

## TOWNSHIP OF MELANCTHON

## AGENDA

Thursday, August 13, 2015 - 5:00 p.m.

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Announcements
- 3. Additions/Deletions/Approval of Agenda
- 4. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and the General Nature Thereof
- 5. Approval of Draft Minutes July 16, 2015
- 6. Business Arising from Minutes
- 7. Point of Privilege or Personal Privilege
- 8. Public Question Period (Please visit our website under Agendas and Minutes for information on Public Question Period)
- 9. <u>Road Business</u>
  - 1. Accounts
  - 2. Data from road traffic counters 8<sup>th</sup> Line NE, 5<sup>th</sup> Line, 3<sup>rd</sup> Line
  - 3. Report to Mayor White and Members of Council dated August 13, 2015, Re -Recommendations From The Roads Sub-Committee
  - 4. Roads Agreement for the 4<sup>th</sup> Line OS from former CP Railway Tracks to Highway 89
  - 5. Onsite to 121 Main Street in Horning's Mills regarding snow placement Set a date and time
- 10. County Council Update
  - 1. Council In Brief for Thursday, July 9, 2015
- 11. Committee Reports
- 12. Correspondence

#### **\*Outside Board & Committee Minutes**

- 1. Centre Dufferin Recreation Complex Board of Management Meeting May 27, 2015
- 2. Centre Dufferin Recreation Complex Board of Management Meeting June 8, 2015
- 3. Grand River Conservation Authority General Membership Meeting Friday June 26, 2015
- 4. Minutes of the Mulmur-Melancthon Fire Board Meeting April 20, 2015
- 5. Minutes of the Mulmur-Melancthon Fire Board Meeting May 25, 2015
- 6. Shelburne & District Fire Board Meeting May 5, 2015
- 7. Minutes of the Roads Sub-Committee Meeting April 29, 2015
- 8. Minutes of Police Services Board Meeting February 18, 2015

\* Items for Information Purposes

- 1. Email from Tristin McCredie, Municipal Advisor dated July 30, 2015, Re Applications Now Open for Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund
- 2. Email from Pam Hillock, County Clerk, County of Dufferin dated July 13, 2015, Re -Integrity Commissioner and Bill 8
- 3. Email from Pam Hillock, County Clerk, County of Dufferin dated July 13, 2015, Re -Response to Consultations
- 4. Copy of a resolution passed by the County of Dufferin dated July 15, 2015, Re -Proposed Privatization of Hydro One
- 5. Normal Farm Practices Protection Board Pre-Hearing Conference Order No. 3, Cox V. Mono

- 6. AMO Communications AMO Policy Update Infrastructure Funding
- 7. Email from Steven Sills, Detachment Commander dated July 28, 2015, Re Horning's Mills
- 8. Letter from Randy Pettapiece, MPP Perth-Wellington dated July 21, 2015, Re -Resolution for Fairness in Provincial Infrastructure Funds
- 9. Press Release Town of Shelburne dated July 24, 2015, Re Coors Banquet One Horse Town Competition
- 10. Email from Great Lakes and Water Policy Section (MNRF) dated July 20, 2015, Re -Notification of Environmental Registry Posting of the <u>Conservation Authorities Act</u> <u>Review Discussion Paper</u>

## \* Items for Council Action

- 1. Letter from Atkinson Farms Ltd. dated July 16, 2015, Re Renewal of Agreement for Irrigation Purposes
- 2. Letter from Carol Hawton, Re File No. B4/15
- 3. Letter from H.J. Lyon dated July 8, 2015, Re Proposed Severance Part Lot 32 Con 3 NE Moratorium on any future applications for On-Farm Shops
- 4. Email from Shari Page, Triton Engineering dated July 13, 2015, Re Township of Southgate, Notice of Project Commencement, Class EA, Dundalk Water System
- 5. Drainage Report
- 6. Copy of a resolution from the Police Services Board dated June 11, 2015, Re Invitation to Council to September 10, 2015 meeting to discuss roles and responsibilities

### 13. General Business

- 1. Accounts
- 2. Applications to Permit
- 3. Open Tenders Received for the Guide Rail at 10 Line SW and Highway 89
- 4. New/Other Business
  - 1. Canada Post Mailbox Replacement in Corbetton & Riverview Mayor White
  - 2. NVCA Efficiency Audit Report Mayor White
- 5. Unfinished Business
  - 1. Hill Agra Machinery Inc. Fire Cleanup Lot 4, Lot 5, Plan 30A Letter from Jim Hill
  - 2. North Dufferin Recreation Centre Agreement
  - 3. Corbetton Park Update
  - 4. Information Flyer Update
  - 5. Southgate Recreation Agreement
  - 6. Ark II Shelter in Horning's Mills Update

#### 14. Delegations

- 1. 5:45 p.m. Public Meeting for Zoning By-law Amendment Holmes Agro
- 2. 6:00 p.m. COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT
- 3. 6:30 p.m. Jerry Jorden, Township Planner to update Council on the status of matters relating to the Appeal of the Township's OP and the August 19<sup>th</sup> OMB Hearing
- 4. 7:00 p.m. Tom Pridham, RJ Burnside and Associates Presentation and Review of the Reports for the Bauman and Fluney Drainage Works

#### 15. Closed Session (if required)

- 1. Approval of Draft Minutes July 16, 2015
- 16. Notice of Motion
- 17. Confirmation By-law
- 18. Adjournment and Date of Next Meeting Thursday, September 3, 2015 5:00 p.m.
- 19. On Sites
- 20. Correspondence on File at the Clerk's Office

Station Name:8th line north east Site ID:000000318469 Station Num:101820130001 Description:0.5 km south east of cty road 9 City: County: Start Date/Time:07/13/15 09:15 End Date/Time:07/20/15 14:30

Class 1 Class 2 Class 3 Class 4 Class 5 Class 6 Class 7 Class 8 Class 9 Class 10 Class 11 Class 12 Class 13 Class 14 Class 15 All Classes

July 13, 2015	0	49	59	5	7	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
July 14, 2015	2	79	52	8	20	10	0	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	181
July 15, 2015	1	70	70	12	13	6	1	5	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	186
July 16, 2015	3	81	67	9	15	7	1	9	3	5	0	0	0	0	1	201
July 17, 2015	2	71	51	6	8	18	4	10	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	176
July 18, 2015	5	43	28	3	9	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
July 19, 2015	6	71	18	9	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	· 0	111
July 20, 2015	0	37	31	6	7	1	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	90
	10		076		~ ~ ~	10				40			1			4475
Total	19	501	376	58	84	48	10	39	20		0	0	1	0	1	1175
Percentage	1.62%	4 <b>2.6</b> 4%	32.00%	<b>4.9</b> 4%	7.15%	4.09%	0.85%	3.32%	1 <b>.70</b> %	1.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	0.00%	0.09%	100.00%
	40 KPH	45 KPH	50 KPH	55 KPH (	60 KPH	65 KPH 7	70 KPH	75 KPH	80 KPH	85 KPH	90 KPH	95 KPH	100 KPH	110 KPH >	110 KPF	All Speeds
	יוווייעד															
																·
July 13, 2015	2	2	5	6	5	4	12	16	18		17	13	7	7	4	132
July 13, 2015 July 14, 2015	2 5	2 6	5		5								7 2	7 7	4 0	-
	2	2 6 1	5 7 2		5	4	12	16	18	14	17	13	7 2 7	7 7 6	4 0 2	132
July 14, 2015	2 5	2 6 1 5	5 7 2 2		5 9	4 15	12 2 <b>6</b>	16 33	18 18	14 14	17 15	13 15	7 2 7 5	7 7 6 4	4 0 2 3	132 181
July 14, 2015 July 15, 2015 July 16, 2015 July 17, 2015	2 5 8	2 6 1 5 11	5 7 2 2 8	6 9 5	5 9 12	4 15 17	12 2 <b>6</b> 23	16 33 34	18 18 29	14 14 10	17 15 19	13 15 11	7 2 7 5 4	7 7 6 4 1	4 0 2	132 181 186 201 17 <b>6</b>
July 14, 2015 July 15, 2015 July 16, 2015	2 5 8 17	2 6 1 5	5 7 2 2	6 9 5 <b>6</b>	5 9 12 11	4 15 17 13	12 2 <b>6</b> 23 27	16 33 34 24	18 18 29 31	14 14 10 22	17 15 19 12	13 15 11 19	7 2 7 5 4 2	7 7 6 4 1 3	4 0 2	132 181 186 201 176 98
July 14, 2015 July 15, 2015 July 16, 2015 July 17, 2015 July 18, 2015 July 19, 2015	2 5 8 17 11	2 6 1 5	5 7 2 2	6 9 5 <b>6</b> 20	5 9 12 11	4 15 17 13 19	12 2 <b>6</b> 23 27 29	16 33 34 24 18	18 18 29 31 13 13	14 14 10 22 14	17 15 19 12 10	13 15 11 19 5	7 2 7 5 4 2 4	7 7 6 4 1 3 0	4 0 2	132 181 186 201 176 98 111
July 14, 2015 July 15, 2015 July 16, 2015 July 17, 2015 July 18, 2015	2 5 8 17 11 4	2 6 1 5	5 7 2 2	6 9 5 <b>6</b> 20	5 9 12 11 12 7	4 15 17 13 19 8	12 2 <b>6</b> 23 27 29 14	16 33 34 24 18 10	18 18 29 31 13 13	14 14 10 22 14	17 15 19 12 10	13 15 11 19 5	7 2 7 5 4 2 4 1	7 6 4 1 3 0 4	4 0 2	132 181 186 201 17 <b>6</b> 98
July 14, 2015 July 15, 2015 July 16, 2015 July 17, 2015 July 18, 2015 July 19, 2015	2 5 17 11 4 16	2 6 1 5	5 7 2 2 8 4 4	6 9 5 <b>6</b> 20	5 9 12 11 12 7	4 15 17 13 19 8 <b>6</b>	12 26 23 27 29 14 24	16 33 34 24 18 10 14	18 18 29 31 13 13	14 14 10 22 14 8 5 9	17 15 19 12 10	13 15 11 19 5	7 2 7 5 4 2 4 1	7 6 4 1 3 0 4 <b>32</b>	4 0 2	132 181 186 201 176 98 111

