methods for the 3 categories of programs and services that CAs deliver. The update to the levy regulation proposes to retain the two existing voting methods and the three current methods of apportioning expenses/costs. For the budget process, the MECP are proposing to regulate the current process and practices including those for voting. In addition, authorities would be required to provide a summary of how the authority considered opportunities for self-generated revenue as part of the budget/levy consultation process with their participating municipalities and to distribute a final budget to the Minister in addition to its participating municipalities. There are no new apportioning methods proposed. CAs are able to levy for all category 1 (mandatory) programs and services and can only levy for category 2 and 3 programs and services with agreements in place with the municipalit(ies). Corporate administrative costs could be levied without agreement however it is proposed that these costs would be accounted for in a transparent and stand-alone manner in the authority's budget.

### Part 2: Proposed Minister's Regulation for Determining Amounts Owed by Specified Municipalities

MECP is proposing a Minister's regulation for determining amounts owed by specified municipalities designated under the *Clean Water Act* and the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act*. These are municipalities that are not a 'participating municipality' of a CA under the *Conservation Authorities Act*. For the levy of 'specified' municipalities under the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act*, MECP is proposing that the modified current property value assessment method be the method for apportionment. For the *Clean Water Act*, the MECP is proposing that any of the three existing apportionment methods could be used.

### Part 3: Proposal for Minister's Published List of Classes of Programs and Services For Which a Conservation Authority May Charge a Fee

MECP is proposing to proclaim subsection 21.2 of the *Conservation Authorities Act* which will enable the Minister to determine a list of classes of programs and services for which a CA may charge a fee. The Minister is proposing to enable all classes of programs and services (category 1: mandatory; category 2: municipal; and category 3: other) to charge a fee where the user fee principle is appropriate and subject to other conditions. The list of classes of programs and services will replace the list of specific activities that conservation authorities may charge a fee for which has been in place since 1997. In addition, all conservation authorities will be required to create a fee policy and fee schedule.

### Part 4: Complementary Proposals To Increase Transparency of Authority Operations

MECP is proposing a complementary amendment to the [Transition Plans and Agreements Regulation](#) to enable fees for category 3 (other) programs and services. Should this amendment be enacted, conservation authorities and participating municipalities would be required to include provisions in their cost apportioning agreements if user fees would be established for those programs and services.

A Minister's regulation is also being proposed that would require conservation authorities to maintain a governance webpage. This webpage must include: CA membership and contact information; authority bylaws; draft and final budgets; category 2 and 3 agreements between CAs and municipalities; and a meeting schedule. CAs would also be required to include a notice on their website when it amends or enters into a new agreement with municipalities. The regulation would provide an exception for CA/municipal agreements that relate to procurement processes or portions of agreements that contain commercially sensitive information.

For further information, please contact: Kim Gavine, General Manager,  
[kgavine@conservationontario.ca](mailto:kgavine@conservationontario.ca)



February 2, 2022

Chairs, All Conservation Authorities  
Via Email

Dear Chair,

Attached is an *Overview of the Conservation Authorities Act Phase 2 Regulatory and Policy Proposal Consultation Guide* which was released by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) on the Environmental Registry of Ontario last week for a 30 day consultation period.

It appears that the Ministry's proposal is building upon what is already working between conservation authorities and municipalities and that there is sufficient flexibility to enable local circumstances to best advise the approach taken to the budget and levy process. This approach is reinforced by some transparency and oversight measures. Conservation authorities are encouraged to consider in their own review of this Consultation Guide whether there is anything missing or included in the proposal that will limit your current practices to a significantly negative degree.

Please feel free to contact myself or Conservation Ontario staff Kim Gavine, General Manager ([kgavine@conservationontario.ca](mailto:kgavine@conservationontario.ca)) to give us an early heads up with regard to any major concerns. Otherwise, I note that the Consultation Guide has been circulated to all Conservation Authority CAOs/GMs with a request for comments back to Conservation Ontario staff by Thursday, February 10th, 2022.

Sincerely,

Andy Mitchell  
Chair, Conservation Ontario

c.c. General Managers/CAOs, All Conservation Authorities

Conservation Ontario  
120 Bayview Parkway, Newmarket ON L3Y 3W3  
Tel: 905.895.0716 Email: [info@conservationontario.ca](mailto:info@conservationontario.ca)  
[www.conservationontario.ca](http://www.conservationontario.ca)



GREY SAUBLE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION  
MINUTES

Full Authority Board of Directors  
Wednesday, November 10, 2021, at 10:00 a.m.

---

1. Call to Order

Chair Don Sankey called the meeting to order and welcomed those present at 10:01 A.M.  
Valerie Coleman will act as secretary.

Members Present: Don Sankey (Chair), Al Wilcox (Vice-Chair), Dick Hibma (Treasurer), Bill Law, Scott Greig (GSCA Board Representative), Cathy Little (GSCA Board Representative), Marg Gaviller, Don Knight, Rebecca Ferguson (GSCA Staff Representative), Valerie Coleman

Guests: None at this time.

Regrets: Nancy Brown

2. Introduction of Guests

3. Adoption of Agenda

Moved By: Bill Law  
Seconded By: Cathy Little

"THAT the agenda of the Grey Sauble Conservation Foundation meeting dated November 10, 2021 be approved, as amended."

Carried

4. Approval of Minutes of Board Meeting – September 15, 2021

Moved By: Dick Hibma  
Seconded By: Al Wilcox

"THAT the minutes of the Grey Sauble Conservation Foundation meeting dated be approved as presented."

Carried



5. Business Arising from Minutes (not otherwise on Agenda)

Nothing at this time.

6. Team Reports

a. Finance/Administration/Financial Statements

Treasurer, Dick Hibma presented the Finance Committee reports for October and November.

It was noted that due to the Bank of Montreal's new two step authorization a motion is required to approve Dick Hibma and Alison Armstrong as the Foundation's Authorized Trading Officers.

The 2022 budget was presented.

Moved By: Dick Hibma  
Seconded By: Marg Gaviller

"THAT the GSCF Board approve the Financial Reports for September and October 2021."

Carried

Moved By: Dick Hibma  
Seconded By: Al Wilcox

"THAT the GSCF Board approve Treasurer Richard (Dick) Hibma as the Authorized Trading Officer for the Grey Sauble Conservation Foundation BMO InvestorLine Account #22589374, and that Alison Armstrong be approved as an Additional Authorized Trading Officer on the same account, effective immediately as of Nov. 10, 2021."

Carried

Moved By: Dick Hibma  
Seconded By: Bill Law

"THAT the GSCF Board receive the draft 2022 budget for consideration prior to final deliberation at the January 2022 Board meeting."

Carried

Moved By: Dick Hibma  
Seconded By: Al Wilcox

"THAT the GSCF Board approve the Finance and Administration Committee report for November as presented."

b. **Memorial Forest**

Chair Don Sankey gave an update on the Memorial Forest ceremony for 2022. It has been decided to host a two day event if future restrictions allow.

Don conducted a site visit with Rebecca Ferguson to assess the sites. It was noted that the three memorial forest sites are running low on usable space to plant. There was a suggestion that municipal and/or county land that would be considered marginal could be used.

2022 Ceremony dates will be June 11 and 12<sup>th</sup>, the second Saturday and Sunday of June.

Parking and road signage remains a concern.

c. **Film Festival**

Chair Don Sankey reported that the festival will run in May of 2022 at the Roxy theatre. Capacity limits are still to be determined.

d. **Inglis Falls Arboretum Alliance**

Chair Don Sankey gave an update on behalf of Nancy Brown via email. The IFAA was able to extend the funding deadline for the TD Friends of the Environment grant.

7. Acceptance of Committee Reports

Moved By: Cathy Little

Seconded By: Al Wilcox

"THAT the reports of the Finance and Administration Committee, Memorial Forest Committee, and the Earth Film Festival Committees presented at the November 10, 2021 meeting of the GSCF Board of Directors be received and the items contained therein be approved."

Carried

8. Grey Sauble CA Updates

Manager of Conservation Lands, Rebecca Ferguson gave a report on GSCA activities and news.

Properties are in the midst of closing.

Parking revenue for 2022 was in excess of \$266,000 for day passes and \$36,000 in season passes.

The 2022 pass is currently being designed and printed.

Inglis Falls management plan is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2022.

The printing of the new brochure was delayed because of sizing and formatting issues but will be ready for 2022.

Staff have reached out to the Municipality of Grey Highlands regarding parking and the road issues and will be reaching out to the Municipality of Meaford.

GSCA has begun the 2023 strategic planning process. They started it with a staff wide information and strategy session.

GSCA is still working through the changes to the CAA regulations.

The office is currently open but with limited capacity and access for the public.

A Member asked with regard to the Eugenia Falls & Bruce Trail Winter closure. Rebecca informed the Board that the Bruce Trail Conservancy has created a reroute for that section. Parking and safety are of especial concern at the Eugenia Falls property.

A Member asked with regard to the Old Baldy trail. Rebecca clarified that there was a trail reroute due to safety. Because the road was taken on by the Municipality of Grey Highlands the trail cannot be on the road.

**9. New Business**

**a. Eugenia Falls Management Committee**

Rebecca Ferguson informed the Board that the committee for the Eugenia Falls Management Plan is being formed. Members Scott Greig and Cathy Little sit on the committee to represent the GSCA Board of Directors.

Rebecca asked if anyone from the GSCA Foundation Board would like to sit on the committee. Dick Hibma volunteered.

**10. Next Board Meeting**

Wednesday January 12, 2022 @ 10:00 A.M.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.



# MEDIA RELEASES AND ARTICLES

## ATTACHMENT #8

Collingwood Today

February 16, 2022

"New report shows impact of 100-year storm event on Collingwood"

[New report shows impact of 100-year storm event on Collingwood - Collingwood News \(collingwoodtoday.ca\)](https://collingwoodtoday.ca/new-report-shows-impact-of-100-year-storm-event-on-collingwood/)

## **Grey Sauble Authority Board of Directors**

---

### **M O T I O N**

**DATE:** February 23, 2022

**MOTION #:** FA-22-017

**MOVED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECONDED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**THAT in consideration of the Consent Agenda Items listed on the February 23, 2022, agenda, the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors receives the following items: (i) Environmental Planning – Section 28 Permits – January 2022; (ii) Administration – Receipts & Expenses – January 2022; (iii) Correspondence – Letter from Elwood Moore; (iv) Conservation Ontario – 2022 Provincial Budget Consultation, CO Phase 2 Regulation Summary; (v) Minutes – GSC Foundation Minutes; (vi) Recent Media Articles**



## **STAFF REPORT**

**Report To:** Board of Directors  
**Report From:** Tim Lanthier, CAO  
**Meeting Date:** February 23, 2022  
**Report Code:** 004-2022  
**Subject:** 2021 Year End Budget Report Back and Reserve Transfers

---

**WHEREAS** the Board of Directors approved the GSCA 2021 Operating and Capital Budget on January 27, 2021, by motion FA-21-019,

**AND WHEREAS**, the 2021 Year-End actuals deviate from the approved budget,

**THAT**, the Board of Directors approve any previously unapproved transfers of funds to or from reserves or surplus as detailed in Report 004-2022.

### **Strategic Initiative:**

This item is part of GSCA's corporate services that supports and assists all of GSCA's Strategic Plan deliverables and desired outcomes.

### **Background:**

Overall, GSCA experienced many changes and challenges in 2021 that required the organization to pivot and adapt. We experienced some significant staff turnover in our Environmental Planning Department, as well as a record high intake of applications that required the organization to reallocate staff resources into this Department, to change the way we provide services, and to engage Watson and Associates to assist with rethinking our funding model.

Additional budget challenges faced in 2021 include a dramatic spike in insurance premiums over 2020 values, a reduction in available merchantable timber on GSCA's landholdings, and some unexpected fleet maintenance costs.

**Subject:** 2021 Year End Budget Report Back and Reserve Transfers

**Report No:** 004-2022

**Date:** February 23, 2022

---

In spite of the foregoing, the overall 2021 Year End budget exhibits a slight surplus which will be balanced as described in the departmental summaries presented below.

## **Analysis:**

The summaries below provide a brief synopsis of the 2021 Year End Budget by program area. The detailed budget line items and reserve continuity table are included as appendices to this report.

### **Water Management**

The Water Management budget was underspent in 2021, resulting in a surplus. This was largely due to a reduction in staff time charged to this budget as a result of reallocation of that staff time to GSCA's Environmental Planning Department and Operations Department, as well as a reduction in vehicle usage.

The resulting surplus created in this department is being reallocated into the Administration Department where unbudgeted increases in expenses have resulted in a deficit. Additionally, a small amount of the surplus will be utilized in the Watershed Monitoring Department.

### **Watershed Monitoring and Management**

The Watershed Monitoring and Management budget was approximately \$1400 overspent in 2021, resulting in a slight deficit. This will be balanced with surplus funds from the Water Management Department as noted above.

### **Stewardship**

The original budgeted plan for Stewardship in 2021 was to fund the staff position approximately 50 percent from levy and 50 percent from the Healthy Lake Huron grant funding. Due to the requirements of the grant provider, we needed to spend the entirety of the grant in 2021. Therefore, the majority of the levy portion of the staff funding is carried forward as surplus and has been factored into the approved 2022 Operating Budget for this position.

Some additional funds are carried in deferred revenue for grant project funds received but not yet spent on projects.

### **Environmental Planning**

2021 was a highly unstable year for this department and its budget, resulting in discrepancies between the originally approved budget and the yearend revenues and expenses.

Items of note include that the budget was underspent in salary & wages, vehicle expenses, and materials & supplies. This budget was overspent in contracts & services due to both legal spending and the service rate review that is currently underway.

Municipal levy and Section 39 contributions remain as budgeted, however due to a very high service demand, self-generated revenues are above average. After factoring the portion of the service rate review and legal costs paid for in 2021, this department is still showing a \$42,901 surplus at the end of the year. This money will be carried forward into 2022 as surplus to fund the remainder of the service rate review and to partially fund the newly approved Regulations Officer position.