No consistent time for speeders. It appears to be all day.

ч,

--

3

Station Name:5th line Site ID:000000398663 Station Num:101820130001 Description:0.4 km south of 240 City: County: Start Date/Time:07/20/15 15:15 End Date/Time:07/29/15 08:30

4,

÷,

c	lass 1 Cl	lass 2 C	lass 3 C	lass 4 Cla	ass 5 Cla	iss 6 Cla	ass 7 Cla	ass 8 Cla	ass 9 C	lass 10 C	lass 11 Cla	ass 12 Cl	lass 13	Class 14 C	lass 15 A	II Classes
July 20, 2015	1	12	26	1	6	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
July 21, 2015	0	51	37	2	8	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Jul <b>y 22, 201</b> 5	0	40	60	3	21	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
July 23, 2015	0	48	42	0	10	8	0	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	117
July 24, 2015	0	47	56	1	18	2	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	132
July 25, 2015	4	47	36	0	6	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
July 26, 2015	3	54	37	0	6	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
July 27, 2015	1	60	52	7	9	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
July 28, 2015	3	55	41	0	11	5	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	121
July 29, 2015	2	5	12	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
TOTALS	14	419	399	14	97	37	1	<b>2</b> 6	3	6	0	0	0	0	1	1017
PERCENTAGE	1.38%	41.20%	39.23%	1.38%	9.54%	3.64%	0.10%	2.56%	0.29%	0.59%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	100.00%
4	0 KPH 4	5 KPH 50	0 KPH 5	5 KPH 60	KPH 65	KPH 70	KPH 75	KPH 80	KPH 8	5 KPH 9	0 KPH 95	КРН 10	00 KPH	110 KPH >	110 KPH /	II Speeds
	<b>о КРН 4</b> 8 0	5 KPH 50 1	0 KPH 5 2	5 KPH 60 0	КРН 65 0	KPH 70 4	KPH 75	КРН 80 6	KPH 8	5 KPH 9 7	0 KPH 95 5	КРН 10 6	0 <b>0 KPH</b>	110 KPH >	110 KPH A	All Speeds 49
4 July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2				KPH 70 4 4	• <b>KPH 75</b> 4 7		<b>KPH 8</b> 5 7 25				00 KPH 4 0		110 KPH A 1 4	-
July 20, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2 1				KPH 70 4 4 9	<b>KPH 75</b> 4 7 7	6	7	7	5	6	00 KPH 4 0 8	2	110 KPH 4 1 4 4	49
July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2 1 2				KPH 70 4 4 9 6	<b>KPH 75</b> 4 7 7 9	6 14	7 25	7 17	5 12	6 14	00 KPH 4 0 8 8	2 3	110 KPH 4 1 4 4 0	49 109
July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015 July 22, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2 1 2 0				KPH 70 4 9 6 6	<b>KPH 75</b> 4 7 7 9 9	6 14 15	7 25 23	7 17 12	5 12 21	6 14 16	00 KPH 4 0 8 8 8	2 3	110 KPH 4 1 4 0 5	49 109 131
July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015 July 22, 2015 July 23, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2 1 2 0 0				KPH 70 4 9 6 5	4 7 7 9	6 14 15 10	7 25 23 21	7 17 12 21	5 12 21 15	6 14 16 7	00 KPH 4 0 8 8 8 4	2 3	110 KPH 4 1 4 0 5 4	49 109 131 117
July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015 July 22, 2015 July 23, 2015 July 24, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2 1 2 0 0 2				KPH 70 4 9 6 5 4	4 7 9 9	6 14 15 10 16	7 25 23 21 16	7 17 12 21 13	5 12 21 15 17	6 14 16 7 14	00 KPH 4 0 8 8 8 4 2	2 3	110 KPH 4 1 4 4 0 5 4 1	49 109 131 117 132
July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015 July 22, 2015 July 23, 2015 July 24, 2015 July 25, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2 1 2 0 0 2 1				KPH 70 4 9 6 5 4 8	4 7 9 9	6 14 15 10 16 9	7 25 23 21 16 14	7 17 12 21 13 7	5 12 21 15 17 15	6 14 16 7 14 3	00 KPH 4 0 8 8 8 4 2 10	2 3	110 KPH 4 1 4 0 5 4 1 9	49 109 131 117 132 98
July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015 July 22, 2015 July 23, 2015 July 24, 2015 July 25, 2015 July 26, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2 1 2 0 0 2 1 1				4 9 6 5 4	4 7 9 9 11 13	6 14 15 10 16 9 18	7 25 23 21 16 14 17	7 17 12 21 13 7 12	5 12 21 15 17 15 13	6 14 16 7 14 3 5	4 0 8 8 8 4 2	2 3 11 9 5 8 3	110 KPH 4 1 4 0 5 4 1 9 2	49 109 131 117 132 98 103
July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015 July 22, 2015 July 23, 2015 July 24, 2015 July 25, 2015 July 26, 2015 July 27, 2015		5 KPH 50 1 2 1 2 0 0 2 1 1 1 0				4 9 6 5 4 8	4 7 9 9 11 13	6 14 15 10 16 9 18 14	7 25 23 21 16 14 17 16	7 17 12 21 13 7 12 12	5 12 21 15 17 15 13 26	6 14 16 7 14 3 5 12	4 0 8 8 4 2 10	2 3 11 9 5 8 3 10	110 KPH 4 4 0 5 4 1 9 2 0	49 109 131 117 132 98 103 133
July 20, 2015 July 21, 2015 July 22, 2015 July 23, 2015 July 24, 2015 July 25, 2015 July 26, 2015 July 27, 2015 July 28, 2015	0 1 1 4 4 0 2 0	1 2 1 2 0 0 2 1 1	2 2 0 2 4 6 6 2 4	0 3 2 7 4 4 0 7	0 1 3 4 8 4 3 3 7	4 9 6 5 4 8 5	4 7 9 9 11 13 8 8	6 14 15 10 16 9 18 14 15	7 25 23 21 16 14 17 16 28	7 17 12 21 13 7 12 12 12 16	5 12 21 15 17 15 13 26 10	6 14 16 7 14 3 5 12 5	4 0 8 8 4 2 10 6	2 3 11 9 5 8 3 10 <b>7</b>	1 4 0 5 4 1 9 2	49 109 131 117 132 98 103 133 121

Station Name:3rd line Site ID:000000477400 Description:.4 km north of 15 sideroad Start Date/Time:07/09/15 08:00 End Date/Time:07/12/15 23:59

	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5	Class 6	Class 7	Class 8	Class 9	Class 10	Class 11	Class 12	Class 13	Class 14	Class 15	All Classes
July 9, 2015	2	157	75	0	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
July 10, 2015	3	162	103	0	21	6	1	7	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	307
July 11, 2015	2	133	80	1	15	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233
July 12, 2015	7	113	63	1	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198
Total Percentage	14 1.41%	565 56.96%	321 32.36%	2 0.20%	67 6.75%	8 0.81%	1 0.10%	10 1.01%	1 0.10%	2 0.20%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	1 0.10%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	992 100.00%

	40 KPH	45 KPH	50 KPH	55 KPH	60 KPH	65 KPH	70 KPH	75 KPH	80 KPH	85 KPH	90 KPH	95 KPH	100 KPH	110 KPH :	> 110 KPH	All Speeds
July 9, 2015	1	0	1	3	3	15	34	44	59	35	33	8	10	2	6	254
July 10, 2015	0	1	5	8	8	27	28	50	65	39	44	22	5	4	1	307
July 11, 2015	1	1	4	5	7	14	27	33	57	23	23	19	9	6	4	233
July 12, 2015	4	0	3	4	5	17	20	34	42	24	19	6	8	7	5	198
Total	6	2	13	20	23	73	109	161	223	121	<b>1</b> 19	5 <b>5</b>	32	1 <b>9</b>	16	992
Percentage	0.60%	0.20%	1.31%	2.02%	2.32%	7.36%	10.99%	16.23%	22.48%	12.20%	12.00%	5.54%	3.23%	1.92%	1.61%	100.00%

Speeders are all different times.