The Board of Directors have been kept apprised of these changes throughout the year.

#### Forestry, Species & Forestry Services

Overall, the Forestry portion of the budget balanced and drew less from reserves than originally budgeted. Given the challenges with timber sales that staff have reported on throughout the year, this can be viewed as a very successful overall outcome.

This Department does not utilize levy funding.

#### Conservation Lands Policy & Strategy

Conservation Lands Policy & Strategy earned higher revenues in 2021 than originally budgeted for and incurred fewer expenses. The additional revenues are largely associated with a parking agreement that GSCA has with the Town of the Blue Mountains for the management of the Peasemarth Nature Preserve property east of Thornbury. Parking revenues collected by the Town and shared with GSCA resulted in approximately \$11,500 in additional revenues for GSCA.

The surplus generated by this combination is proposed to be carried forward into 2022 to partially fund a research assistant position to aid in the ongoing preparation of property management plans and to offset the workload impacts of the new requirements under the Conservation Authorities Act.

#### Grey County Management Contract

The Grey County Management Contract appears approximately \$6,500 over budget at the end of 2021, but this reflects in-year funding that was secured by the County for an additional contract position.

This program area is funded 100 percent through a service agreement with Grey County.

#### Conservation Lands Operations

As reported to the Board throughout 2021, the GSCA paid parking and membership program facilitated by our Lands Operations Department was incredibly successful in 2021. The success of this program has resulted in a \$118,800 surplus, net of operating costs for the parking program. Additionally, due to the success of this program, we did not require the \$57,000 that was placed into reserve in 2020 for Park Ambassadors, as in-year revenues were able to cover these expenses.



The Conservation Lands Operations Department utilized 10 percent less levy in 2021 compared to 2020, and also was able to hold static at that amount moving into the 2022 budget year, despite inflationary costs.

All of the surplus revenue is proposed to be transferred to the Lands Reserve to provide a source of funding for capital renewals, as well as to provide funding to offset any unforeseen or newly proposed costs associated with managing GSCA's properties.

#### Conservation Information & Community Outreach

This Department was able to operate generally on budget.

#### Education

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, we were unable to offer the GSCA Day Camp in 2021. This resulted in zero sales and service revenues. Costs were limited to near zero, excepting a grant for program supplies that was provided by Enbridge.

#### Administration, Finance & Human Resources

Expenses in this department came in approximately \$25,000 over budget in 2021. This is largely related to unforeseen insurance costs and some increased salary and wage costs. This deficit will be balanced with surplus realized in the Water Management section of the budget.

Additional surplus shown in this Department as a result of the reallocation from Water Management will be used to fund cultural awareness training for GSCA Staff and Board Members in 2022. A defibrillator will also be purchased for the GSCA office as per recommendations from our Joint Health and Safety Committee.

#### GIS, Information Management & Information Technology

The GIS/IM/IT department is underspent in salary & wages, vehicles, and materials & supplies, and over budget in contracts and services. This is balanced by a reduction in the budgeted draw from reserves for this department.

#### Source Water Protection

This portion of the budget generally balances at the end of 2021.

#### Source Water Risk Management Service

At the beginning of this program there were surpluses in funding from the participating municipalities. These surpluses allowed for creation of a Risk Management reserve to be utilized in future years when the costs of the program may be higher than the funding. There is also a requirement that 10% of the bill for services be placed in a contingency for potential legal issues.

### **Fleet & Equipment Management**

Overall expenses were higher in this department than originally budgeted for, due to a higher need for maintenance on our fleet, unexpected repairs to the dump truck and the cost of renting vehicles due to delayed delivery of new vehicle purchases. This was combined with a reduction in revenue due to a lower vehicle usage across the organization in 2021. The overall result is that we were unable to allocate new funds to the Fleet Reserve in 2021.

### **Capital Budget – Water Management**

This capital funding is being set aside in the Major Dam Reserve to provide base funding for replacement or capital investments into these large assets.

### **Capital Budget – Conservation Lands**

Monies continue to be set aside for Entrance Signage. Now that GSCA's branding strategy is complete, staff are moving forward with the creation and installation of these signs in 2022.

As per approval of the Board of Directors in 2021, monies earmarked for the Spirit Rock and Bruce's Caves Washroom upgrades were reallocated to cover those items plus the installation of three new gatehouse structures. This project was completed underbudget.

The Indian Falls washroom building upgrade did not occur in 2021 as budgeted. Following discussions with the Township of Georgian Bluffs, the Township was interesting in investigating costs associated with complete replacement of the structure. This may be investigated as part of a management plan for this property.

\$45,000 was targeted from reserves for the replacement of the septic system at Inglis Falls. After further investigation of the system, it was determined that the system is functioning properly and only a service of the pump system was required, resulting in substantial savings. Staff will continue to monitor this system and the associated washroom building and recommendations on future considerations will be provided through the Inglis Falls Management Plan.

The Inglis Falls safety fence occurring between the dam structure and the bailey bridge was completed under budget. The unspent portion of this budget will remain in the Lands Reserve.

The stone repointing project did not occur in 2021 and this project is being carried forward into 2022.

### **Capital Budget – Administration**

As reported to the Board in Q4 of 2021, we decided not to move forward with any of the proposals received from our RFP for the Administration Building renovations. This funding has been reallocated into the 2022 budget. Otherwise, the Administration portion of the capital budget is on budget for the year.

### Capital Budget – GIS/IM/IT

This portion of the budget is overspent in 2021 due to some unexpected hardware issues and the rising cost of computer products. The extra funding was drawn from the Computer Reserve.

### Capital Budget – Fleet and Equipment

This portion of the capital budget shows as overspent in 2021. However, this is the result of two trucks, procured in 2020, that due to global microchip shortages and vehicle supplies were not received and paid for until 2021. Additionally, one of two budgeted passenger vehicles was purchased in 2021.

## Proposed Reserve Transfers:

Following a review of the 2021 year-end budget numbers, the following reserve transfers are recommended:

1. That the surplus of \$118,800 recorded in the Conservation Lands Operations portion of the budget be transferred to the Lands Reserve.
2. That an additional \$6,372 be transferred from the Risk Management Reserve into the Operating Account to balance the deficit shown in the Source Water Risk Management Service portion of the budget.
3. That \$6,514 be transferred from the Fleet and Equipment Reserve into the Operating Account to balance the deficit shown in the Fleet and Equipment portion of the budget.
4. That an additional \$4,196 be utilized from the Computer Reserve to cover unexpected server and hardware costs.

## Proposed Use of Surplus:

1. That the surplus of \$31,757 recorded in the Stewardship portion of the budget be carried forward as surplus in 2022 to offset the operating costs of this Department. The rationale for this is explained above and this is already reflected in the approved 2022 budget.
2. That the surplus of \$42,901 recorded in the Environmental Planning portion of the budget be carried forward as surplus in 2022 to cover the remainder of the service rate review and to offset the salary and wages of the new Regulations

**Subject:** 2021 Year End Budget Report Back and Reserve Transfers

**Report No:** 004-2022

**Date:** February 23, 2022

---

Officer position. This has already been approved by the Board of Directors through Board Motions FA-21-099 and FA-22-012.

3. That the surplus of \$22,660 recorded in the Conservation Lands Policy and Strategy portion of the budget be carried forward as surplus in 2022 to cover the costs of a Research Assistant to aid in the completion of the management plans and to alleviate some of the extra workload associated with new requirements under the Conservation Authorities Act, including a Land Inventory and a Conservation Land Strategy. This position will dovetail with the Education Specialist position to create a more desirable employment option.

### **Consultation:**

Senior Management Team

## GREY SAUBLE CONSERVATION AUTHORITY 2021 APPROVED BUDGET vs ACTUAL - Q4

EXPENSES					FUNDING				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved Budget 2021	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021		Approved Budget 2020	Approved 2021 Budget	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
<b>WATER MANAGEMENT</b>					<b>WATER MANAGEMENT</b>				
<b>Flood Forecasting &amp; Warning</b>					<b>Flood Forecasting &amp; Warning</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	96,729	119,199	102,160	111,295	Municipal Levy	80,738	102,999	82,238	93,444
Contracts & Services	5,500	5,200	3,745	5,360	CAA S39	29,492	29,400	29,520	29,400
Vehicles & Equipment	4,000	4,000	3,137	3,533	MECP (DWSP)				
Materials & Supplies	3,000	3,000	2,716	2,941	Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
Training & Workshops	1,000	1,000			Services & Sales				285
<b>Total Flood Forecasting &amp; Warning</b>	<b>110,229</b>	<b>132,399</b>	<b>111,758</b>	<b>123,129</b>	<b>Total Flood Forecasting &amp; Warning</b>	<b>110,229</b>	<b>132,399</b>	<b>111,758</b>	<b>123,129</b>
<b>Flood Control Structures</b>					<b>Flood Control Structures</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	1,437	1,500	2,446	6,408	Municipal Levy	5,467	5,707	4,293	8,707
Contracts & Services	2,500	2,500	1,515	1,066	CAA S39	1,820	1,643	1,828	2,271
Vehicles & Equipment	350	350	460	627	MECP (DWSP)				
Materials & Supplies	1,200	1,200		1,154	Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
Other	1,800	1,800	1,700	1,723	Interest & Gains				
<b>Total Flood Control Structures</b>	<b>7,287</b>	<b>7,350</b>	<b>6,121</b>	<b>10,978</b>	<b>Total Flood Control Structures</b>	<b>7,287</b>	<b>7,350</b>	<b>6,121</b>	<b>10,978</b>
<b>Erosion Control Structures</b>					<b>Erosion Control Structures</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	800	800	1,123	294	Municipal Levy	1,100	1,100	964	163
Contracts & Services					CAA S39	1,000	1,000	963	162
Vehicles & Equipment	300	300	77	31	MECP (DWSP)				
Materials & Supplies	1,000	1,000	727		Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
<b>Total Erosion Control Structures</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>1,927</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>Total Erosion Control Structures</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>1,927</b>	<b>325</b>
<b>Other Dams</b>					<b>Other Dams</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	18,043	18,041	11,674	10,005	Municipal Levy	23,043	18,641	22,853	12,268
Contracts & Services	2,000				CAA S39				
Vehicles & Equipment	1,500	1,600	1,772	1,101	MECP (DWSP)				
Materials & Supplies	1,500	1,500	1,844	1,162	Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
To Reserves			5,564		From Reserves or Surplus		2,500		
To Deferred Revenue			2,000		From Deferred Revenue				
<b>Total Other Dams</b>	<b>23,043</b>	<b>21,141</b>	<b>22,853</b>	<b>12,268</b>	<b>Total Other Dams</b>	<b>23,043</b>	<b>21,141</b>	<b>22,853</b>	<b>12,268</b>
<b>TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>142,660</b>	<b>162,990</b>	<b>142,660</b>	<b>146,699</b>	<b>TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>142,660</b>	<b>162,990</b>	<b>142,660</b>	<b>146,699</b>
<b>Watershed Monitoring &amp; Management</b>					<b>Watershed Monitoring &amp; Management</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	34,755	17,781	16,628	19,277	Municipal Levy	47,205	35,581	47,205	36,981

EXPENSES				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved Budget 2021	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
Contracts & Services	10,000	13,600	8,681	14,775
Vehicles & Equipment	5,000	5,000	1,398	4,579
Materials & Supplies	400	400		649
Training & Workshops	750		150	
Donations				
To Reserves			24,801	
<b>Total Watershed Monitoring &amp; Management</b>	<b>50,905</b>	<b>36,781</b>	<b>51,658</b>	<b>39,281</b>
<b>Stewardship</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	33,255	56,639	28,488	53,992
Contracts & Services	1,000	1,000		
Vehicles & Equipment	5,000	3,000	381	548
Materials & Supplies	65,000	31,913	72,289	25,488
Training & Workshops	500			
To Reserves			12,695	31,757
To Deferred Revenue				57,339
<b>Total Stewardship</b>	<b>104,755</b>	<b>92,552</b>	<b>113,853</b>	<b>169,123</b>
<b>Environmental Planning &amp; Regulations</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	390,089	389,359	387,552	357,219
Contracts & Services	1,000	1,000	4,691	29,778
Vehicles & Equipment	11,000	10,000	5,977	2,394
Materials & Supplies	5,000	4,707	4,665	4,218
Training & Workshops	5,000		401	
To Deferred Revenue/Surplus			7,662	42,901
<b>Total Environmental Planning &amp; Regulations</b>	<b>412,089</b>	<b>405,066</b>	<b>410,947</b>	<b>436,509</b>
<b>Forestry, Species &amp; Forestry Service</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	235,623	229,122	238,950	222,400
Contracts & Services	1,500	2,250	6,822	710
Vehicles & Equipment	21,000	24,000	9,090	11,042
Materials & Supplies	92,500	99,500	71,152	139,861
Training & Workshops	5,000		672	
Donations	3,000		3,000	
To Reserves	13,934		579	
To Deferred Revenue				10,000
<b>Total Forestry, Species &amp; Forestry Service</b>	<b>372,557</b>	<b>354,872</b>	<b>330,266</b>	<b>384,013</b>
<b>CONSERVATION LANDS</b>				
<b>Conservation Lands Policy &amp; Strategy</b>				

FUNDING				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved 2021 Budget	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants			3,788	
Services & Sales				1,100
Donations	3,700		665	
From Reserves or Surplus		1,200		1,200
<b>Total Watershed Monitoring &amp; Management</b>	<b>50,905</b>	<b>36,781</b>	<b>51,658</b>	<b>39,281</b>
<b>Stewardship</b>				
Municipal Levy	34,755	35,639	34,755	35,639
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants	70,000	56,913	79,098	133,484
Services & Sales				
From Reserves or Surplus				
From Deferred Revenue				
<b>Total Stewardship</b>	<b>104,755</b>	<b>92,552</b>	<b>113,853</b>	<b>169,123</b>
<b>Environmental Planning &amp; Regulations</b>				
Municipal Levy	83,606	84,073	83,606	84,073
CAA S39	2,993	2,993	2,993	2,993
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants			1,000	
Services & Sales	325,490	318,000	323,348	349,443
From Surplus/ Deferred Revenue				
<b>Total Environmental Planning &amp; Regulations</b>	<b>412,089</b>	<b>405,066</b>	<b>410,947</b>	<b>436,509</b>
<b>Forestry, Species &amp; Forestry Service</b>				
Municipal Levy				
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants	75,000	166,500	164,190	172,973
Services & Sales	294,557	155,000	152,333	176,118
Donations	3,000	5,000	1,014	22,000
From Reserves		28,372	12,729	5,679
From Deferred Revenue				7,244
<b>Total Forestry, Species &amp; Forestry Service</b>	<b>372,557</b>	<b>354,872</b>	<b>330,266</b>	<b>384,013</b>
<b>CONSERVATION LANDS</b>				
<b>Conservation Lands Policy &amp; Strategy</b>				

EXPENSES				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved Budget 2021	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
Salary, wages & benefits	103,482	114,095	38,747	114,778
Contracts & Services	3,000	3,000	9,131	237
Vehicles & Equipment	1,500	1,500	884	1,354
Materials & Supplies	3,000	2,400	532	1,248
Training & Workshops	1,000	-	840	
Other	73,000	83,000	73,689	70,574
To Reserves/Surplus	5,000		46,853	22,660
To Deferred Revenue			19,000	
<b>Total Conservation Lands Policy &amp; Strategy</b>	<b>189,982</b>	<b>203,995</b>	<b>189,676</b>	<b>210,850</b>
<b>Grey County Management Contract</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	134,516	160,864	115,023	161,902
Vehicles & Equipment	16,500	13,500	13,640	16,879
Materials & Supplies				2,115
Training & Workshops				
<b>Total Grey County Management Contract</b>	<b>151,016</b>	<b>174,364</b>	<b>128,663</b>	<b>180,897</b>
<b>Conservation Lands Operations</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	186,926	238,152	184,552	248,083
Contracts & Services	23,000	23,000	21,916	15,786
Vehicles & Equipment	21,925	22,000	28,921	31,799
Materials & Supplies	15,000	15,000	17,714	23,406
Training & Workshops	2,000			
Donations				
To Reserves		59,000	44,683	118,800
<b>Total Conservation Lands Operations</b>	<b>248,851</b>	<b>357,152</b>	<b>297,786</b>	<b>437,874</b>
<b>TOTAL CONSERVATION LANDS</b>	<b>589,849</b>	<b>735,511</b>	<b>616,125</b>	<b>829,621</b>
<b>Conservation Information &amp; Community Outreach</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	71,221	80,306	71,281	83,391
Contracts & Services	22,700	9,700	13,797	8,030
Vehicles & Equipment	500	500	21	
Materials & Supplies	3,050	8,250	292	7,885
Training & Workshops	800		47	
Donations	200	100	80	
To Reserves			5,346	
<b>Total Conservation Information &amp; Community Outreach</b>	<b>98,471</b>	<b>98,856</b>	<b>90,863</b>	<b>99,306</b>

FUNDING				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved 2021 Budget	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
Municipal Levy	132,982	133,347	132,982	133,347
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
Services & Sales	55,000	64,048	56,694	77,504
Interest & Gains				
From Reserves	2,000	6,600		
From Deferred Revenue				
<b>Total Conservation Lands Policy &amp; Strategy</b>	<b>189,982</b>	<b>203,995</b>	<b>189,676</b>	<b>210,850</b>
<b>Grey County Management Contract</b>				
Municipal Levy				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants				11,364
Services & Sales	151,016	174,364	128,663	169,533
<b>Total Grey County Management Contract</b>	<b>151,016</b>	<b>174,364</b>	<b>128,663</b>	<b>180,897</b>
<b>Conservation Lands Operations</b>				
Municipal Levy	188,601	170,082	188,601	170,082
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants			14,277	
Services & Sales	60,000	130,070	95,255	267,792
Donations	250			
From Reserves or Surplus		57,000		
<b>Total Conservation Lands Operations</b>	<b>248,851</b>	<b>357,152</b>	<b>298,133</b>	<b>437,874</b>
<b>TOTAL CONSERVATION LANDS</b>	<b>589,849</b>	<b>735,511</b>	<b>616,472</b>	<b>829,621</b>
<b>Conservation Information &amp; Community Outreach</b>				
Municipal Levy	98,471	96,356	90,863	96,356
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
Services & Sales				950
Donations				
From Reserves / Surplus		2,500		2,000
<b>Total Conservation Information &amp; Community Outreach</b>	<b>98,471</b>	<b>98,856</b>	<b>90,863</b>	<b>99,306</b>

EXPENSES				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved Budget 2021	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
<b>Education</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	44,993	38,458	9,552	
Contracts & Services	6,500	5,700	1,299	
Vehicles & Equipment	250	250		
Materials & Supplies	3,800	3,400	40	2,986
Training & Workshops	400			
To Reserves		4,482		246
To Deferred Revenue			7,000	
<b>Total Education</b>	<b>55,943</b>	<b>52,290</b>	<b>17,892</b>	<b>3,232</b>
<b>Administration, Finance &amp; Human Resources</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	351,580	373,280	345,555	387,829
Contracts & Services	85,300	67,024	50,617	70,076
Vehicles & Equipment	1,000	1,000	371	274
Materials & Supplies	16,800	12,050	10,785	15,747
Training & Workshops	2,000	16,000	5,135	9,516
Donations				
Other	94,000	100,075	97,388	111,405
To Reserves			19,507	
To Surplus/Deferred Revenue				6,003
<b>Total Administration, Finance &amp; Human Resources</b>	<b>550,680</b>	<b>569,429</b>	<b>529,357</b>	<b>600,851</b>
<b>GIS, Information Management &amp; Information Technology</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	201,664	235,742	187,506	216,159
Contracts & Services	26,910	27,790	10,381	27,079
Vehicles & Equipment	1,200	1,000	558	65
Materials & Supplies	5,850	4,900	3,435	1,616
Training & Workshops	3,200		153	
To Reserves				
<b>Total GIS &amp; Information Management</b>	<b>238,824</b>	<b>269,432</b>	<b>202,033</b>	<b>244,919</b>
<b>Source Water Protection</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	171,019	162,304	162,792	166,183
Contracts & Services	11,292	15,000	22,372	14,136
Vehicles & Equipment	1,500	1,500	136	61
Materials & Supplies	3,000	3,000	3,742	1,942
Other				

FUNDING				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved 2021 Budget	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
<b>Education</b>				
Municipal Levy	323		7,931	
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants	3,500		7,000	3,232
Services & Sales	52,120	52,290	543	
From Reserves/Deferred Revenue			2,418	
From Deferred Revenue				
<b>Total Education</b>	<b>55,943</b>	<b>52,290</b>	<b>17,892</b>	<b>3,232</b>
<b>Administration, Finance &amp; Human Resources</b>				
Municipal Levy	498,983	525,680	488,096	538,145
CAA S39	2,020	2,020	1,750	2,230
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants			3,666	3,024
Services & Sales	32,177	36,130	30,015	36,649
Donations	500	1,600	2,312	1,500
Interest & Gains	2,000	4,000	4,291	4,302
From Reserves	15,000			15,000
From Deferred Revenue				
<b>Total Administration, Finance &amp; Human Resources</b>	<b>550,680</b>	<b>569,429</b>	<b>530,130</b>	<b>600,851</b>
<b>GIS, Information Management &amp; Information Technology</b>				
Municipal Levy	185,324	222,932	196,211	222,932
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants	15,000	-		3,149
Services & Sales	5,500	3,500	5,555	3,000
From Reserves or Surplus	33,000	43,000		15,839
<b>Total GIS &amp; Information Management</b>	<b>238,824</b>	<b>269,432</b>	<b>201,766</b>	<b>244,919</b>
<b>Source Water Protection</b>				
Municipal Levy				
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)	186,811	181,804	203,963	264,645
Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
Interest & Gains			1,073	478



EXPENSES				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved Budget 2021	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
To Deferred Revenue			15,994	82,802
<b>Total Source Water Protection</b>	186,811	181,804	205,036	265,124
<b>Source Water Risk Management Service</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	34,084	51,427	46,263	52,395
Contracts & Services	9,000	6,000	6,237	6,000
Vehicles & Equipment	1,500	1,000	36	54
Materials & Supplies	2,000	2,000	2,057	3,000
Training & Workshops	1,000	1,000		
Other			6,450	4,850
To Reserves	29,095		3,457	
<b>Total Source Water Risk Management Service</b>	76,679	61,427	64,500	66,299
<b>Fleet &amp; Equipment Management</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	11,072	8,000	7,432	11,968
Contracts & Services	18,500	19,000	20,346	38,283
Vehicles & Equipment				
Materials & Supplies	30,000	30,000	20,445	29,903
Training & Workshops				
To Reserves	21,803	33,500	17,834	
<b>Total Fleet &amp; Equipment Management</b>	81,375	90,500	66,057	80,155
<b>Total Operating Budget</b>	2,961,597	3,111,510	2,841,246	3,365,132
<b>Total Operations Budget Expenses</b>				
Salary, wages & benefits	2,121,289	2,295,068	1,957,723	2,223,580
Contracts & Services	229,702	201,764	181,552	231,317
Vehicles & Equipment	94,025	90,500	66,859	74,339
Materials & Supplies	252,100	224,220	212,434	265,320
Training & Workshops	22,650	18,000	7,397	9,516
Donations	3,200	100	3,080	-
Other	168,800	184,875	179,228	188,552
To Reserves	69,832	96,983	181,319	173,462
To Surplus/Deferred Revenue	-		51,656	199,044
<b>Total Operating Budget</b>	2,961,597	3,111,510	2,841,246	3,365,132

FUNDING				
	Approved Budget 2020	Approved 2021 Budget	Actual Q4 2020	Actual Q4 2021
From Deferred Revenue				
<b>Total Source Water Protection</b>	186,811	181,804	205,036	265,124
<b>Source Water Risk Management Service</b>				
Municipal Levy				
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
Services & Sales	76,679	50,000	64,500	48,500
Interest & Gains				
From Reserves		11,427		17,799
<b>Total Source Water Risk Management Service</b>	76,679	61,427	64,500	66,299
<b>Fleet &amp; Equipment Management</b>				
Municipal Levy				
CAA S39				
MECP (DWSP)				
Agreements, MOUs and Grants				
Services & Sales	81,375	90,500	66,057	73,641
From Reserves				6,514
<b>Total Fleet &amp; Equipment Management</b>	81,375	90,500	66,057	80,155
<b>Total Operating Budget</b>	2,961,597	3,111,510	2,842,100	3,365,132
<b>Total Operations Budget Funding</b>				
Municipal Levy	1,380,597	1,432,136	1,380,598	1,432,136
CAA S39	37,325	37,056	37,054	37,056
MECP (DWSP)	186,811	181,804	203,963	264,645
Agreements, MOUs and Grants	163,500	223,413	273,019	327,226
Services & Sales	1,133,914	1,073,901	922,964	1,204,514
Donations	7,450	6,600	3,991	23,500
Interest & Gains	2,000	4,000	5,364	4,780
From Reserves	50,000	152,599	15,147	64,030
From Deferred Revenue	-			7,244
<b>Total Operating Budget</b>	2,961,597	3,111,510	2,842,100	3,365,132

**GREY SAUBLE CONSERVATION AUTHORITY 2021 APPROVED CAPITAL BUDGET**  
**EXPENSES** **FUNDING**

	Approved Budget 2021	2021 Q4 Actual		Approved Budget 2021	2021 Q4 Actual
<b>WATER MANAGEMENT</b>			<b>WATER MANAGEMENT</b>		
Flood Forecasting & Warning			Flood Forecasting & Warning		
To Reserves	25,000	25,000	Municipal Levy	25,000	25,000
<b>WATER MANAGEMENT Subtotal</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>WATER MANAGEMENT Subtotal</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>25,000</b>
<b>CONSERVATION LANDS Policy/Operations</b>			<b>CONSERVATION LANDS Policy/Operations</b>		
Entrance Signs			Entrance Signs		
Contracts & Services	19,600	54	Municipal Levy	4,800	54
To Reserves			Reserves	14,800	
<b>Spirit Rock - Washroom Upgrade/Gatehouse</b>			<b>Spirit Rock - Washroom Upgrade/Gatehouse</b>		
Contracts & Services	10,000	8,308	Reserves	10,000	8,308
			Sales and Services		
<b>Bruce's Caves, Eugenia - Washroom Upgrade</b>			<b>Bruce's Caves, Eugenia - Washroom Upgrade</b>		
Contracts & Services	10,000	798	Municipal Levy		
			Reserves	10,000	798
<b>Eugenia, Old Baldy - Gatehouse</b>			<b>Eugenia, Old Baldy - Gatehouse</b>		
Contracts & Services		4,758	Municipal Levy		
			Reserves		4,758
<b>Indian Falls - Washroom Upgrades</b>			<b>Indian Falls - Washroom Upgrades</b>		
Contracts & Services	15,000		Municipal Levy		
			Agreements/MOUs/Grants	7,500	
			Reserves	7,500	
<b>Inglis Falls - Septic</b>			<b>Inglis Falls - Septic</b>		
Contracts & Services	45,000	3,113	Sales and Services		
			Reserves	45,000	3,113

## EXPENSES

	Approved Budget 2021	2021 Q4 Actual
Inglis Falls - Safety Fence		
Contracts & Services	3,000	1,729
Various - Stone Repointing Projects		
Contracts & Services	6,000	
<b>CONSERVATION LANDS Subtotal</b>	<b>108,600</b>	<b>18,760</b>
Administration, Finance & Human Resources		
Admin Centre refurbish Concept Design		
Contracts & Services	20,000	
Admin Centre - Renewal		
Contracts & Services	-	731
Admin Centre - Office Furniture		
Materials and Supplies	6,000	5,332
Administration, Finance & Human Resources		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>26,000</b>	<b>6,063</b>
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - Server		
Materials & Supplies		
Equipment	6,000	9,347
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - GPS Units/Tablets		
Materials & Supplies	500	
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - 2020 Screen		