The Corporation of **THE TOWNSHIP OF MELANCTHON** 157101 Highway 10,

Melancthon, Ontario, L9V 2E6

#### TO: MAYOR WHITE AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

FROM: JOYCE CLARKE, ROADS SUB-COMMITTEE SECRETARY

DATE: AUGUST 13, 2015

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ROADS SUB-COMMITTEE

The Roads Sub-Committee Meeting on July 30, 2015 resulted in the following recommendations.

#### 1. Shook Street In Corbetton

#### Recommendation to Council:

The Roads Sub-Committee recommends the Council directs staff to send an official notice to Mr. James Turner to clean up the road allowance on Shook Street. Mr. Norman Patterson should be sent an official notice to clean up the road allowance on Cedar Street in Corbetton. Both notices should indicate the Sub-committee's concern regarding fire route regulations.

2. Allan Wargon Request for increase in snow blowing for 2014/2015

#### **Recommendation to Council**

The Roads Sub-committee recommends to Council that the remaining amount of \$135.60 (\$120 + HST of \$15.60) be paid to Mr. Allan Wargon for 2013/2014 snow blowing.

#### 3. Third Line Realignment—Relocation of Bell Cables

#### Recommendation to Council

The Roads Sub-committee recommends Council invites Glenn Clarke to speak on recommendations to the Third Line Realignment of Bell Cables.

4. E-mail regarding putting a "No Jake Break" sign up on the 20 sideroad.

#### **Recommendation to Council**

The Road Sub Committee recommends to council that a "No Jake Brake" sign be erected on the 20 sideroad at County Road 124.

5. 2 culverts on Grey Highland/Melancthon Townline.

#### **Recommendation to Council**

The Road Sub Committee recommends to council enters a road agreement with the Township of Grey Highlands to construct a culvert on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Line NE and the Melancthon/Grey Highlands Townline and on the Melancthon/Grey Highland Townline east of 30 sideroad.

Report respectfully submitted.

Joseclarke

Joyce Clarke Road Sub-committee Secretary

٩

**e** 5

#### **Denise Holmes**

From:

Sent: To: Subject: Dufferin County <clerk=dufferincounty.ca@mail74.atl51.rsgsv.net> on behalf of Dufferin County <clerk@dufferincounty.ca> Friday, July 10, 2015 4:39 PM Denise Dufferin County E-Newsletter- Council in Brief - July 9, 2015

Dufferin County's Official E-Newsletter

View this email in your browser

# COUNCIL IN BRIEF

For Thursday, July 9, 2015. For the full agenda and minutes, please visit our website.

1



#### TRIBUTE TO BOB SHIRLEY

Warden Maycock paid tribute to Bob Shirley at last evening's council meeting. Mr. Shirley had dedicated almost four decades to the betterment of Island Lake Conservation Authority and the Credit River. He has been part of the Board of Directors of the Credit Valley Conservation Authority since 1977, a member of the CVC Foundation and founding

member of the Friends of Island Lake. Bob was very instrumental in connecting the links to the trail surrounding Island Lake.



#### DYNES GREY APARTMENTS

Council approved the construction of three additional social housing units at the Dynes Grey Apartments in Shelburne. The tender was awarded to Everstrong Construction in the amount of \$457,197 plus taxes. Funding is being provided in the amount of \$326,375 through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs Affordable Housing (IAH) Program

#### CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

As part of the County's 2015 Capital budget, the following road work has been approved for completion this year:

Location Description	Length	From/To	Status	Timing

CR11	Resurfacing & Widening	3.1 km	CR 10 to 15 SK, Amaranth	Commenced May 6, 2015	Completion Sept.15,2015
CR18	Resurfacing	4.0 km	1 km South of 15 SR to CR8, Mono	Start June 15, 2015	Completion July13, 2015
CR18	Resurfacing	3.1 km	20 SR to CR21, Mulmur	Start June 22, 2015	Completion July 20, 2015
CR19	Resurfacing	3.2 km	Hwy 89 North to 5 SR,	Start May 21, 2015	Complete
CR18	Intersection Improvements	0.5 km	Intersection of 5 SR & CR18 (Stanton) Mulmur	Start June 17, 2015	Completion July 8, 2015
CR16	Intersection Signalization	N/A	Intersection of CR16 and Broadway, Orangeville	Finalizing Tender	TBD
13.9 km					

#### **TENDERS AWARDED**

Tenders were awarded as follows:

Line Painting - R & N Maintenance in the amount of

\$127,238.00

Purchase of Tractor Backhoe - Strongo Limited Partnership in the amount of \$129,827.00 plus taxes

#### ROAD TOLL APPROVED

The Marsville Lions Club were granted permission to hold a charity "toll road" on County Road 3 on Monday, September 7th, 2015.

## COUNTY RESPONSE TO INFRASTRUCTURE CONSULTATIONS

The Ontario Government in May launched a consultation on Infrastructure Priorities.

The high-level parameters of the infrastructure strategy of the Province were reported as:

High-level parameters of the infrastructure strategy of the Province are:

- \$31.5 Billion over the next ten years, which includes
- \$16 Billion within the GTHA (Greater Toronto Hamilton Area)
- \$15 Billion outside the GTHA, for roads, bridges, transit and other infra. About \$3.5 Billion has already been assigned to specific projects, leaving a further \$11.5 Billion unallocated (over 10 years)

Included in this \$11.5 Billion is a \$15 Million annual commitment towards a Connecting Link program. Details are not yet available on this specific program. County staff will be watching for further developments. In addition, the funds have been identified for other types of projects such as ultrahigh speed broadband which support the Western Ontario Warden's Caucus SWIFT project which the County is a part of.

County Council agreed that the following points be provided as feedback to the Province regarding infrastructure priorities:

• The Province should repeat the strategy it used in the OCIF (Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund) and design a framework that includes both a formula-

based and a competition-based segment. The reason is that the formula-based portion ensures that every municipality receives at least some amount of funding. This is supportive of the reality that every municipality has some infrastructure deficits.

- The Province should use, in its formula-based portion, data such as population and tangible capital asset values, and asset condition ratings. However, it should specifically not use other data that measures per-capita income or family income, as these things are not related to the condition of a municipality's capital assets.
- The Province should include a Small Communities component in its annual funding, which it is suggested would be limited to only municipalities with populations under 100,000.
- The extension of ultra, high-speed broadband connectivity should be a specific category of its own, and be eligible for infrastructure funding.
- Municipal statistics such as reserves per capita, or long-term debt levels, typically used to measure the financial position of a municipality, should not be used in determining eligibility in the competition-based portion. The selection criteria should focus instead on the benefits of the specific project being applied for, regardless of the financial condition of the municipal corporation. This corresponds to the stated MEDEI Guiding Principle of Evidence-Based projects, based on research and business case analysis.
- The Province should allow funding for the installation of natural gas in less populated areas

## COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURAL BY-LAW APPROVED

In line with its corporate strategic priories, Council approved a new Procedural By-law and Committee Structure Policy. The previous procedural by-law was passed in 2008 and has been under review for the past year and a half.

## BILL 8 - Broader Public Sector and MPP Accountability Act, 2014

Bill 8 received Royal Assent on December 11, 2014 and it expands the power of the Ontario Ombudsman to review public entities in the MUSH (Municipalities, Universities, School Boards and Hospitals) Sector. The Ontario Gazette notes that Bill 8, Public Sector and MPP Accountability and Transparency Act, 2014 and related regulations affecting municipal governments are to be proclaimed in effect on January 1, 2016. The Bill enacts a new Act and amends a number of other Acts by way of schedules. Schedule 6 amends the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act by adding a duty for heads (Clerk) to ensure that measures are in place to preserve the records in their institution in accordance with applicable laws, rules and practices as well as the creation of offences. Schedule 9 makes amendments to the Ombudsman Act.

County Council has directed staff to create a Customer Service Policy, Complaints Registry and processes associated with the policy and registry. In addition, staff were asked to report back on options regarding retaining an Integrity Commissioner after consulting with local municipal staff.

6

UPCOMING MEETINGS - all at 55 Zina Street, Sutton Room

Public Works Committee - August 25-7 am

General Government Services- August 25 - 4 pm

Community Services/Dufferin Oaks Committee - August 25 - 7

pm

DUFFERIN Twitter Website Facebook Email and the same second Did you know you can receive other information from Dufferin County directly to your email inbox? For road closures on County Roads, sign up here. For timely reminders and information about garbage, recycling and compost, sign up here. For weather watches and information on emergency preparedness, sign up here. Copyright © 2015 Dufferin County, All rights reserved. You are receiving this email because you signed up for the Dufferin County E-Newsletter. Our mailing address is: Dufferin County

55 Zina Street Orangeville, ON L9W 1E5 Canada

Add us to your address book

unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences



**Total Control Panel** To: dholmes@mclancthontownship.ca Message Score: 1 From: bounce-mc.us3 23098803.1007197dholmes=melancthontownship.ca@mail74.atl51.rsgsv.net

My Spam Blocking Level: High

High (60): Pass Medium (75): Pass Low (90): Pass

Login

Block this sender Block mail74.atl51.rsgsv.net

This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.

#### **CENTRE DUFFERIN RECREATION COMPLEX**

#### **BOARD OF MANAGEMENT**

#### Minutes of the Regular meeting held May 27, 2015 at the CDRC

Laura Ryan	
Walter Benotto	
Heather Foster	
Chris Gerrits	
Janice Elliott	

Mono Shelburne Amaranth Amaranth Melancthon

Kim Fraser

Facility Administration Manager

Absent: Dan Sample, AJ Cavey, Wade Mills, Ron Webster, Rick Thompson

Meeting called to order by Chair, Laura Ryan at 6:00pm A quorum was present.

#### **Declaration of Pecuniary Interests:**

Laura Ryan stated that if any member of the board had a disclosure of pecuniary interest that they could declare the nature thereof now or at any time during the meeting.

#### Agenda:

MOTION #1 – Moved by W. Benotto seconded by C. Gerrits. Be it resolved we approve the agenda dated May 27, 2015 as circulated and presented. Carried

#### **Discussion of Minutes of Previous Meetings:**

**MOTION #2** – Moved by C. Gerrits seconded by W. Benotto. That the minutes of the CDRC Board of Management regular board meeting held March 25, 2015 be approved as presented and circulated.

Carried

#### **Correspondence:**

- Letter from Township of Amaranth-Council supports the CDRC 2015 Budget
- Letter from Town of Mono-Council accepts the CDRC 2015 Budget
- Email from Township of Melancthon-Council accepts the CDRC 2015 Budget
- Thank you from Tara Bernard-McCabe for CDRC support for Be the Best You Can Be day

**MOTION #3** – Moved by W. Benotto seconded by C. Gerrits. That correspondence is received and placed on file.

Finance Committee Report:

**MOTION #4** – Moved by C. Gerrits seconded by H. Foster. That the bills and accounts in the amount of \$110,248.05 be approved and paid.

Carried

#### **Pool Committee Report:**

The Pool Committee met prior to the general meeting and conducted two (2) summer employment interviews.

MOTION #5 – Moved by C. Gerrits seconded by J. Elliott. Be it resolved that the CDRC Board of Management hires the following for the 2015 contract seasonal positions: Casual Instructor/Lifeguards-Aidan Bruce and Holly Tremills. Carried

**MOTION #6** – Moved by J. Elliott seconded by C. Gerrits. That we receive the verbal report from the Pool Committee.

Carried

#### Policies and Procedures Committee Report:

The Policies and Procedures Committee is looking to schedule a meeting. As Wade Mills was absent, an email will be circulated to schedule meeting.

**MOTION #7** – Moved by C. Gerrits seconded by W. Benotto. That we receive the verbal report from the Policies and Procedures Committee.

Carried

#### Human Resource Committee Report:

Committee member L. Ryan reported that Employee Performance reviews were conducted on May 13, 2015 with CDRC management staff.

**MOTION #8** – Moved by J. Elliott seconded by C. Gerrits. That we receive the verbal report from the Human Resource Committee.

Carried

#### Hall of Fame Committee Report:

The Committee met prior to the general meeting. The committee feels there may be additional candidates. Therefore, the committee has decided to postpone the induction ceremony until the Fall Fair. The committee has three (3) public members interested in participating on the committee.

**MOTION #9** – Moved by C. Gerrits seconded by J. Elliott. Be it resolved that the CDRC Board of Management appoints the following as Public members to the Hall of Fame Committee: Al Widbur, Geoff Dunlop and Allan Walker.

Carried

**MOTION #10** – Moved by H. Foster seconded by J. Elliott. That we receive the verbal report from the Hall of Fame Committee.

#### **Facility Administration Manager's Report:** See Schedule A

**MOTION #11** – Moved by H. Foster seconded by W. Benotto. That we receive the report from the Facility Administration Manager.

Carried

#### **Facility Maintenance Manager's Report:** See Schedule B

See Schedule B

**MOTION #12**– Moved by J. Elliott seconded by H. Foster. That we receive the report from the Facility Maintenance Manager.

Carried

#### New Business:

**Pro Shop Contract Renewal:** 

The Pro Shop Lease agreement has expired. Staff will advertise and report back to the board.

#### County of Dufferin-Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Emergency Sheltering:

A draft MOU was circulated. Staff has suggested one edit to item #11, to add "Before vacating the facility, the Shelter Manager will ensure that all shelter related supplies and equipment have been removed from the premises."

#### Header Trench:

Further to the Report dated May 25, 2015 to replace cedar boards over Header Trench.

**MOTION #13** – Moved by J. Elliott seconded by H. Foster. Be it resolved that the CDRC Board of Management receives four (4) quotations to replace cedar boards over the header trench. And further, accepts the quotation from Barry McLean Construction in the amount of \$6,408.60 plus HST.

Carried

#### Parking Along East Side of Berm:

After discussion the following motion was presented

MOTION #14 – Moved by C. Gerrits seconded by J. Elliott. Be it resolved that for safety and fire route reasons, the CDRC Board of Management recommends to Town of Shelburne Council that the parking along the east side of the berm be considered a "no parking area". And Further, to have a traffic bylaw be amended accordingly.

#### **Confirmation by By-law**

MOTION #15 – Moved by W. Benotto seconded by H. Foster. Be it resolved that leave be given for the reading and enacting of by-law #04-2015 being a by-law to confirm certain proceedings of the CDRC Board of Management for its Regular Board meeting held May 27, 2015.

Carried

#### Adjournment:

۰.

MOTION #16-Moved by J. Elliott seconded by H. Foster. That we now adjourn at 7:26pm to meet again on June 24, 2015 at 6:00pm, or at the call of the chair. Carried

Secretary - Treasurer

Chairperson

Dated

#### SCHEDULE 'A'

#### Facility Administration Managers Report -- May 27, 2015

- Funding has been approved for all three (3) summer job & youth subsidies: CSJ (Canada Summer Jobs) – One (1) position. Total subsidy \$1,807.00 SJS (Summer Job Service) – Six (6) positions. Total subsidy \$3,360.00 RSJS (Rural Summer Job Service) – Three (3) positions. Total subsidy \$3,360.00
- "Be the Best You Can Be" day on Thursday, May 14<sup>th</sup> went well. We were able to have the arena floor cleaned up and ready for 5:30pm floor rentals.
- The Shelburne Kinette Club has graciously purchased a lap clock for the pool. This will enhance endurance swimming.
- The large (old) cooler in the T&C Room kitchen has stopped working. As the cooler is very old and consumes a lot of hydro, and there remains adequate refrigeration in the kitchen, we are not considering fixing it. It will be disposed of. We may consider purchasing a refrigerator next year.

Kim Fraser Facility Administration Manager

#### SCHEDULE 'B'

#### Facility Maintenance Managers Report - May 27, 2015

- The skimmer valve in the filtration system of the pool is seized. The pool cannot be refilled until it is repaired. Three (3) pool companies were contacted. PPL Aquatic, Fitness & Spa was the only business available to look at the equipment. The estimated cost to repair is approx. \$1,100-\$1,500.00. We anticipate that it will be repaired mid-week.
- Fire Safety Plan has been updated. Fire inspection completed April 13, 2015.
- "Do Not Enter" signs have been installed at the entrance of the CDRC. Lines and arrows in the parking lot have been repainted.

Rick Thompson Facility Maintenance Manager

#### **CENTRE DUFFERIN RECREATION COMPLEX**

#### **BOARD OF MANAGEMENT**

#### Minutes of the Special meeting held June 8, 2015 at the CDRC

Laura Ryan	Mono
Wade Mills	Shelburne
AJ Cavey	Shelburne
Heather Foster	Amaranth
Chris Gerrits	Amaranth
Janice Elliott	Melancthon
Ron Webster	Melancthon
Kim Fraser Rick Thompson	Facility Administration Manager Facility Maintenance Manager

Absent: Dan Sample and Walter Benotto

Meeting called to order by Chair, Laura Ryan at 5:30pm A quorum was present.

#### **Declaration of Pecuniary Interests:**

Laura Ryan stated that if any member of the board had a disclosure of pecuniary interest that they could declare the nature thereof now or at any time during the meeting.

#### Agenda:

3

Attendance:

**MOTION** #1 – Moved by AJ Cavey seconded by H. Foster. Be it resolved we approve the agenda dated June 8, 2015 as circulated and presented.