## FUNDING

	Approved Budget 2021	2021 Q4 Actual
Inglis Falls - Fence		
Sales & Services		
Reserves	3,000	1,729
Various - Stone Repointing Projects		
Reserves	6,000	
<b>CONSERVATION LANDS Subtotal</b>	<b>108,600</b>	<b>18,760</b>
Administration, Finance & Human Resources		
Admin Centre refurbish Concept Design		
Reserves	20,000	
Admin Centre - Renewal		
Reserves	-	731
Admin Centre - Office Furniture		
Levy	6,000	5,332
Administration, Finance & Human Resources		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>26,000</b>	<b>6,063</b>
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - Server		
From Reserves	6,000	9,347
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - GPS Units		
From Reserves		
Municipal Levy	500	
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - 2020 Smart Screen		

## EXPENSES

	Approved Budget 2021	2021 Q4 Actual
Equipment	-	
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - Workstations		
Materials & Supplies	6,000	8,849
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - Subtotal	12,500	18,196
<b>Fleet &amp; Equipment Management</b>		
Vehicles & Equipment**	60,000	77,559
To Lands Operations**		
<b>Fleet &amp; Equipment Management Subtotal</b>	60,000	77,559
<b>Total Proposed Capital Budget</b>	<b>232,100</b>	<b>145,579</b>
<b>Total Capital Budget</b>		
Salary, wages & benefits		
Contracts & Services	128,600	19,491
Vehicles & Equipment	60,000	77,559
Materials & Supplies	18,500	23,528
Training & Workshops		
To Reserves	25,000	25,000
<b>Total Capital Budget</b>	<b>232,100</b>	<b>145,579</b>

## FUNDING

	Approved Budget 2021	2021 Q4 Actual
Municipal Levy	-	
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - Workstations		
Municipal Levy	6,000	6,000
Reserves		2,849
GIS, Information Management & Information Technology - Subtotal	12,500	18,196
<b>Fleet &amp; Equipment Management</b>		
Services & Sales		2,451
From Reserves	60,000	75,108
<b>Fleet &amp; Equipment Management Subtotal</b>	60,000	77,559
<b>Total Proposed Capital Budget</b>	<b>232,100</b>	<b>145,579</b>
<b>Total Capital Budget</b>		
Municipal Levy	42,300	36,386
CAA S39		
MECP (DWSP)		
Agreements, MOUs and Grants	7,500	
Services & Sales		4,758
From Reserves	182,300	101,983
<b>Total Capital Budget</b>	<b>232,100</b>	<b>143,128</b>

APPENDIX 3

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority  
Reserve Continuity 2021

	V & E	Admin	Forestry Mgmt.	Major Dam	Computer	Special includes swoop	Lands	Youth	Risk Management	Total	
Value at Jan 1, 2021	244,085	441,691	451,065	211,915	18,269	36,826	343,878	24,495	187,548	1,959,773	
Transfers to Reserves in Budget	33,500						59,000			92,500	
Actual Transfers to Reserves	2,451	31,757		25,000	500		123,546	246		183,499	
Actual Transfers From Reserves	(84,073)	(17,731)	(5,679)	(1,200)	(12,196)	(10,351)	(18,706)		(17,799)	(167,734)	transfers on paper only
Gain/(Loss) on TD Investment Portfolio at Dec 31	13,562	24,542	25,063	11,775	1,015	2,046	19,107	1,361	10,421	108,891	
Bank Interest at Dec 31	375	679	693	326	28	57	528	38	288	3,012	
Dec 31, 2021 projected Ending balance	176,401	480,937	471,143	247,815	7,616	28,578	468,353	26,140	180,458	2,179,941	budgetted transfers in not included
Comprised of: Bank (BMO reserve 12/31)										549,203	
TD Investment Portfolio at Cost Dec 31										1,494,204	
2021 Transfers	(81,622)	14,026	(5,679)	23,800	(11,696)	(10,351)	104,840	246	(17,799)	15,765	
	176,400.98	480,937.15	471,142.63	247,814.93	7,615.92	28,577.79	468,352.98	26,140.14	180,458.47	2,179,941	

Transfers to Reserves

Actual	Budget
Stewardship Surplus	
Forestry surplus	
Gate staff Parking Revenue	59,000
Vehicle Reserve from vehicle sales	33,500
Admin Centre	
GIS GPS Units	
Communications	
levy from capital budget for signs - not spent	
Capital Projects - addtl parking revenue	

Risk Management

Signage		
Dams	25,000	25,000
Admin salary surplus for review		
Lands Policy to Capital		
Education	246	4,482
	183,499	121,982

Transfers from Reserves

Actual	Budget
Indian Falls washrooms	7,500
Forestry surplus	5,679
Repointing Projects	6,000
Admin Centre	731
Admin - Salary review	15,000
Servers	9,347
Comms	2,000
Gate Staff - 2020 Parking revenue	57,000
Spirit Rock washroom/gatehouse	8,308
Bruces caves washrooms	798
Inglis Fence	1,729
Risk Management	17,799
Vehicles	77,559
Signage	-
Swoop & S&W	10,351
Lands Policy - mangmt plan	-
Gatehouses (Eugenia, Old Baldy)	4,758
Inglis Falls septic	3,113
Watershed monitoring	1,200
workstations	2,849
Dump truck repair less pool gain	6,514
	167,734
	332,399

## **Grey Sauble Authority Board of Directors**

---

### **M O T I O N**

**DATE:** February 23, 2022

**MOTION #:** FA-22-018

**MOVED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECONDED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**WHEREAS** the Board of Directors approved the GSCA 2021 Operating and Capital Budget on January 27, 2021, by motion FA-21-019,

**AND WHEREAS**, the 2021 Year-End actuals deviate from the approved budget,

**THAT**, the Board of Directors approve any previously unapproved transfers of funds to or from reserves or surplus as detailed in Report 004-2022.



## STAFF REPORT

**Report To:** Board of Directors  
**Report From:** Tim Lanthier, CAO  
**Meeting Date:** February 23, 2022  
**Report Code:** 005-2022  
**Subject:** Regulatory and Policy Proposal Consultation Guide: Regulations Regarding Municipal Levies, Conservation Authority Budget Process, Transparency, and Provincial Policy for the Charging of Fees by Conservation Authorities

---

### Recommendation:

**WHEREAS** on January 26, 2022, the Province of Ontario released the “*Regulatory and Policy Proposal Consultation Guide: Regulations Regarding Municipal Levies, Conservation Authority Budget Process, Transparency, and Provincial Policy for the Charging of Fees by Conservation Authorities*”,

**THAT** the GSCA Board of Directors receive Staff Report 005-2022 as information

### Strategic Initiative:

This item is related to all of GSCA’s Strategic Initiatives and overall operations.

### Background:

Over the last two years, the Provincial government has been working towards revisions of the Conservation Authorities Act. In early 2021, the Province released the Regulatory Proposal Consultation Guide, Phase 1, to receive feedback and comments. This Consultation Guide provided preliminary details on mandatory versus non-mandatory programs and provided more details on the required transition plans. Based on this Consultation Guide, staff prepared a Transition Plan and an Inventory of

Programs and Services, both of which were approved by the Board of Directors and afterwards circulated to participating municipalities and the Province.

On January 26, 2022, the Province of Ontario released the “*Regulatory and Policy Proposal Consultation Guide: Regulations Regarding Municipal Levies, Conservation Authority Budget Process, Transparency, and Provincial Policy for the Charging of Fees by Conservation Authorities*” for the Phase 2 regulations.

### **Current Analysis:**

The new processes have been well summarized in the Conservation Ontario overview, and this is therefore appended to this report. At a staff level, GSCA is overall very pleased with the content of this Guide and look forward to reviewing the regulations. The only comments provided back to the Province and to Conservation Ontario are the following:

1. There is a comment in the consultation guide (Page 7, Paragraph 6), stating that as part of the budget consultation process, conservation authorities would be required to provide a summary of how the authority considered opportunities for self-generated revenue. Although this is a relevant discussion at the Board of Directors’ table, it is not a relevant discussion at individual municipal council tables. Revenues generated in Category 3, non-levy funded program areas are outside of the purview of municipal councils.
2. We have recommended a 28-day circulation period for the Draft Budget instead of 30-days. This would allow the Board to meet and vote on the Draft and Final budgets at two consecutive meetings. Under the current process and the Board’s current meeting schedule, this cannot be accomplished.
3. We are asking for clarification that under the new “Classes of Programs and Services for Which a Conservation Authority May Charge a Fee” that there is a distinction or clarification on continuing to be able to charge for “parking” without charging for “entry”. This is an important distinction under the Occupier’s Liability Act.
4. We are asking for clarification that CA’s can continue to charge fees for the sale of products (ie: timber or carbon) on properties that may also receive municipal levy to operate. The levy would not be required to run that program (ie: timber or carbon) but may be required for other maintenance and operation of a same property.



### **Financial/Budget Implications:**

This Guide and the forthcoming regulations will define the new budgeting and levy process for CA's. Much of this will be similar to the current framework, with the exception of Category 2 and 3 program and service areas.

### **Communication Strategy:**

There is no communication strategy required at this time.

### **Consultation:**

The CAO has been in consultation with GSCA Staff, Conservation Ontario, Ontario's other Conservation Authorities, and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks.



Conservation Ontario – February 1, 2022

## Overview of *Conservation Authorities Act* Phase 2 Regulatory and Policy Proposal

This document represents a summary of the Phase 2: [Regulatory and Policy Proposal Consultation Guide: Regulations regarding Municipal levies, Conservation Authority Budget Process, Transparency, and Provincial Policy for the Charging of Fees by Conservation Authorities](#). This summary provides best advice based on available materials and current understanding of the proposed regulations. This document may be subject to change upon the release of the Phase 2 regulations.

### Part 1: Proposed Municipal Levies Regulation

There are 3 basic components being addressed in the proposed regulation: 1) levy: incorporation of the two current levy regulations and updated as appropriate; 2) inclusion of standards and policy for the authority budget process; and 3) apportionment methods for the 3 categories of programs and services that CAs deliver. The update to the levy regulation proposes to retain the two existing voting methods and the three current methods of apportioning expenses/costs. For the budget process, the MECP are proposing to regulate the current process and practices including those for voting. In addition, authorities would be required to provide a summary of how the authority considered opportunities for self-generated revenue as part of the budget/levy consultation process with their participating municipalities and to distribute a final budget to the Minister in addition to its participating municipalities. There are no new apportioning methods proposed. CAs are able to levy for all category 1 (mandatory) programs and services and can only levy for category 2 and 3 programs and services with agreements in place with the municipalit(ies). Corporate administrative costs could be levied without agreement however it is proposed that these costs would be accounted for in a transparent and stand-alone manner in the authority's budget.

### Part 2: Proposed Minister's Regulation for Determining Amounts Owed by Specified Municipalities

MECP is proposing a Minister's regulation for determining amounts owed by specified municipalities designated under the *Clean Water Act* and the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act*. These are municipalities that are not a 'participating municipality' of a CA under the *Conservation Authorities Act*. For the levy of 'specified' municipalities under the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act*, MECP is proposing that the modified current property value assessment method be the method for apportionment. For the *Clean Water Act*, the MECP is proposing that any of the three existing apportionment methods could be used.

### Part 3: Proposal for Minister's Published List of Classes of Programs and Services For Which a Conservation Authority May Charge a Fee

MECP is proposing to proclaim subsection 21.2 of the *Conservation Authorities Act* which will enable the Minister to determine a list of classes of programs and services for which a CA may charge a fee. The Minister is proposing to enable all classes of programs and services (category 1: mandatory; category 2: municipal; and category 3: other) to charge a fee where the user fee principle is appropriate and subject to other conditions. The list of classes of programs and services will replace the list of specific activities that conservation authorities may charge a fee for which has been in place since 1997. In addition, all conservation authorities will be required to create a fee policy and fee schedule.

### Part 4: Complementary Proposals To Increase Transparency of Authority Operations

MECP is proposing a complementary amendment to the [Transition Plans and Agreements Regulation](#) to enable fees for category 3 (other) programs and services. Should this amendment be enacted, conservation authorities and participating municipalities would be required to include provisions in their cost apportioning agreements if user fees would be established for those programs and services.

A Minister's regulation is also being proposed that would require conservation authorities to maintain a governance webpage. This webpage must include: CA membership and contact information; authority bylaws; draft and final budgets; category 2 and 3 agreements between CAs and municipalities; and a meeting schedule. CAs would also be required to include a notice on their website when it amends or enters into a new agreement with municipalities. The regulation would provide an exception for CA/municipal agreements that relate to procurement processes or portions of agreements that contain commercially sensitive information.

For further information, please contact: Kim Gavine, General Manager,  
[kgavine@conservationontario.ca](mailto:kgavine@conservationontario.ca)

**MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT, CONSERVATION AND PARKS**

**REGULATORY AND POLICY PROPOSAL CONSULTATION GUIDE:  
Regulations regarding Municipal Levies, Conservation Authority  
Budget Process, Transparency, and Provincial Policy for the Charging  
of Fees by Conservation Authorities**

**Date: January 26, 2022**

# Contents

<b>Purpose .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
REGULATORY AND POLICY PROPOSALS FOR CONSULTATION .....	2
<b>Part 1: Proposed Municipal Levies Regulation .....</b>	<b>3</b>
BACKGROUND .....	3
<i>Municipal Levy Framework .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>New Legislative And Regulatory Framework.....</i>	<i>4</i>
PROPOSAL .....	5
<i>Municipal Levy .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Conservation Authority Budgeting .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Apportionment Methods For Conservation Authority Programs And Services Costs .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>Part 2: Proposed Minister's Regulation For Determining Amounts Owed By Specified Municipalities .....</b>	<b>11</b>
BACKGROUND .....	11
PROPOSAL .....	12
<b>Part 3: Proposal For Minister's Published List Of Classes Of Programs And Services For Which A Conservation Authority May Charge A Fee .....</b>	<b>13</b>
BACKGROUND .....	13
PROPOSAL .....	14
<b>Part 4: Complementary Proposals To Increase Transparency Of Authority Operations .....</b>	<b>17</b>
PROPOSAL .....	17
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>18</b>
CURRENT MUNICIPAL LEVY FRAMEWORK.....	18
<i>Current Authority Budget And Municipal Levy Approval Process .....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Current Annual Authority Budget And Municipal Levy Voting Methods .....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Current Approach To Apportionment Of Conservation Authority Costs .....</i>	<i>19</i>

## PURPOSE

The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (the “ministry”) is consulting on a second phase of provincial regulatory and policy proposals that would be made under the *Conservation Authorities Act* to ensure that conservation authorities focus and deliver on their core mandate including helping protect people and property from the risk of natural hazards, the conservation and management of conservation authority-owned lands, and their roles in drinking water source protection and to improve governance and oversight in conservation authority operations.