Carried

#### New Business:

#### Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program:

Finance Chair, Heather Foster lead the discussion to apply to Federal Development Ontario for funding to repair the arena roof. After discussion the following motion was presented:

**MOTION #2** – Moved by H. Foster seconded by C. Gerrits. Be it resolved that the CDRC Board of Management instructs staff to apply to the Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program. And further that the Board recognizes this as our number one (1) priority project seeking funding and understanding that the project is to be completed by March 31.

#### **Confirmation by By-law**

**MOTION #3** – Moved by W. Mills seconded by AJ Cavey. Be it resolved that leave be given for the reading and enacting of by-law #05-2015 being a by-law to confirm certain proceedings of the CDRC Board of Management for its Special Board meeting held June 8, 2015.

Carried

#### Adjournment:

ĩ

MOTION #4-Moved by C. Gerrits seconded by R. Webster. That we now adjourn at 6:00pm to meet again on June 24, 2015 at 6:00pm, or at the call of the chair. Carried

Secretary - Treasurer

Chairperson

Dated



## Grand River Conservation Authority General Membership Meeting

Friday, June 26, 2015

The following are the minutes of the General Membership Meeting help at 9:30 a.m. on Friday, June 26, 2015 at the Administration Center, Cambridge, Ontario.

#### **Members Present:**

J. Mitchell, Chair, L. Armstrong, B. Banbury, B. Bell, B. Coleman, B. Corbett, S. Foxton, G. Gardhouse, H. Jowett, Cindy Lunau\*, G. Lorentz, F. Morison\*, D. Neumann, J. Nowak, V. Prendergast, W. Roth, M. Salisbury, P. Salter, S. Shantz, S. Simons, W. Stauch, G. Stojanovic, C. White, G. Wicke

#### **Members Regrets:**

K. Linton

#### Staff:

J. Farwell, K. Murch, D. Bennett, D. Boyd, N. Davy, S. Lawson, S. Radoja, D. Schultz, M. Keller, F. Natolochny, B. Parrott

#### Also Present:

Not applicable

#### 1. Call to Order:

J. Mitchell, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

#### Roll Call and Certification of Quorum – 13 members constitute a quorum (1/2 of members appointed by participating municipalities)

The Secretary-Treasurer called the roll and certified a quorum with 22 members present. A total of 24 members attended the meeting.

#### 3. Chair's Remarks:

J. Mitchell welcomed members, staff and guests and made the following comments:

- J. Mitchell observed the passing of Grand River Conservation Authority member W. Wettlaufer. She indicated that she would forego any remarks so that the meeting could proceed and those wishing to attend his funeral could be available to do so.
- \*C. Lunau and F. Morison joined the meeting at 9:35 a.m.
- 4. Review of Agenda:

The following items were added to the agenda:

- Item 12 m) Report GM-06-15-70 Foundation Member Appointments
- Item 16 Grand River Conservation Foundation Grants
- Item 17 Union Negotiations Update
- 5. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest:

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest made in relation to the matters to be dealt with.

6. Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

General Membership Meeting - May 22, 2015

There were no questions or comments with respect to the minutes of the General Membership Meeting of May 22, 2015.

Moved by: B. Corbett Seconded by: J. Nowak (Carried)

THAT the Minutes of the General Membership Meeting of May 22, 2015 be approved as circulated.

#### 7. Business Arising from Previous Minutes:

None

8. Hearing of Delegations:

None

9. Presentations:

None

#### 10. Correspondence:

- a) Copies for members
  - i) tripadvisor 2015 Certificate of Excellence Elora Gorge Conservation Area

J. Mitchell congratulated staff with respect to this achievement.

#### b) Not copied

None

Moved by: S. Foxton Seconded by: L. Armstrong (Carried)

THAT the tripadvisor - 2015 Certificate of Excellence for Elora Gorge Conservation Area be received as information.

#### 11. 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading of By-Laws:

None

#### **12. Presentation of Reports:**

a) GM-06-15-58 Financial Summary for the Period Ending May 31, 2015

There were no questions or comments with respect to this report.

**Resolution 69-15** 

Moved by: G. Wicke Seconded by: P. Salter (Carried)

THAT the Financial Summary for the Period Ending May 31, 2015 be approved.

b) GM-06-15-59 2015 Vehicle Purchase Tender Results

B. Corbett asked why there were so few tenders. D. Bennett said receiving very few responses to vehicle tenders is common and the proponents are dealerships with active fleet programs. B. Corbett asked if staff felt that the tenders were competitive. D. Bennett responded in the affirmative.

Resolution 70-15 Moved by: J. Nowak

Seconded by: C. White (Carried)

THAT Grand River Conservation Authority accept the tenders for the purchase of three ½ Ton Pickup Trucks Regular Cab (2WD), one ¾ Ton Pickup Truck Regular Cab (4WD) and one ¾ Ton Pickup Truck Extended Cab (4WD) from Bennett GM for a total amount of \$141,126.00 (excluding HST) and one SUV / Crossover vehicle from Parkway Ford Sales Ltd. in the amount of \$25,620.00 (excluding HST).

 c) GM-06-15-60 Operation Pollinator Garden at Guelph Lake – Pond Construction Tender Results 5. Simons asked why there was such a discrepancy in tender amounts. D. Bennett said that he felt the larger firms involved had a large amount of work and the low bidder was anxious to get work in this area.

**Resolution 71-15** 

Moved by: 5. Foxton Seconded by: B. Coleman (Carried)

THAT the Grand River Conservation Authority awards the tender for the *Operation Pollinator Garden at Guelph Lake* pond construction to TDI International of Guelph, Ontario in the amount of \$96,436.35 excluding HST.

AND THAT a budget of \$106,086.35 is approved for the *Operation Pollinator Garden at Guelph Lake* pond construction project.

d) GM-06-15-61 Canada 150 Infrastructure Program

There were no questions or comments with respect to this report.

Resolution 72-15

Moved by: J. Nowak Seconded by: G. Gardhouse (Carried)

THAT the following projects be endorsed by the General Membership, subject to confirmation of funding from the Canada 150 Infrastructure Program:

- Renovation of Apps' Mill Nature Centre
- Renovation of Kay Marston Pavilion at Elora Gorge Conservation
  Area
- Rehabilitation of the FWR Dickson Nature Trail and Boardwalk

AND THAT the GRCA's share of the funding for these projects be included in the Capital Forecast and Budgets in 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018, with the sources of this funding to be finalized during the budget deliberations.

#### e) GM-06-15-61 Parkhill Dam Hydro Project - Feed-in-Tariff Program

B. Coleman asked whether staff was going to apply for additional points for aboriginal involvement. He said that Brant County was successful by entering into a corporate arrangement. D. Boyd said that staff would not recommend this because it would require the creation of a separate corporation.

**Resolution 73-15** 

Moved by: V. Prendergast Seconded by: S. Shantz (Carried)

THAT a Feed-in-Tariff (FIT) 4.0 application be submitted to the Independent Electrical System Operator (IESO) for the proposed Parkhill Dam hydro project;

AND THAT the rate used in the Parkhill Dam FIT 4.0 Application is in accordance with direction given to staff by the General Membership;

AND THAT staff be authorized to enter into a contract with the Independent Electrical System Operator (IESO) if a contract is offered at a rate that provides an acceptable return on investment, as established by the General Membership.

f) GM-06-15-63 Cash and Investments Status Report as at May 31, 2015

There were no questions or comments with respect to this report.

**Resolution 74-15** 

Moved by: S. Simons Seconded by: S. Shantz (Carried)

THAT Report GM-06-15-63 – Cash and Investments Status Report as at May 31, 2015 be received as information.

 g) GM-06-15-64 Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulations

G. Lorentz noted that there were permit applications from numbered companies. He said that without the names of the principals the members would not know whether to declare a conflict. He also said that the Region of Waterloo includes the names of the principals of a corporation. N. Davy said that she would look into this. The Chair reminded the members that the recommendation is to receive the report as information and the members do not approve the permits.

**Resolution 75-15** 

Moved by: V. Prendergast Seconded by: G. Wicke (Carried)

THAT Report GM-06-15-64 - Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulations be received as information.

h) GM-06-15-65 Environmental Assessments

There were no questions or comments with respect to this report.

**Resolution 76-1S** 

Moved by: B. Coleman Seconded by: S. Foxton (Carried)

THAT Report GM-06-1S-6S – Environmental Assessments be received as information.

i) GM-06-15-66 Water Management Plan - 2014 Report on Actions

There were no questions or comments with respect to this report.

Resolution 77-15

Moved by: B. Corbett Seconded by: W. Roth (Carried)

THAT Report GM-06-1S-66 – Water Management Plan – 2014 Report on Actions be received as information.

j) GM-06-15-67 Grand River Trail Discussion

M. Salisbury said he would be interested in seeing a loop trail as opposed to a linear trail.

Resolution 78-15

Moved by: S. Simons Seconded by: P. Salter (Carried)

THAT Report GM-06-67 – Grand River Trail Discussion be received as information.

k) GM-06-1S-68 Snyder's Flats Off-Leash Dog Park

S. Shantz asked when the members could expect the next report. D. Bennett responded that the next report would be presented in the Fall.

**Resolution 79-15** 

Moved by: S. Foxton Seconded by: B. Banbury (Carried)

THAT Report GM-06-1S-68 – Snyder's Flats Off-Leash Dog Park be received as information.

1) GM-06-1S-69 Current Watershed Conditions as of June 23, 2015

There were no questions or comments with respect to this report.

**Resolution 80-1S** 

Moved by: G. Stojanovic Seconded by: G. Wicke (Carried)

THAT Report GM-06-15-69 – Current Watershed Conditions as of June 23, 2015 be received as information.

m) GM-06-15-70 Foundation Member Appointments

There were no questions or comments with respect to this report.

**Resolution 81-1S** 

Moved by: D. Neumann Seconded by: C. White (Carried)

THAT the following members be re-appointed to the Grand River Conservation Foundation for a term of three years (renewable for one further three year term):

- James den Ouden
- Paul General
- John Whitney

AND THAT the following member be re-appointed to the Grand River Conservation Foundation for a term of three years:

Joy O'Donnell

AND THAT the following new member be appointed to the Grand River Conservation Foundation for a term of three years (renewable for two further three year terms):

Joel Doherty

AND THAT the following new member be appointed to the Grand River Conservation Foundation for a term of one year (renewable for two further three year terms):

Floyd Davis

#### 13. Committee of the Whole:

None

#### 14. General Business:

a) SR-05-15-01 Report of the Special Recognition Committee

There were no questions or comments with respect to this report.

Resolution 82-15

Moved by: D. Neumann Seconded by: C. White (Carried)

THAT the Report of the Special Recognition Committee with respect to its meeting on May 22, 2015 be approved.

15. 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading of By-Laws:

None

- 16. Other Business:
  - a) S. Simons advised the members that she recently presented Grand River Conservation Foundation Community Conservation Grants to the Holy Family School in Paris and the Branlyn Community School in Brantford.
  - b) P. Salter advised the members that she presented grants to four schools: two in Guelph, one in Rockwood and one in Arthur.
  - c) J. Mitchell advised the members that she presented a grant to the Edna Staebler School in Waterloo.
  - d) W. Stauch advised the members that a statue of war poet John McCrae was recently unveiled in Ottawa. John McCrae's hometown was Guelph and he penned "In Flanders Fields". The statue is by renowned sculptor Ruth Abernethy who has a studio near Wellesley.

#### 17. Closed Meeting: (motion required pursuant to Section 36 of By-Law 1-2013)

Resolution 83-15

Moved by: H. Jowett Seconded by: L. Armstrong (Carried)

THAT the meeting adjourn into closed session to provide direction to staff regarding bid-down price for Parkhill Dam FIT 4.0 application and to update the members with respect to Union negotiations.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:05 a.m.

- 18. Next Meetings:
  - General Membership Meeting Friday, July 24, 2015 – 9:30 a.m. Auditorium/Boardroom, Administration Centre, Cambridge

\*to be followed by Special Recognition Committee\*

 General Membership Meeting Friday, August 28, 2015 – 9:30 a.m. Auditorium/Boardroom, Administration Centre, Cambridge

#### 19. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

#### 20. Grand River Source Protection Authority Meeting (if required)

Chair

Secretary-Treasurer

#### MINUTES OF THE MULMUR/MELANCTHON FIRE BOARD MEETING HELD AT THE FIRE HALL IN HONEYWOOD APRIL 20, 2015

PRESENT: Chair Paul Mills, Mulmur Township Vice-Chair Darren White, Melancthon Township Member James Webster, Melancthon Township Member Heather Hayes, Mulmur Township Chief Jim Clayton Deputy Chief Jeff Clayton Secretary Karen Davidson-Lock

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER at 5:50 pm

#### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

#### Motion # 22 - 2015

#### MOVED by Hayes

SECONDED by White

That the agenda be approved as circulated and amended to include a memo from Mulmur's Director of Public Works, and a copy on desk of Mulmur's motion regarding Arena Gratis User Fees. Motion Carried.

#### 3. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS

The Chair advised that if any member had a disclosure of pecuniary interest that they could declare the nature thereof now or at any point during the meeting.

#### 4. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MARCH 9, 2015 MINUTES

Motion # 23 - 2015

MOVED by White SECONDED by Hayes That the minutes of the March 9, 2015 meeting be approved as circulated. Motion Carried.

#### 5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES -- none

#### 6. CORRESPONDENCE

*il* Report from Mulmur Director of Public Works re. fuel supply to the department

In light of the potential savings as per the Director's report, the following motion was passed.

Motion # 24 - 2015

MOVED by White SECONDED by Webster That the Mulmur Melancthon Fire Department obtain fuel from the Township of Mulmur and be billed accordingly. Motion Carried.

#### 7. APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTS/FINANCIAL UPDATE

a) Accounts

Motion # 25 - 2015

MOVED by Hayes SECONDED by White That the accounts in the amount of \$9,424.98 (March 10 to March 31) be paid. Motion Carried.

b) 2015 Budget/Vehicle Replacement for Rescue #42

The current status of the Fire Board's 2015 budget is as follows: Mulmur Township approved the Fire Board's budget with the line item for a bank loan removed; Melancthon Township approved the Fire Board's budget as presented (with the loan included). For both Councils to be on the record as approving the same budget, this item will be forwarded back to Mulmur Council for the budget to be approved as originally presented.

Discussion then turned to vehicle replacement for Rescue #42. Upgrading the current ambulance to road-worthy condition would cost approximately \$3,000 in parts plus \$2,000 in labor. Both the Chief and Deputy Chief felt that the unit was not worth investing further funds. Vehicles with Ford chassis are not selling at the current time due to rear end issues, and the waiting list to obtain a new vehicle would be at least 8 months. The advice from various sources during the investigation into a replacement vehicle is that used Dodge vehicles should be avoided due to various mechanical issues. One 2003 vehicle that was found would cost approximately \$70,000. The Board then discussed the long term capital equipment replacement plan. This plan includes the replacement of a tanker, which is a very expensive piece of equipment. The age range of a truck that staff are currently looking for is 2006 or 2007 at a cost of \$70,000 to \$75,000.

Tom Reid, Director of the Dufferin County Paramedic Service will have two used ambulances available at different points during 2015. One ambulance is newer, and this one would be the preferred option. If the cost to place the ambulance into service was approximately \$10,000,

some equipment and features could be added to make it a more desirable short term option until that vehicle is eventually replaced. At that time, a different type of rescue vehicle could be contemplated depending on the amount in capital reserves and the department's needs.

The Board directed the Chief and Deputy Chief to contact Tom Reid regarding the two potential ambulances that will become available, and continue to look at other options for a newer vehicle.

The issue of liability for the firefighters should one of them use their personal vehicle to pull any piece of fire department equipment arose. The Secretary was directed to email our contact at the insurance company for clarification.

c) 2014 Consolidated Financial Statements

The Secretary reviewed some of the highlights of the statements for the Board's information.

#### Motion # 26 - 2015

MOVED by Hayes SECONDED by White That the Board receives the 2014 audited financial statements and authorizes the Chair to sign the Engagement Letter. Motion Carried.

#### 8. HEALTH & SAFETY ISSUES

i/ Update on Inspection Reports

The Department's Health and Safety Committee will be setting aside a Saturday to resolve all outstanding items as noted in their report for the building.

With respect to Inspection Reports for the municipalities, reports have been prepared for different locations as outlined in the Risk Assessment Report. These reports outline timeframes to comply with any deficiencies. Following resolution of the outstanding items, final inspection reports will be issued, a copy of which will be forwarded to each respective municipal office. There are three outstanding issues with the Arena, and one outstanding issue with the Mulmur Township Office. The Arena Manager and CAO/Clerk have copies of the reports for same. Outstanding locations for inspections to be done are the Terra Nova Public House, and the Redickville Store. The Chief has set up a meeting with the wind turbine company located in Melancthon to discuss any possible issues.

Some departments are charging fees for inspections, and after some discussion the Chief and Deputy were directed to compile fees for surrounding areas and report back to the next meeting.

Mulmur/Melancthon Fire Board Minutes

ii/ Personal use of Fire Hall/Equipment

The Chief advised that all waivers have been signed with the exception of 2 firefighters.

iii/ Burning in Ditches, Mulmur-Melancthon Townline

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter from the Chair and Vice-Chair to the resident. As well, it was suggested that a letter from Melancthon Township would be appropriate as the burning is taking place on the Melancthon side of the Townline.