The purpose of this Consultation Guide (guide) is to provide a description of the proposed Phase 2 levy and budget regulations (Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council (LGIC) and Minister’s regulation), provincial policy to be made under the *Conservation Authorities Act*, and complementary regulatory proposals, in order for the ministry to obtain feedback on the proposals. The guide describes the proposals that would inform the drafting of the regulations and associated policy document and is not intended to convey the precise language that would be used in regulation or policy.

Comments on the proposals may be submitted before the date indicated through either the Environmental Registry of Ontario or can be emailed directly to the ministry at [ca.office@ontario.ca](mailto:ca.office@ontario.ca). Comments received will be considered by the ministry when developing the final regulations and policy.

## INTRODUCTION

In 2018, the government made a commitment in its environment plan to collaborate with municipalities and other stakeholders to ensure that conservation authorities focus and deliver on their core mandate.

As part of that commitment, the government made amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* through the *More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019* which received Royal Assent on June 6, 2019. Beginning in late 2019, the ministry undertook extensive consultations with municipalities, the public, landowners, development, agricultural, environmental and conservation organizations as well as conservation authorities, about the core role of conservation authorities.

Based on the extensive and valuable feedback received, legislative amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* were made through [Bill 229, Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act \(Budget Measures\), 2020](#) which received Royal Assent on December 8, 2020.

The government is proclaiming unproclaimed provisions in the *Conservation Authorities Act* (stemming from amendments made in 2017, 2019, and 2020) through a staged process enabling a staggered rollout of regulations and policies in two phases.

The first stage of proclamations occurred on February 2, 2021 and included housekeeping amendments as well as provisions related to conservation authority governance, government requirements and the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks powers. These were followed by the first phase of regulatory proposals posted to the Environmental Registry of Ontario and Ontario's Regulatory Registry for comment for 45-days from May 13 to June 27, 2021.

Following extensive consultation, the final regulations were filed on October 1, 2021 when the enabling provisions in the *Conservation Authorities Act* were proclaimed.

More information on the recently proclaimed provisions and approved regulations can be found via <https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-2986>.

## REGULATORY AND POLICY PROPOSALS FOR CONSULTATION

The proposals in this guide for consultation are to support development of the following:

1. LGIC regulation governing the apportionment by conservation authorities of their capital costs and operating expenses to be paid by their participating municipalities through municipal levies, as well as related conservation authority budgetary matters, including requirements that conservation authorities distribute their draft and final budgets to relevant municipalities and make them publicly available – i.e. “Municipal Levies Regulation”.
2. Minister's regulation governing the determination by a conservation authority of costs owed by specified municipalities for the authority's mandatory programs and services under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, and the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008* – i.e. “Minister's regulation for determining amounts owed by specified municipalities”.
3. Minister's published list of classes of programs and services in respect of which a conservation authority may charge a user fee.
4. Complementary regulations to increase transparency of authority operations.

Until the levy regulations and policy proposals noted above are finalized and in effect and the associated legislative provisions proclaimed into force, conservation authorities and municipalities would continue to follow current levy and budgeting processes, as well as the current list of eligible user fees set out in provincial policy. The schedule of timing for the effective date of these proposed regulations and provincial policy is proposed to align with municipal and conservation authority calendar year budget cycles, beginning January 1, 2023. This would ensure that conservation authority 2024 budgets and levy processes would follow the updated regulations, and conservation authorities would have the necessary time to satisfy the legislative requirements following the Minister's publication of the list of classes of programs and services for which an authority may charge a user fee.

# PART 1: PROPOSED MUNICIPAL LEVIES REGULATION

## BACKGROUND

### MUNICIPAL LEVY FRAMEWORK

The province established conservation authorities through the *Conservation Authorities Act* based on resolutions by municipalities within a common watershed to address provincial and cross-municipal boundary interests in resource management, principally for water and natural hazard management.

The participating municipalities who petitioned for or later joined a conservation authority were agreeing to appoint their share of representative members to the authority, with the collective membership being the authority.

Municipalities also were agreeing to finance the conservation authority which, under the *Conservation Authorities Act*, must be done through the levy provisions. This Act enabled municipalities to take advantage of cost sharing through joint municipal funding of the conservation authority and its programs, services and projects (e.g., flood control infrastructure) that provide economic benefits, including through the protection of people and property.

A 'levy' is a compulsory financial charge on participating municipalities. Under the *Conservation Authorities Act*, an authority has the power to charge the participating municipalities for its operating expenses and capital costs if not funded by other revenue sources. The municipal levy provisions under the Act provide that the authority can determine the amount of levy required for expenses/costs and can apportion an amount of the total to each participating municipality as prescribed in the regulation. The levy under the Act is a debt due by the participating or specified municipalities to the authority and may be enforced by the authority as such.

Un-proclaimed provisions under the Act will, once proclaimed, continue to provide participating municipalities with the ability to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal regarding levy apportionments. Participating municipalities also have an opportunity to provide direct input into the authority annual municipal levy and authority budget.

Current legislation, regulations and provincial policy provide direction to the authorities and municipalities on the annual conservation authority budget process. The budget process also determines the total municipal levy required to be paid and how each type of authority cost can be apportioned among the participating municipalities based on the benefit each such municipality receives (or derives) from the costs. The *Conservation Authorities Act* provides that a conservation authority can determine the total benefit afforded to all the participating municipalities and the proportion of the benefit afforded to each of the participating municipalities (clause 21(1)(h)).



In 2019, participating municipalities provided over \$231 million to their conservation authorities through municipal levies (general and special project levies) under the *Conservation Authorities Act*. Municipal levies, the principal source of conservation authority funding, accounted for 56.6% of total authority revenue in 2019 with authority self-generated revenue accounting for 33.6%. Self-generated revenue could include cash raised through fees, such as user fees for park admissions, permitting fees, nature centre programs or stewardship services. Other revenue sources included provincial grants (6%) and federal grants (3.8%) (Conservation Ontario 2019 statistics).

Given the varying scope of programs and services each of the 36 conservation authorities provide and the size of their annual budgets to support those programs and services, each has a different makeup of revenue sources to finance their operations. For example, one authority may finance up to 81% of its annual operations through the municipal levy while another may only rely on the municipal levy for 28% of their budget, with the rest covered through other sources including self-generated revenue or provincial and federal grants (2019 conservation authority statistics).

Please see the Appendix for more information on the current municipal levy framework.

## NEW LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

With the proclamation of recent amendments made to the *Conservation Authorities Act* and newly approved regulations (Environmental Registry of Ontario notice number [019-2986](#)) made under this Act, the ministry is reviewing the current municipal levy context. Unproclaimed amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* would replace the existing municipal levy provisions with new levy provisions, once proclaimed, and would be supported by proposed regulations intended to bring the municipal levy framework into alignment with the new legislative and regulatory framework.

The new legislative amendments and corresponding regulations now require the categorization of conservation authority programs and services into three categories: category 1 (those programs and services every conservation authority is required to provide), category 2 (programs and services a municipality requests the conservation authority to undertake pursuant to a memorandum of understanding or agreement) and category 3 (programs and services the authority decides to adopt to further the purposes of the Act).

Category 1 mandatory programs and services that conservation authorities must now deliver pursuant to [O. Reg. 686/21: "Mandatory Programs and Services,"](#) may be funded by provincial grants and, in some cases, conservation authority self-generated revenue (e.g., user fees, resource development). Where such revenue sources cannot finance the entire cost of these programs and services, under the unproclaimed levy provisions, a conservation authority will have the authority to levy their participating municipalities to finance these mandatory programs and services without any separate agreement. Most of the mandatory programs and services reflect long-standing programs and services that all 36 CAs have provided within their areas of jurisdiction.

Category 2 programs and services are those that a conservation authority delivers at the request of and on behalf of one or more municipalities (i.e., are municipally requested). Under the *Conservation Authorities Act*, a memorandum of understanding or service level agreement (or other similar agreement) between the parties is required and would describe the program(s) or service(s) to be delivered and will include provisions for how it is funded, where appropriate. Funding for such programs and services could be through special project levy and/or combined with user fees, or by other means as may be specified in the agreement if the municipality is not a participating or specified municipality. The ability for municipalities to request programs and services to be delivered by authorities on behalf of the municipalities is fundamental in the *Conservation Authorities Act* and long standing in authority budgets.

Category 3 programs and services are those a conservation authority determines are advisable to deliver in their area of jurisdiction (authority determined). For a conservation authority to levy for these programs and services, the authority must have cost apportioning agreements in place with the participating municipalities who have individually agreed to fund the programs and services. This requirement for participating municipalities to decide on funding category 3 programs and services and then enter into a cost apportioning agreement where the municipal levy is proposed to be used, is new to the funding and programming relationship between conservation authorities and participating municipalities. Cost apportioning agreements need to be in place as of January 1, 2024, for authorities to be able to levy for these category 3 programs and services as per the recently approved [O. Reg. 687/21 "Transition Plans and Agreements Regulation"](#).

## PROPOSAL

### MUNICIPAL LEVY

Unproclaimed provisions of the *Conservation Authorities Act* provide for legislative changes to the current levy provisions to reflect the changes stemming from the new categorization of programs and services and provide for an enhanced LGIC "Municipal Levies" Regulation to replace existing LGIC levy regulations (O. Reg. 670/00 "Conservation Authority Levies"; Ontario Regulation 139/96 "Municipal Levies").

We are proposing to proclaim unproclaimed provisions of the *Conservation Authorities Act* that provide expanded regulatory authority for the LGIC to develop regulations which will govern the apportionment of the authority 'operating expenses' and 'capital costs' and conservation authority budgetary matters in general. 'Operating expenses' are defined in the *Conservation Authorities Act* and includes salaries of authority staff, per diems of authority members, rent and other office costs, program expenses, and costs related to the operation or maintenance of a project, and authority budgets break down these types of costs.

In order to safeguard the effective and timely transition of conservation authority operations to the new funding framework, we are proposing as part of this new Municipal Levies Regulation to apply the long practised municipal levy processes to the changed municipal levy context by:

- Maintaining consistency with current budget and municipal levy processes (i.e., budget, voting and apportionment methods as described in this guide).
- Using and adapting existing voting and apportionment methods and practices set out in current regulations or provincial policy.

Please see the Appendix for more details on the current municipal levy voting and apportionment methods.

The overall proposed approach in general is to provide direction as well as clarification where required while ensuring conservation authorities and municipalities have the necessary flexibility to respond to local circumstances. For example, for category 3 programs and services where an authority and participating municipalities are entering into cost apportioning agreements, these agreements could be with one, some or all municipalities and could use different apportioning methods on a case by case basis.

As a result, we propose that the Municipal Levies Regulation would:

- Incorporate the two current levies regulations (O. Reg. 670/00 “Conservation Authority Levies”; O. Reg. 139/96 “Municipal Levies”) and update as appropriate, including terminology such as ‘general levy’, ‘special project levy’, and removing ‘matching’, and ‘non-matching’ levy (see appendix for definitions).
- Incorporate the standards and policy for the authority budget process as currently set out in regulation and provincial policy. This is summarized in Table 1 below.

The intent is to ensure clear, consistent and transparent practice by the authorities and municipalities in the annual budget and municipal levy process and approval, and in the authority apportionment of project capital costs and operating expenses, including corporate administrative costs, to participating municipalities.

Additionally, we propose that the Municipal Levies Regulation would include:

- The two existing voting methods (i.e., the ‘one member, one vote’ and ‘weighted vote’, as set out in current legislation and regulation).
- The three current methods of apportioning expenses/costs (i.e., modified current property value assessment, agreement of the authority and participating municipalities, and as decided by the authority), while adapting the appropriate use of the apportionment and voting methods to the categories of programs and services where costs may be apportioned among all participating municipalities or to one or some.

See the Appendix for a summary of the current voting methods and methods for apportioning expenses/costs.

## CONSERVATION AUTHORITY BUDGETING

The total annual municipal levy amount is confirmed with the approval of the annual authority budget by the authority (the members) at the annual budget meeting.

Unproclaimed provisions provide the LGIC with regulatory authority to develop regulations that govern conservation authority budget matters including the process authorities must follow when preparing a budget, the consultations required, and the rules and procedures governing budget meetings including quorum for these meetings and voting on the budget.

Current budget processes that the authorities and participating municipalities have developed at the local level are based on a mix of legislation, regulation, policy and guidance, and appears generally to function well and often leads to unanimous approval of the authority budget.

We propose to update and consolidate current regulation, policy and guidance for the budget, where relevant, into the proposed Municipal Levies Regulation. We propose to leave the working relationship for authorities and municipalities to develop, and they can coordinate and communicate their fiscal and budgetary timelines and expectations. The proposed regulation would include what is in the current O. Reg. 139/96 “Municipal Levies”, such as the items provided in Table 1 (i.e., methods of voting and notice).

In addition, it is proposed that as part of the consultation process on the budget with the participating municipalities, conservation authorities would be required to provide a summary of how the authority considered opportunities for self-generated revenue. We know that many conservation authorities provide valuable programs and services that are important to their local communities. These may be funded in whole or in part by self-generated revenue including from contracts with other organizations and user-generated fees or through other means. A greater reliance on self-generated revenue can reduce demands on the overall municipal levy and respect taxpayer dollars. Self-generated revenue can also come from resource development (e.g. logging, hydroelectric generation), fundraising and donations, services such as weddings and other events, as well as other rental / leasing opportunities such as for movie productions.

To enable full transparency in the conservation authority budget process, we are also proposing that the LGIC regulation would require each conservation authority to:

- 1) Publicly post its full draft budget, including the details related to operating and capital costs, on its website, irrespective of sources of revenue. This shall be done upon circulation to the municipality a minimum of 30 days prior to the meeting to decide any municipal levy component of the budget.
- 2) Distribute a copy of the final approved conservation authority budget to the Minister and its participating municipalities; and, make the final budget available

to the public by posting on its website and any other means the authority deems appropriate.

**Table 1. Elements of the proposed conservation authority budget process to be included in the proposed Municipal Levies Regulation.**

Conservation Authority Budget	Description
<b>1. Draft Annual Budget</b>	<p>Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation authority staff prepare draft budgets each year including proposed municipal levy amounts (general and special project levies) and apportionments. The overall budget addresses all anticipated revenues and expenditures for the core mandatory programs and services and local priorities (category 2 and 3) as well as corporate costs.</li> <li>• Budgets are set based on the experience from the previous year, staff recommendations to address current priorities, and authority member input and direction.</li> <li>• An authority and participating municipalities coordinate and communicate with each other their fiscal and budgetary timelines and expectations for the municipal levy and for the budget.</li> <li>• The draft preliminary authority budget is circulated to participating municipalities and upon circulation, the authority would be required to publicly post the draft budget to its website a minimum of 30 days before a vote on the final budget by the municipally appointed members.</li> <li>• NOTE: this proposal aligns with current provincial policy.</li> </ul> <p>Vote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authority (i.e. the members) vote to approve the draft preliminary budget for circulation to the participating municipalities by one member/one vote (i.e., each member is entitled to one vote per subsection 16(1) of the <i>Conservation Authorities Act</i>).</li> </ul>
<b>2. Notification of Meeting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 30 days' notice given to participating municipalities of the conservation authority meeting to decide on the municipal levy component of the annual budget (generally held at the meeting to approve the annual budget).</li> <li>• Notice must contain the amount of the municipal levy to be voted on and be accompanied by the financial information used to determine the levy, including the full draft authority budget which includes all operating and capital costs.</li> <li>• NOTE: this proposal aligns with requirements set out in the current Municipal Levies Regulation and provincial policy.</li> <li>• In addition, it is proposed that the conservation authority must provide a summary of how the authority considered opportunities</li> </ul>

	for self-generated revenue as part of the consultation process with participating municipalities on the budget and the levy.
<b>3. Municipal Levy Vote</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The municipal levy part of the authority budget includes both the general and special project levies, and would continue to be approved by a 'weighted' majority vote of 51% of all the members present at the meeting for the levy vote (generally also the meeting for the budget vote), as set out in current regulations.</li> <li>• Member votes are 'weighted' by the percentage of municipal levy their appointing municipality pays to the authority ('pay for say' principle).</li> <li>• A municipality cannot have a weighted vote of its members exceeding 50% of all the weighted votes unless that municipality has more than 50% of the members in the authority.</li> <li>• When a member represents more than one municipality, each of their weighted votes would be based on the respective municipal weighting.</li> <li>• Municipal levy vote is a recorded vote. No proxy vote.</li> <li>• NOTE: this proposal aligns with requirements set out in the current Municipal Levies Regulation and provincial policy.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Budget Vote</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is to provide the two voting options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Each member is entitled to one vote.</li> <li>○ The member vote is 'weighted' (as noted above).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The budget vote is a recorded vote. No proxy vote.</li> <li>• NOTE: this proposal aligns with current practices, where some authorities use the one member/one vote while others use the 'weighted vote'.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Final Budget</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conservation authority would distribute a copy of the final approved conservation authority budget to the Minister and its participating municipalities and would be required to make the final budget publicly available by posting it on their website in a timely manner and by any other means the authority considers advisable.</li> <li>• NOTE: this proposal aligns with current practices of many conservation authorities.</li> </ul>

## APPORTIONMENT METHODS FOR CONSERVATION AUTHORITY PROGRAMS AND SERVICES COSTS

Conservation authorities will be able to levy for all category 1 mandatory programs and services, and only levy for category 2 and 3 programs and services with memorandums of understanding or service level agreements (or other similar agreement) or cost apportioning agreements in place. It would be required that the conservation authority budget clearly show these programs and services categories and detailed associated cost apportionment method for the municipal levy among the participating municipalities for each going forward.

As noted above, we are proposing to provide direction on the methods available to conservation authorities to apportion 'capital costs' and 'operating expenses' while enabling flexibility in determining which method meets local needs.

### Category 1 Mandatory Programs and Services

Apportionment of 'operating expenses' and 'capital costs' of mandatory programs and services and the voting on the municipal levies for these programs and services is not proposed to change significantly from the current levy requirements. For the most part, the prescribed mandatory programs and services have been delivered by conservation authorities for many years, paid for (in whole or part) through the municipal levy.

'Operating expenses' for mandatory programs and services are proposed to be apportioned against all the participating municipalities using the modified current property value assessment method as set out in the current O. Reg. 670/00 "Conservation Authority Levies." However, where there may be operating expenses that do not apply to all participating municipalities (e.g., ice management, certain types of infrastructure operation and maintenance costs) it is proposed that those operating expenses may be apportioned by agreement of the authority and participating municipalities, or as decided by the authority, rather than the modified current property value assessment method.

Currently maintenance costs may be apportioned using two of the methods (i.e., modified current property value assessment or agreement of the authority and participating municipalities). It is proposed that capital costs would still be apportioned by any of the three of the current apportionment methods.

### Category 2 and 3 Programs and Services

We propose that the apportionment method(s) used for costs/expenses related to category 2 and 3 programs and services would provide flexibility, allowing the conservation authority and its participating municipalities to decide the method to use, which must be set out in an agreement (e.g., memorandum of understanding or service level agreement (or other such agreement) for category 2, or cost apportioning agreement for category 3). This would likely be dependent on the benefit afforded or derived by a municipality from the program or service relative to other participating municipalities funding the program or service and how many participating municipalities may be involved.

### Conservation Authority Corporate Administrative Costs (costs not directly related to the delivery of programs and services)

In order to successfully deliver all categories of programs and services, conservation authorities have ongoing 'operating expenses' and 'capital costs' to function effectively as an organization and ensure they can best deliver their programs and services. These



on-going 'corporate administrative' costs are not directly related to the delivery of any specific program or service and are costs to maintain the organization itself.

These costs could include for example: staffing and expenses for the authority members (governance costs), general management, clerical, financial (e.g., accounting, payroll), general asset management planning, IT staff, senior management costs, legal costs (e.g. 'back office functions'), office equipment and supplies including IT, vehicles and machinery, workshop space, main office occupancy costs (e.g., heating, utilities, potentially rent), depreciation on owned buildings and equipment, main office maintenance, repair as well as insurance and property taxes.

These corporate administrative costs do not require a memorandum of understanding or service level agreement (or other similar agreement) or cost apportioning agreement with a participating municipality for an authority to levy for these costs. We are proposing that these costs be included in the Municipal Levies Regulation and accounted for in a transparent, detailed and stand-alone manner in the authority's draft and approved budgets.

Unproclaimed provisions in the *Conservation Authorities Act* would also continue, once proclaimed, to enable a conservation authority to apportion a minimum levy for operating expenses to a participating municipality. The unproclaimed term 'operating expenses' under the Act includes corporate administrative costs as well operating costs of programs and services.

## PART 2: PROPOSED MINISTER'S REGULATION FOR DETERMINING AMOUNTS OWED BY SPECIFIED MUNICIPALITIES

### BACKGROUND

Recent changes to the *Conservation Authorities Act* include unproclaimed provisions that, once proclaimed, would allow conservation authorities to levy participating municipalities and 'specified municipalities' for the mandatory programs and services related to authority responsibilities under the *Clean Water Act, 2006* and for the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority mandatory policy implementation under the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008*.

A 'specified municipality' is a municipality designated by regulation for a source protection authority/area under the *Clean Water Act, 2006* or designated under a regulation of the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008* as a municipality in the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority; however, a specified municipality is not a participating municipality of a conservation authority under the *Conservation Authorities Act*. In other words, a specified municipality is a municipality or part of a municipality that did not join a conservation authority under the *Conservation Authorities Act* and is geographically



outside of any conservation authority area of jurisdiction under the *Conservation Authorities Act*.

The *Conservation Authorities Act* provides the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks with regulatory authority to govern the determination of amounts owed by any of the specified municipalities for the programs and services an authority provides in respect of the *Clean Water Act, 2006* and the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008*.

We are proposing to proclaim the unproclaimed provisions in the *Conservation Authorities Act* related to the municipal levy and those related specifically to these other Acts.

No change is anticipated to the provincial funding for the drinking water source protection program under the *Clean Water Act, 2006* or *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008*.

The unproclaimed provision (subsection 27.2(2)) of the *Conservation Authorities Act* would enable, once proclaimed, conservation authorities to determine amounts owed by any of its specified municipalities in connection with the mandatory programs and services the authority provides in respect of the *Clean Water Act, 2006* and *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008* as set out in O. Reg. 686/21 "Mandatory Programs and Services Regulation."

## PROPOSAL

For the proposed Minister's regulation with respect to determining amounts owed by specified municipalities related to the programs and services under the *Clean Water Act 2006* and the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008*, as set out in the Mandatory Programs and Services Regulation, we propose to:

- clearly identify the specified municipalities for each of these Acts; and
- identify the methods available for conservation authorities to determine the costs that the specified municipalities may need to pay, including a process of engagement with and integration of the specified municipalities with the participating municipalities into the levy and budget process for the costs associated with these two mandatory programs and services, as set out in the LGIC regulation.

For the levy of participating and 'specified' municipalities under the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008*, the ministry is proposing that the modified current property value assessment method be the method for apportionment. It is anticipated that this would primarily cover operating expenses for the implementation of the mandatory Lake Simcoe Protection Plan policies by the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority.

For the levy of participating and 'specified' municipalities for programs and services provided by a conservation authority in respect of the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, all three

apportionment methods are being proposed (i.e., modified current property value assessment, agreement of the authority and municipalities, and as decided by the authority). This is intended to enable flexibility for the local circumstances in each source protection area, with apportionment, if needed, taking into consideration the extent of risk to sources of drinking water in each municipality. The consideration of risk may involve assessing different agreed upon criteria (e.g., number of municipal drinking water systems, extent of wellhead protection areas and intake protection zones with significant drinking water threats).

The process for engaging specified municipalities on levies under the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008* and *Clean Water Act, 2006* is proposed to be similar to the levy process and budget process for participating municipalities under the *Conservation Authorities Act* (see Table 1, including the requirement for a minimum of 30 days' notice of the levy vote, distribution of the draft budget to the specified municipalities and public posting of the draft budget to the authority's website upon circulation of it to the specified municipalities). Voting on these levies is proposed to occur with both appointed members from the participating and specified municipalities together and the member vote on the municipal levy for these programs and services is "weighted" by the amount of levy for these mandatory programs and services the municipality pays to the authority. In addition, it is proposed that a copy of the final conservation authority budget be distributed to the specified municipalities, in addition to the Minister and the participating municipalities.

## PART 3: PROPOSAL FOR MINISTER'S PUBLISHED LIST OF CLASSES OF PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FOR WHICH A CONSERVATION AUTHORITY MAY CHARGE A FEE

### BACKGROUND

The current clause 21(1)(m.1) of the *Conservation Authorities Act* provides conservation authorities with the ability to charge fees for services that are approved by the Minister. The Minister approved list of services that conservation authorities may charge a fee for that is currently in effect is set out in the provincial *Policies and Procedures for the Charging of Conservation Authority Fees* (June 13, 1997) and includes section 28 permit fees, plan review, response to legal, real estate and public inquiries, extension services (e.g., technical advice / implementation of erosion control measures, forest management / tree planting), information and education services, and sale of products.

Also, in addition to the services the Minister approved for the charging of fees, under *Conservation Authorities Act* clause 21(1)(m), conservation authorities may charge admission for the use of lands that they own or control and to their building and facilities on that land for recreational purposes.

## PROPOSAL

We are proposing to proclaim s. 21.2 of the *Conservation Authorities Act*, which provides that the Minister may determine a list of 'classes of programs and services' that a conservation authority may charge a fee for, publish this list and distribute it to each conservation authority. An authority would be permitted to charge a fee for a program or service only if it is set out in the Minister's list of classes of programs and services. Once a conservation authority is granted the power to charge a fee for a program and service, the authority may determine the fee amount to charge.

The proclamation of s. 21.2 would ensure that a conservation authority administers fees in a transparent and accountable manner. For example, it would require a conservation authority to adopt and publish a written fee policy and fee schedule that lists the programs and services for which it charges a fee and the amount to be charged. If an authority makes changes to its fee schedule, it would be required to notify the public. The section also requires a conservation authority to set out the frequency with which the authority will conduct a review of its fee policy, including its fee schedule, the process for carrying out a review of the policy, including giving notice of the review and how the policy will be changed as a result of a review, and the circumstances and procedures under which any person may request the authority to reconsider a fee that was charged to the person.

In addition, a conservation authority would be required to reconsider a fee at the request of any person who finds that a fee the authority has charged is contrary to their fee schedule or excessive in relation to the program or service for which it was charged. After being requested to reconsider a fee, the authority may either vary the amount of the fee to be charged to an amount the authority considers appropriate, order that no fee be charged or confirm the original amount of the fee.