#### OLD/NEW BUSINESS

i/ Discussion on rental of Norduff Room in Arena for Association Banquet

The Mulmur motion on file from 2014 was presented on desk for the Board's information. The motion states in part that "any community groups can request a donation from Council in support of their community cause as per the Township contribution policy". The Chief noted that the Firefighters Association still supports the arena, including being present for the annual barbeque for first aid purposes. For the 2014 barbeque, the chairs and tables were already on the main floor from a buck and doe event, and therefore the firefighters were told that their assistance was not required for set-up. The Association has made substantial donations to the Fire Department over the years. The Board agreed that the Mulmur representatives should take this issue back to Mulmur Township Council for further discussion.

II/ Request from Chester Tupling for permission to place a "GPS" unit on the fire hall tower for use by local farmers in tracking their equipment

The Chief had contacted Point to Point Communications on this issue, who suggested that such a unit may cause interference with the Department's radio signal. Any equipment would have to be located at least 10 feet below the Department's equipment. The Chief will obtain the exact specifications of the proposed equipment so that Point to Point can review same further. The Board requested that Point to Point's recommendation be submitted in writing. If the equipment could work without interference, suggestions included a trial period and potential fees for same. This item is to be brought back to the next meeting.

lii/ Memo from Mulmur's Director of Public Works regarding incident notification

The Director requested notification of road incidents for four specific situations: serious motor vehicle accident; motor vehicle accident involving personal injury; incident causing damage to the travelled portion of the road or signage; road closure or detours. The Secretary advised that this issue arose yesterday during a large fire in Mulmur where mutual aid was required. The Director received a call from Steve Murphy, County Emergency Management Coordinator, who asked about road closures. The Director was caught off guard by the request, and thus this memo has been sent to all three departments covering Mulmur Township. The system being contemplated which would relay messages from pagers to cell phones would be ideal in

these situations, as Township officials and staff would be notified without taking time away from the firefighters' immediate priority of dealing with the incident.

The Mayors of both Townships will contact Steve Murphy to ascertain why he was contacting Mulmur's Director of Public Works when no road closures were required and no state of emergency had been declared.

#### CONFIRMING MOTION

Motion # 27 - 2015

MOVED by Webster

SECONDED by Hayes

That be it resolved that all actions of the Members and Officers of the Mulmur/Melancthon Fire Board of Management, with respect to every matter addressed and/or adopted by the Board on the above date are hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed; and each motion, resolution and other actions taken by the Board Members and Officers at the meeting held on the above date are hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed. Motion Carried.

Motion # 28 - 2015

MOVED by Hayes SECONDED by Webster That the board adjourn at 7:08 p.m. Motion Carried.

Paul Mills

CHAIR

Karen Davidson-Lock

SECRETARY

#### MINUTES OF THE MULMUR/MELANCTHON FIRE BOARD MEETING HELD AT THE FIRE HALL IN HONEYWOOD May 25, 2015

PRESENT: Chair Paul Mills, Mulmur Township Vice-Chair Darren White, Melancthon Township Member James Webster, Melancthon Township (absent with notice) Member Heather Hayes, Mulmur Township Chief Jim Clayton Deputy Chief Jeff Clayton Secretary Karen Davidson-Lock Captain Dana Prentice Captain Dave Clarke Captain Jeff Merkley Captain Dave Horner Firefighter James Yarborough

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER at 5:52 pm

Chair Mills welcomed the firefighters to the meeting.

#### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

#### Motion # 29 - 2015

MOVED by Hayes SECONDED by White That the agenda be approved as circulated. Motion Carried.

#### 3. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS

The Chair advised that if any member had a disclosure of pecuniary interest that they could declare the nature thereof now or at any point during the meeting.

#### 4. PRESENTATION REGARDING POTENTIAL TRUCK PURCHASE

Deputy Chief Jeff Clayton gave a slide show presentation regarding the vehicle. A summary of his presentation is presented below.

- 2000 Freightliner FL60 conventional cab, 7.2L L6 diesel engine.
- 11,800 miles (18,990 kms).
- Hours 1,405.
- Located in Meaford, ON.
- Currently in an online auction, reserve is \$40,000.
- Auction ends May 28, 2015.
Equipment Included:

- 2 SCBA seats.
- Code 3 light package, siren.
- 2 Motorola mobile radios with mics (similar frequency, easily reprogrammed).
- 2 stage hydraulic extrication pump.
- Two cutters, 1 spreader, 2 rams.
- 2 x 75' hydraulic hose reels (electric).
- 30 pieces wooden cribbing.
- Yamaha, EF 3800 Generator with 2 x 6' Halogen lights.

Benefits of this unit:

- Fills our needs as a rescue unit and vehicle to tow the trailer.
- A vehicle like this eliminates the need for a large enclosed trailer to hold the Argo as the rehab area and command area are included in the box. This will save capital funds when the trailer/Argo are due to be replaced.
- Greatly enhances our abilities at MVC's.
- Maintains a moderate level of capital funds for future apparatus replacement.
- Allows for safe transportation of both personnel and equipment.
- The increase in storage space will allow us to remove some equipment from the other apparatus making them less cluttered.
- The previous Honeywood Firefighters Association Executive agreed to assist in the purchase of additional extrication equipment for it.

Drawbacks of this Rescue Vehicle:

- Although it has extremely low kilometers and hours on the chassis, it is a 2000.
- I'm told it will require brakes.
- It will require a hitch fabricated to it.
- It has a dent.
- It will need the decals replaced.
- It has a manual transmission.
- It is high, limiting laneway access in some cases.

Closing Comments:

- In closing, my personal recommendation is that we bid on this rescue. The maximum bid should be determined before we leave this evening if we decide to attempt the purchase.
- Meaford Fire Department takes great care of their equipment and station, leading me to believe this rescue was well maintained and looked after.
- My goal would be to get 7 or 8 years out of this rescue making it 22 or 23 years old at retirement.
- This would be an ideal timeline knowing that we have a 1999 freightliner pumper that will have to be replace around the same time (2021).

Board members then discussed the truck with all the personnel present; specifically, their test drives of the vehicle and whether it would be a good fit for this department's needs. Discussion then turned to extra costs, which includes safety inspection, license, hitch, possible brake

repairs, and a possible insurance cost adjustment. A smaller trailer could be utilized should this truck be acquired, which brought up the possibility of selling the existing trailer. Some concerns were brought forward as the community helped to fundraise for the existing trailer. Chief Clayton confirmed that the original commitment for those donating funds was that their names were to stay on the trailer for a term of 2 years and therefore, those obligations have been fulfilled. As this vehicle has a 6 speed manual transmission, a "D" license is required. There are no air brakes, and therefore the additional "Z" license is not required. All personnel would be required to sign off that they have the proper license to operate this vehicle, but should this vehicle be acquired it would assist in training for those who are unable to drive the tanker, which has a standard transmission.

The Secretary briefly explained the financial aspect of the proposed purchase and available funds. It may be necessary to bill both Townships earlier than normal for their 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quarter operating contributions depending on cash flow. She also quoted Section 9 under the Board's Procurement Policy "The circumstances under which a tendering process is not required: 9) Emergency, unique situation or procurement for specialized goods or services." The Treasurer will be placing the on-line bid.

# Motion # 30 - 2015

MOVED by White

SECONDED by Hayes

Be it resolved that staff be authorized to bid to a maximum of \$50,000 on a rescue truck as described by Deputy Chief Clayton during the meeting on May 25, 2015. Motion Carried.

# MOTION TO RATIFY CAPTAIN'S POSTION

Motion # 31 - 2015

MOVED by Hayes SECONDED by White That according to the Hiring Policy adopted by the Board on June 3, 2009, the Board ratifies the following:

- 1/ Name of Employee: Dave Clarke;
- 2/ Position Title: From Firefighter to Captain;
- 3/ Date of Hire: November 25,2014;
- 4/ Probationary Period: 12 months from date of hire (as per Hiring Policy June 3, 2009);
- 5/ That the salary or hourly wage is according to Board accepted Policy.

Motion Carried.

# **CONFIRMING MOTION**

# Motion # 32 - 2015

MOVED by Hayes SECONDED by White That be it resolved that all actions of the Members and Officers of the Mulmur/Melancthon Fire Board of Management, with respect to every matter addressed and/or adopted by the Board on the above date are hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed; and each motion, resolution and other actions taken by the Board Members and Officers at the meeting held on the above date are hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed. Motion Carried.

# Motion # 33 - 2015

MOVED by Hayes SECONDED by White That the board adjourn at 6:40 p.m. Motion Carried.

Paul Mills

CHAIR

Karen Davidson-Lock

SECRETARY

# SHELBURNE & DISTRICT FIRE BOARD

May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2015

1

The Shelburne & District Fire Department **Board of Management** was held at the Fire Hall on the above mentioned date at 7:00 P.M.

# <u>Present</u>

As per attendance record.