The Minister's classes of programs and services for which conservation authorities may charge fees captures 'user' fees - i.e., fees paid by a person or organization who requests a service they specifically benefit from. This includes use of a public resource (e.g., park access or facility rental) or the privilege to do something (e.g., receive an approval through a permit or an approval to undertake a regulated activity). The 'user' pay principle is considered appropriate when a program or service is delivered by a conservation authority to a requestor that is the primary beneficiary of the program or service. Conversely, the principle holds that those who do not benefit from the delivery of a program or service should not be obliged to pay. For these types of programs and services, such as the delivery of programs and services by the conservation authority that generate a public good or service, the municipal levy is the primary mechanism to fund conservation authorities.

The Minister's list of classes of programs and services is not however meant to capture fees for programs and services that are already enabled under other legislation. For example, North Bay-Mattawa Conservation Authority may charge a fee to administer on-site sewage systems approvals as prescribed in the *Building Code Act, 1992*. Since the

ability to charge this fee is already enabled through another statute, it is not proposed to be listed in the published list of classes of programs and services for which a conservation authority may charge a fee under the unproclaimed s. 21.2 of the *Conservation Authorities Act*. Similarly, where conservation authorities have been delegated by municipalities the role of a risk management official under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, they may charge a fee for this role as set out by that Act; this fee will not be listed in the proposed Minister's list of classes for which a conservation authority may charge a fee.

Once subsection 29(1) of the *Conservation Authorities Act* is proclaimed and [O. Reg. 688/21 "Rules of Conduct in Conservation Authorities"](#) is in effect, the current authority for conservation authorities to charge fees under subsection 29(1) would be repealed and a conservation authority's ability to make such regulations would be transferred to the Minister. However, since the new Minister's section 29 regulation does not prescribe any fees, the power to impose fees will depend on the Minister's list of classes of programs and services that conservation authorities can charge a fee for, in amounts that the conservation authority may determine, under section 21.2 of the Act. This would affect the charging of fees by authorities for permits required to engage in activities on conservation authority owned or controlled lands, such as camping permits, and for the use (i.e. rental) of conservation authority property including vehicles, boats, recreational facilities and services.

It is recognized that continuing to enable user fees can increase opportunities for a conservation authority to generate their own revenue as well as reduce the overall municipal levy, respecting taxpayer dollars. We are proposing to continue to enable conservation authorities to charge fees where the user-pay principle applies and that the following be the published list of classes of programs and services that conservation authorities may charge fees for:

**Table 2. Proposed classes of programs and services for which a conservation authority may charge a fee.**

List of Classes	Qualifications
Category 1 Mandatory programs and services	<p>All mandatory programs and services where the following requirement is met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where the 'user' pay principle is appropriate such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Administration of s. 28 permits (current s. 28 and proposed s. 28.1, including technical advice and studies)</li> <li>– Responses to legal, real estate and public inquiries regarding a s. 28 permit</li> <li>– s. 29 regulation activities</li> <li>– Review of applications under other legislation</li> <li>– Access to authority owned or controlled land for passive recreation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Category 2 programs and services – i.e. those requested by municipalities and requiring a memorandum of understanding or service level agreement (or other similar agreement).</p>	<p>All Category 2 programs and services where the following requirements are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where the ‘user’ pay principle is appropriate <b>and</b></li> <li>• Provisions for the charging of fees are set out in the memorandum of understanding or service level agreement (or other similar agreement) between the authority and municipality(ies) for these programs and services.</li> </ul> <p>Examples may include commenting on <i>Planning Act</i> applications for matters other than natural hazards, such as for consistency with natural heritage policies.</p>
<p>Category 3 authority determined programs and services <u>with</u> cost apportioning agreement with participating municipalities</p>	<p>All Category 3 programs and services requiring a cost apportioning agreement where the following requirements are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where the ‘user’ pay principle is appropriate <b>and</b></li> <li>• Provisions for the charging of fees are set out in the cost apportioning agreement<sup>1</sup> between the authority and the participating municipality(ies) for the program and service.</li> </ul> <p>Examples may include stewardship extension services that are partially funded by municipal levy.</p> <p>Exception to the requirement for provisions to charge fees in the agreement is where the cost apportioning agreement is to fund: i) category 3 park or non-passive recreational programs and services offered by conservation authorities on authority owned or controlled land that are funded in part by the municipal levy (for example, for public access and use (rental) of authority land, facilities and services such as active recreation and equipment rentals) or, ii) community relations, information and education as well as product sales. An authority would be able to charge a fee as appropriate in this case.</p>
<p>Category 3 authority determined programs and services <u>without</u> cost apportioning agreement</p>	<p>All Category 3 programs and services with no cost apportioning municipal agreement (i.e., no levy required), where the ‘user’ pay principle is appropriate, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programs and services offered by conservation authorities on authority owned or controlled land (for</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> To support this proposed fee class, amendments to [O. Reg. 687/21 “Transition Plans and Agreements for Programs and Services Under Section 21.1.2 of the Act”](#) are proposed to allow a participating municipality and conservation authority to determine where user fees can be established for those programs and services.

	<p>example, public access and use (rental) of authority land, facilities and services such as active recreation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sale of products from on or off authority owned land.</li> <li>• Provision of community relations / information / education services when on or not on conservation authority owned land.</li> </ul>
--	---

## PART 4: COMPLEMENTARY PROPOSALS TO INCREASE TRANSPARENCY OF AUTHORITY OPERATIONS

### PROPOSAL

Complementary regulations are proposed to increase transparency of conservation authority operations. Specifically, the proposed Minister's list of fee classes would enable fees for category 3 programs and services where a cost apportioning agreement is in place for a program or service if the 'user' pay principle is appropriate and provisions for the charging of fees are set out in the cost apportioning agreement between the authority and the participating municipality as noted in the Table above, including the proposed exception. To support this proposed Minister's fee class, amendments to [O. Reg. 687/21 "Transition Plans and Agreements for Programs and Services Under Section 21.1.2 of the Act"](#) are proposed to allow a participating municipality and conservation authority to determine, through agreement, if user fees can be established for those programs and services. Requiring conservation authorities and participating municipalities to include provisions in the cost apportioning agreements increases transparency of user fees.

We are proposing through a Minister's regulation that conservation authorities be required to maintain a *Governance* section on their website in a conspicuous and easily accessible location for the public to access key information. This section must include the conservation authority membership with email and phone contact information; authority bylaws; draft and final budgets; category 2 and 3 agreements between conservation authorities and municipalities; meeting schedule and could include other relevant governance documents (e.g. strategic plans). Noting that the *Conservation Authorities Act* already requires the following to be posted on the authority website: financial statements, meeting agendas and meeting minutes.

We are also proposing the authority would be required to include a notice on the website when it amends or enters into a new memorandum of understanding or other agreement with municipalities and ensure the most up to date version of the agreements are available on the authority's website. The regulation would provide an exception for agreements that relate to the authority participating in a procurement process or portions of agreements that contain commercially sensitive information.

## APPENDIX

### CURRENT MUNICIPAL LEVY FRAMEWORK

There are two current LGIC regulations governing the nature and amount of the municipal levies:

- Municipal Levies regulation (O. Reg. 139/96) – provides the procedure for the ‘weighted’ votes for ‘non-matching’ levies and the requirement for notice to participating municipalities when the levy would be approved by a weighted vote. Also, it provides that levies cannot exceed the total cost of the project.
- Conservation Authority Levies regulation (O. Reg. 670/00) – provides the process to ‘apportion’ costs among all the participating municipalities using the modified current property value assessments. Also, it provides that an authority may establish a minimum sum to levied against a participating municipality.

Guidance materials are in place which support authorities and municipalities on the development of the annual authority budget and municipal levy, the voting method on the levies and the accountability of authority members to their appointing municipalities for the authority budget and municipal levy.

### CURRENT AUTHORITY BUDGET AND MUNICIPAL LEVY APPROVAL PROCESS

The total municipal levy amount is confirmed by the approval of the authority’s annual budget by the authority. Once the budget is approved, the levy for each participating municipality is automatically apportioned.

The amount of levy required from each municipality is sent in a notice of apportionment. Single-tier and regional municipalities are the ‘participating municipality’ in an authority and the levy would be apportioned to them. The levy is a debt due by the participating municipality to the authority and may be enforced by the authority as such.

The levy amount sent out in the notice to a municipality includes the municipality’s portion of the shared costs that are apportioned among all the participating municipalities, referred to as ‘general’ levy, and the costs specific to that municipality (or shared among a few) for specific authority programs or services, generally referred to as ‘special project levy’.

### CURRENT ANNUAL AUTHORITY BUDGET AND MUNICIPAL LEVY VOTING METHODS

For the authority’s current voting process on the municipal levy and the annual authority budget, there are two different voting methods: the ‘weighted vote’ in the Municipal Levies regulation, and ‘one member/one vote’ set out in the Act.

A ‘weighted’ vote occurs in a manner prescribed by the current Conservation Authority Levies regulation which is based on the ‘pay for say’ principle, where the ‘weighting’



reflects the percentage of municipal levy the appointing municipality pays to the authority. This levy vote is carried by a 'weighted majority'; each authority member's vote is 'weighted' by the percent of levy the member's appointing municipality pays to the authority. For example, if a municipality has 10 members in an authority that has a total of 15 members and that municipality has 89% of the levy to pay, the vote for each member of that municipality would 'weigh' 8.9% of the total 'weighted' vote.

The Conservation Authority Levies regulation stipulates however that a municipality cannot have a 'weighted' vote that exceeds 50% of the overall vote unless that municipality has more than 50% of the actual authority members. This ensures that unless that municipality has more than half the members in the authority, the municipality would need to have at least one other municipality's member(s) vote to pass the 'non-matching' levy. For example, if a municipality has 4 appointed members of a total of 10 authority members and that municipality provides 75% of the levy to the authority, the total weighted vote of its four members would not exceed 50% of the total weighted vote. Each member's weighted vote would then be 12.5%; the total of all four members' weighted vote equals 50% of the total weighted vote. Without the 'weighing', each member's vote would have been 18.75% for a total of 75% of the vote. Neither the Act nor current regulations specify when a 'weighted' vote should be used or for what sections of the Act.

Methods for authority voting on the annual budget is also variable among conservation authorities: some vote on the whole budget using the weighted vote, others may use the one member, one vote, with the levy portion of the budget voted by 'weighted vote'.

For approval of the levy associated with certain eligible provincial grant 'projects' (i.e., flood forecasting and warning) that require the authority to match or cost share with matching municipal levy, authority members use the one-member/one vote method.

## CURRENT APPROACH TO APPORTIONMENT OF CONSERVATION AUTHORITY COSTS

How the authority's current costs (administration, maintenance, and capital) under the Act are apportioned among the participating municipalities, is determined in different ways for the different types of costs.

### 1. Modified Current Property Value Assessment

This long-standing apportionment method set out in O. Reg. 670/00 Conservation Authority Levies is based on two principles:

- a. 'Municipal Ability to Pay': determined through the relative value of a municipality's total property tax base to the other property tax bases of the other municipalities in an authority; and



- b. 'Benefit derived' by a municipality from being in the authority: determined through the percentage of a municipality physically in an authority's jurisdiction (which can be in whole or in part) relative to the percentages of all the other municipalities' jurisdictions in an authority's jurisdiction.

The combination of relative modified current property value assessment dollars and the relative percentage of municipal jurisdiction in the authority's jurisdiction creates a percentage of what each municipality is to pay of the total levy amount the authority determines for its annual budget. While the method is complex, basically municipalities with relatively high property tax value pay a larger proportion of authority costs than municipalities with relatively low property tax value, tempered by how much of the geographic area of the participating municipality (the municipal jurisdiction in whole or in part) is located within the authority's area of jurisdiction.

This apportionment approach currently must be used when apportioning administration costs (as currently defined under the Act) as all the participating municipalities would be paying for these costs. This method may also be used for apportioning maintenance and capital costs of a project, again when all participating municipalities are to share these costs. The Conservation Authority Levies regulation describes this apportionment method.

This current levy apportionment method uses municipal property tax assessments at the single and lower tier municipal levels; however, the notice of apportionment (payment) from the authority goes to the 'participating' municipality which would include regional municipalities.

## 2. Agreement among the Authority and Participating Municipalities

A second method for authorities to apportion costs among all the participating municipalities is also enabled by the Conservation Authority Levies regulation. As an alternative to apportioning based on the modified current property assessment-based method, maintenance costs can be apportioned by agreement among the authority and participating municipalities on what the 'benefit derived' is for each participating municipality related to these maintenance costs where the modified current property assessment value based method is not considered appropriate. Capital costs may also be apportioned by this method.

## 3. As Determined by the Authority

A third method for an authority to apportion costs is for the authority (the members) to decide among themselves. This is the method often used for capital projects. The authority decides which participating municipalities should pay and how much each should pay ('benefit derived'). Dividing capital costs on the basis of 'benefit' is intended to ensure that costs paid by individual participating municipalities in support of project capital costs are proportionate to the benefits they receive (i.e., those who receive the greatest benefit pay the greatest share of costs).

**Table 3. Summary of current apportionment methods and authority costs.**

Current Conservation Authority Project Costs	Apportion by Modified Current Property Value Assessment	Apportion by Authority / Municipal Agreement	Apportion by the Authority
Capital	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maintenance	Yes	Yes	No
Administration	Yes	No	No

**Table 4. Summary of the current municipal levy framework.**

<i>Conservation Authorities Act</i>	Capital Costs for a Project	Maintenance and Administration Costs
Rules for administering	s. 25, s. 26, Municipal Levies regulation and provincial policy	s. 27, Municipal Levies and Conservation Authority Levies regulations and provincial policy
Voting	'Weighted Vote' method under the current Municipal Levies Regulation and provincial policy is required for capital costs unless there are specific provincial natural hazard grants for the authorities, in which case the one vote per member method applies. However, for capital costs, there are no provincial grants to be matched under the <i>Conservation Authorities Act</i> therefore the vote for capital costs has been by weighted vote.	One vote per member method for maintenance and administration costs funded by a specific provincial grant, and 'Weighted Vote' method under Municipal Levies regulation and provincial policy for costs <u>not</u> associated with activities or projects funded by the province.
Apportionment	Authority determines apportionment by benefit derived.	Authority determines apportionment of benefit derived using the modified current property value assessment method for administration costs.  Maintenance costs portion may use alternative system to the modified current property value assessment method if agreed upon by the participating municipalities and the authority.
Minimum levy	Not available.	Authority may set a minimum for administration costs.

## **Grey Sauble Authority Board of Directors**

---

### **M O T I O N**

**DATE:** February 23, 2022

**MOTION #:** FA-22-019

**MOVED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECONDED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**WHEREAS** on January 26, 2022, the Province of Ontario released the “*Regulatory and Policy Proposal Consultation Guide: Regulations Regarding Municipal Levies, Conservation Authority Budget Process, Transparency, and Provincial Policy for the Charging of Fees by Conservation Authorities*”,

**THAT** the GSCA Board of Directors receive Staff Report 005-2022 as information



## STAFF REPORT

**Report To:** Board of Directors  
**Report From:** Tim Lanthier, CAO  
**Meeting Date:** February 23, 2022  
**Report Code:** 006-2022  
**Subject:** Agricultural Committee Terms of Reference and Committee Appointments

---

### Recommendation:

**WHEREAS the GSCA Board of Directors passed motion FA-21-048 which approved the formation of an Agricultural Advisory Committee and Terms of Reference for this Committee at the March 24, 2021 meeting of the Board of Directors;**

**AND WHEREAS, as per the Terms of Reference, GSCA is to appoint two members to this committee;**

**THAT, the GSCA Board of Directors appoint Member \_\_\_\_\_ and Member \_\_\_\_\_ to the Agricultural Committee for the 2022 operating year.**

### Strategic Initiative:

This item is not directly related to any of GSCA Strategic Initiatives, but serves to improve community relationships.

### Background:

At the March 21, 2021 meeting of the Board of Directors, Forestry Coordinator, Michael Fry, presented the Board with a Background Report and a proposed Terms of Reference for a GSCA Agricultural Advisory Committee. The Board considered and approved Terms of Reference at that time under Board Motion FA-21-048.

The committee is made up of representative from a suite of agricultural groups throughout Grey and Bruce Counties. On December 17, 2021, the GSCA Agricultural Committee held its first meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for March 3, 2022.

### **Financial/Budget Implications:**

There are administrative staff costs associated with overseeing this committee. These costs are proposed to be allocated under Administration in future operating budgets.

### **Communication Strategy:**

Staff will continue to communicate with local agricultural groups about the Agricultural Advisory Committee. Staff have informed the current members of the Committee that up to two members of GSCA's Board of Directors will be joining the committee.

### **Consultation:**

CAO, Forestry Coordinator



# GSCA Agricultural Advisory Committee

## Terms of Reference

Version 1.0

Date Approved: 24-March-2021



**PROTECT. RESPECT. CONNECT.**

237897 Inglis Falls Road, Owen Sound ON, N4K 5N6

519-376-3076

[www.greysauble.on.ca](http://www.greysauble.on.ca)

# Table of Contents

MISSION / PURPOSE ..... 2

AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH COMMITTEE..... 2

COMPOSITION ..... 3

MEETINGS..... 4

COMMITTEE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR ..... 4

PROCEDURAL RULES ..... 4

DECISION MAKING..... 4

REMUNERATION..... 4

REPORTING ..... 5

RESOURCES..... 5

## Mission / Purpose

The Committee's purpose is to act as a voice of the agricultural community at Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) and to coordinate communication between agricultural organizations within the GSCA watersheds. The Committee will identify opportunities related to the agricultural community and provide feedback to the Board of Directors from the community.

The purpose of the Agricultural Advisory Committee is to:

- Improve communications with a diverse agricultural community through information sharing, advocacy and education.
- Identify initiatives and projects that impact the agricultural community and discuss pros and cons of these projects.
- Provide an opportunity for input and recommendations on matters considered relevant to the agricultural community including but not limited to: stewardship programs, land programs, regulation policies, and plan review policies.
- Identify areas of common interest/issues and/or concerns as they relate to the agricultural community (externally).
- Act as a discussion group to bring forward communication to the GSCA Board of Directors.

## Authority to Establish Committee

### Conservation Authorities Act

Section 18(2) of the Conservation Authorities Act (CAA) states, *"an authority shall establish such advisory boards as may be required by regulation and may establish such other advisory boards as it considers appropriate. 2017, c. 23, Sched. 4, s. 15"*.

Section 18(3) of the CAA states, *"an advisory board shall comply with any requirements that may be prescribed by regulation with respect to its composition, functions, powers, duties, activities and procedures. 2017, c. 23, Sched. 4, s. 15"*.

Section 19.1(1) of the CAA states, *"an authority may make by-laws,*

- (a) respecting the meetings to be held by the authority, including providing for the calling of the meetings and the procedures to be followed at meetings, specifying which meetings, if any, may be closed to the public;*
- (e) providing for the composition of its executive committee and for the establishment of other committees that it considers advisable and respecting any other matters relating to its governance"*.

### Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Administrative By-Law

Section 17 of the GSCA Administrative By-Law states, *"in accordance with Section 18(2) of the Act the Authority shall establish such advisory boards and committees as required by regulation and may establish such other advisory boards or committees as it considers appropriate to study and report on specific matters. The General Membership shall approve the terms of reference for all such advisory boards and committees, which shall include the role, the frequency of meetings and the number of members required. Resolutions and policies governing the operation of the Authority shall be observed in all advisory board and committee meetings. Each advisory board or committee shall report to the General Membership, presenting any recommendations made by the advisory board*



Grey Sauble Conservation Authority – Agricultural Advisory Committee – Terms of Reference

or committee. The dates of all advisory board and committee meetings shall be made available to all Members of the Authority.”

## Composition

The Agricultural Advisory Committee shall be composed generally of 5 members, who live, farm, work or represent an agricultural organization within the GSCA watershed. GSCA will appoint all committee members. It will be the responsibility of the individual organizations to recommend annually in writing their representatives, by Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> to the GSCA Chief Administrative Officer/Secretary-Treasurer. An invitation for membership would be sent to the following organizations:

### Ontario Federation of Agriculture:

- 1 representative from Bruce County Federation of Agriculture
- 1 representative from Grey County Federation of Agriculture

### Other Agricultural Groups:

- 1 representative from the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario (CFFO)
- 1 representative from the National Farmers Union (NFU)
- 1 additional representative from the Agricultural Community (selected annually by the Advisory Committee through an open/by invitation selection process)

If Federations, CFFO, or NFU do not fulfil their allowed number of representatives the Committee may recommend appointees from other agricultural community groups for appointment by GSCA.

### GSCA Authority Representatives:

- 2 members from the General Membership of the Authority.

### GSCA Staff Resources:

Depending on the topics to be discussed, any of the following GSCA Managers/Coordinators could take the meeting lead:

- Chief Administrative Officer;
- Manager of Conservation Lands;
- Forestry Coordinator;
- Water Resources Coordinator;
- Environmental Planning Coordinator; or
- Drinking Water Source Protection Project Manager.

A current municipal member of the GSCA Board of Directors may not sit on this Committee as a member of another organization.

## Meetings

The Committee will meet up to 4 times per year subject to agenda content and need. Additional meetings will be at the call of the Chair if required for timely matters.

The Committee will set the meeting schedule annually at the first meeting of the year.

Meetings will generally be held during regular business hours at the GSCA Administration Office (237897 Inglis Falls Road, Owen Sound, Ontario) at the call of the Committee Chair.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, meetings may be held in a virtual forum by either majority approval of the Committee or due to pandemic related health and safety concerns.

## Committee Chair and Vice Chair

If the Minister of the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) has designated an agricultural representative to the GSCA Board of Directors as per Section 14(4) of the Conservation Authorities Act, this member shall be the Chair of the Agricultural Committee. The Committee will elect a Vice Chair from its membership annually at the first meeting of the year.

If the Minister of MECP has not designated an agricultural representative as per Section 14(4) of the Conservation Authorities Act, the Committee will elect a Chair and Vice Chair from its membership annually at the first meeting of the year.

## Procedural Rules

The Committee shall be subject to all policies and clauses of the GSCA Administrative By-Laws. In the case where these by-laws are silent, Roberts Rules of Order will take precedent.

Quorum is more than 50% of the membership of the Committee, and never less than four (4) members. Members shall not be represented by proxy.

The agenda will be developed by GSCA staff with input from the Committee chair.

Committee members do not have the authority to specifically direct the activities of GSCA staff and will communicate through the GSCA Chief Administrative Officer/Secretary-Treasurer. The Committee may make recommendations to the GSCA Board of Directors.

The Terms of Reference will be reviewed on an annual basis by the Committee. Any recommended changes must be approved by the Full Authority Board of Directors.

## Decision Making

This Committee does not have decision making power over the Authority or the Staff of the Authority. However, the Committee may make decisions on recommendations to the Authority. Consensus based decisions will be encouraged for all matters, however if required, normal simple majority rules will be implemented. Each committee member shall have full voting rights and be entitled to one vote per member. Members must be present at the meeting to be eligible to vote. Virtual attendance is permitted.

## Remuneration

Agricultural organizational representative members of the Committee are not eligible for remuneration for their participation on the Agricultural Advisory Committee. GSCA Board of Director representatives on the Committee

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority – Agricultural Advisory Committee – Terms of Reference  
are eligible for a per diem pursuant to the policies established by the GSCA.

## Reporting

The Committee Chair shall report to the GSCA Authority Members in the form of a report containing Committee Agendas, meeting minutes, and recommendations. When required the Committee may appoint a representative who best represents the topic of discussion to speak to the report. The Committee shall provide the Chief Administrative Officer/Secretary-Treasurer with a copy of the reports to be circulated to the GSCA Authority Members. Requests to present to the Board of Directors shall be submitted to the Chief Administrative Officer no later than three weeks prior to the subject Full Authority meeting. Written reports and package materials for the Board of Director's shall be provided to the Chief Administrative Officer no later than two weeks prior to the subject Full Authority meeting.

## Resources

GSCA staff and other resource experts will be invited, as required, to provide additional input to the Committee. GSCA will provide administrative support, including the circulation of reports to the GSCA Members, distribution of agendas and the general administrative co-ordination of the meetings.

## **Grey Sauble Authority Board of Directors**

---

### **M O T I O N**

**DATE:** February 23, 2022

**MOTION #:** FA-22-020

**MOVED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECONDED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**WHEREAS** the GSCA Board of Directors passed motion FA-21-048 which approved the formation of an Agricultural Advisory Committee and Terms of Reference for this Committee at the March 24, 2021 meeting of the Board of Directors;

**AND WHEREAS**, as per the Terms of Reference, GSCA is to appoint two members to this committee;

**THAT**, the GSCA Board of Directors appoint Member \_\_\_\_\_ and Member \_\_\_\_\_ to the Agricultural Committee for the 2022 operating year.



---

## STAFF REPORT

**Report To:** Board of Directors  
**Report From:** Rebecca Ferguson, Manager of Conservation Lands  
**Meeting Date:** February 23, 2022  
**Report Code:** 007-2022  
**Subject:** Ad Hoc Committee for Administrative Building RFP

---

### Recommendation:

**WHEREAS the GSCA Board of Director's passed resolution FA-18-094 at the October 24, 2018, Full Authority Meeting directing staff to issue an RFP to engage an architect for concept design drawings;**

**AND WHEREAS GSCA staff issued an RFP to this effect on August 27, 2021, and received three (3) proposals, which all came in over budget;**

**AND WHEREAS the GSCA Board of Director's passed resolution FA-21-119 at the October 27, 2021, Full Authority Meeting to direct staff to reissue the RFP with a refined scope;**

**THAT the GSCA Board of Director's select two additional Members to join the Evaluation Committee to review the new RFP.**

### Strategic Initiative:

This item is part of GSCA's corporate services that supports and assists all of GSCA's Strategic Plan deliverables and desired outcomes.

### Background:

On August 27, 2021, an RFP was issued for architectural schematics and an Order of Magnitude budget for the Administrative Building renovation.

The Evaluation Committee, comprised of the Board Chair, the CAO, the Manager of Conservation Lands and the Operations Manager reviewed the proposals. Based on the results of this review and with all three firms exceeding the allotted budget, GSCA staff proposed to reissue the RFP with a refined scope. This decision was approved by Board of Directors Motion FA-21-119 at the October 27, 2021, meeting.

At this meeting it was also brought forward from CAO, Tim Lanthier that he would like to have a committee of the Board formed that will include Members with relevant knowledge and expertise in the construction fields.

### **Analysis:**

GSCA staff respectfully request that two additional Members join the Evaluation Committee.

### **Financial/Budget Implications:**

There are no financial or budget implications at this time. After issuance of the RFP and review of any received tenders, the Evaluation Committee will recommend a preferred proposal to the Board of Directors for final approval.

### **Communication Strategy:**

There is no communication strategy related to this specific committee request.

### **Consultation:**

CAO



## **Grey Sauble Authority Board of Directors**

---

### **M O T I O N**

**DATE:** February 23, 2022

**MOTION #:** FA-22-021

**MOVED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECONDED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**WHEREAS** the GSCA Board of Director's passed resolution FA-18-094 at the October 24, 2018, Full Authority Meeting directing staff to issue an RFP to engage an architect for concept design drawings;

**AND WHEREAS** GSCA staff issued an RFP to this effect on August 27, 2021, and received three (3) proposals, which all came in over budget;

**AND WHEREAS** the GSCA Board of Director's passed resolution FA-21-119 at the October 27, 2021, Full Authority Meeting to direct staff to reissue the RFP with a refined scope;

**THAT** the GSCA Board of Director's select two additional Members to join the Evaluation Committee to review the new RFP.



## **Grey Sauble Authority Board of Directors**

---

### **M O T I O N**

**DATE:** February 23, 2022

**MOTION #:** FA-22-022

**MOVED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECONDED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**THAT this meeting now adjourn.**