# 1. Opening of Meeting

1.1 Chair Tom Egan called meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

# 2 Additions or Deletions to Agenda

2.1 None at this time.

# 3. Approval of Agenda

3.1 Resolution #1

Moved by J. Elliott - Seconded by H. Foster

# **BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

The Board of Management approves the agenda as presented. Carried

# 4. <u>Approval of Minutes</u>

4.1 Resolution #2

Moved by H. Foster - Seconded by J. Horner

# BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Board of Management adopt the minutes under the date of April 7, 2015 as circulated.

Carried

#### **Resolution #3**

Moved by W. Hannon - Seconded by F. Nix

#### BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Board of Management adopt the minutes under the date of April 15, 2015 as circulated.

Carried

# 5. <u>Pecuniary Interest</u>

5.1 No pecuniary interest declared.

#### 6. <u>Public Question Period</u>

6.1 No public present.

# 7. Delegations / Deputations

7.1 No Delegations.

#### 8. Unfinished Business

#### 8.1 Update on Staff Replacements

The Secretary-Treasurer will be emailing all submitted resumes for the Secretary-Treasurer position to the sub-committee, along with a scoring sheet. The sub-committee will meet on Thursday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015 at 4:30 pm to discuss the scoring and chose those to be interviewed. The posting closes on May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

The board discussed the Fire Chief position, and the process in which the interview stages will be handled. The board agreed that they do not wish for OFMEM advisor Joe Casey to attend a meeting of the board at this time to discuss this matter. It was agreed that someone would be contacted in order to do a technical review of the applications. John Telfer has been asked to sit in as an HR rep with the sub-committee during the process. The posting closes on May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2015.

# 9. New Business

#### 9.1 Memo from Mulmur

The board discussed whether or not a policy should be created, and whether or not each municipality needs to make the request if they want to be notified. As the memo was vague with respect to details, the board then passed the following motion:

#### Resolution #4

Moved by: J. Elliott - Seconded by: K. Bennington

#### BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Shelburne & District Fire Board receives the memo dated April 20, 2015 from Mulmur Township Re: Notification of Road Incidents and that the board ask Mulmur to respond with more detail and clarification on their request around defining incidents and timelines.

Carried

#### 9.2 Health & Safety Policy

The board reviewed the updated document and requested that a date be included on the document.

#### Resolution #5

Moved by: J. Elliott – Seconded by: J. Horner

#### BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Health & Safety Policy of the Shelburne & District Fire Department be adopted for the calendar year 2015; and further that Chair Tom Egan be authorized to sign same.

#### Carried

#### 10. <u>Chief's Report</u>

# 10.1 Monthly Report (April 2015)

There were a total of 24 calls for the month of April. Captain David Holmes answered any questions the board had with respect to the report.

# 10.2 Update from Acting Fire Chief

Captain David Holmes reported that there have been 20 resumes received from the ad that was placed in the paper for Volunteer Firefighters. The department is presently looking to fill 2 positions. Firefighter Os Fleming was promoted to Captain to replace vacancy left by Captain Eric Horsley's retirement.

It was discussed that there should be recognition to employers by placing a "thank-you" ad in local newspapers. It has been several years since any type of recognition went out.

# **Resolution #6**

# Moved by: K. McGhee - Seconded by: G. Little

# BE IT RESOLVED:

The Shelburne & District Fire Department request a letter of appreciation to businesses that accommodate fire department employee(s) being able to attend emergency calls during their work time. An acknowledgement notice should be sent to the Free Press, Citizen and Banner and Alliston newspapers for public awareness; and Dundalk.

#### Carried

There have been several grass fires this year so far. It was discussed that going forward, a fire ban from March 15 – May 15 may help with this issue. The board asked that a report be compiled to provide costs associated with grass fires.

# 11. Future Business

11.1. Nothing at this time.

# 12. <u>Accounts & Payroll</u>

12.1 Resolution #7

Moved by J. Horner - Seconded by H. Foster

# BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The bills and accounts in the amount of \$35,172.86 for the period of April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2015 to April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015 as presented and attached be approved for payment.

4

Carried

#### 12.2 Resolution #8

Moved by W. Hannon - Seconded by J. Horner

#### **BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

Payroll for the following month(s) be approved for payment:

April 2015 - \$17,023.65

Carried

#### 13. Confirming and Adjournment

#### 13.1 Resolution #9

Moved by K. McGhee – Seconded by F. Nix

#### **BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

All actions of the Board Members and Officers of the Shelburne and District Fire Board of Management, with respect to every matter addressed and/or adopted by the Board on the above date are hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed; And each motion, resolution and other actions taken by the Board Members and Officers at the meeting held on the above date are hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed.

#### 13.2 Resolution #10

Moved by F. Nix - Seconded by J. Horner

#### **BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

The Board of Management do now adjourn at 8:35 pm to meet again on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2015 at 7:00 pm or at the call of the Chair.

Carried

Respectfully submitted by:

Carey Holmes

Tom Egan

Approved:

Carey Holmes, AMCT Secretary-Treasurer Tom Egan Chairperson

# SHELBURNE & DISTRICT FIRE BOARD MEMBERS

# Meeting Attendance Record Under Date of May 5, 2015

Municipality / Member	Present	Absent
Township of Amaranth		
Heather Foster	Х	
Gail Little	Х	
Town of Mono		
Ken McGhee	Х	
Fred Nix	Х	
Township of Melancthon		
Janice Elliott	X	
Wayne Hannon	х	
Town of Shelburne		
Tom Egan	х	
Ken Bennington	X	
Township of Mulmur		
Heather Mcintosh-Hayes		X
Janet Horner	x	
Staff		
Ed Walsh – Acting Fire Chief		X (Chiefs Convention)
David Holmes - Captain	X	
Carey Holmes - Sec/Treas.	Х	



The Corporation of T**HE TOWNSHIP OF MELANCTHON** 

157101 Highway 10,

Melancthon, Ontario, L9V 2E6

Denise B. Holmes, AMCT CAO/Clerk Telephone - (519) 925-5525 Fax No. - (519) 925-1110 Website: <u>www.melancthontownship.ca</u> Email:<u>info@melancthontownship.ca</u>

#### MINUTES OF THE ROAD SUB-COMMITTEE APRIL 29, 2015

# ROAD SUB-COMMITTEE TOURED THE MELANCTHON TOWNSHIP ROADS AT 10:30 A.M.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order @ 1:15 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

ATTENDANCE: Chair: Councillor Dave Besley, Mayor Darren White, Councillor Wayne Hannon, Public Member Bart Malloy, Road Superintendent Craig Micks and Secretary Joyce Clarke were in attendance. Marg McCarthy, Murray Hunt, Jo-Anne Hunt and Bill Arnold were in the gallery.

**MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 9<sup>TH</sup> MEETING:** Minutes were adopted by Malloy, 2<sup>nd</sup> by White. Carried.

Marg McCarthy asked if the # 5 item on the agenda regarding Hunt Trucking could be moved to the beginning of the meeting.

#### ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

 Hunt Trucking Request: Chair Besley read out the recommendations from R.J. Burnside and G.W. Jorden regarding this issue. A discussion then followed.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Roads Sub-Committee recommends to Council that a road agreement be written to reduce the half load restrictions and that the agreement be tied to the property. The staff is directed to begin writing this agreement to have a draft ready for Council.

 Discussion regarding the results of the Road Tour. The Sub-committee members agreed that the tour opened their eyes to the bad shape of the roads. Craig reported that the traffic counter is out. Discussion then followed.

#### **Recommendation 1:**

The roads committee recommends to council that an inventory of the roads be done and that paved roads in the municipality be maintained by the use of a road traffic count. The roads that should be returned to gravel will be based on the MTO recommendation that: Under 400 vehicles be gravel 400 to 1000 vehicles be surface treatment 1000-2000 vehicles be asphalt.

#### **Recommendation 2:**

The Roads Sub-committee recommends a second traffic counter be purchased possibly from Policing Reserve (Development Charges).

#### 3. Claim for the Windshield Damage:

The Roads Sub-committee received the report as read.

#### **Recommendation:**

The Roads Sub-committee recommends directing the staff not to pay invoice.

# 4. Beavers Issue on the 4<sup>th</sup> Line OS.

Craig gave an oral report regarding the staff cleaning out the culvert. The Roads Sub-committee accepted the report as given.

#### 5. Township Entrance Permit regarding culverts:

#### **Recommendation:**

The Roads Sub-committee recommends that Steven Christie's wording on an e-mail dated March 3, 2015, regarding entrance permits be included on the entrance permit.

# 6. Consideration of Amending Half Loads By-law No. 10-2014 To Include All Roads in Township:

#### **Recommendation 1:**

The Roads Sub-committee recommends that the Half Loads By-law No. 10-2014 cover all roads as recommended by R. J. Burnsides and Associates.

#### **Recommendation 2:**

The Roads Sub-Committee recommends that staff is directed to inquire if off duty MTO agents can be hired occasionally for enforcement of half load restrictions.

#### Motion for Adjournment:

Malloy made a motion for adjournment at 2:50 p.m. 2<sup>nd</sup> by White. Carried.

<u>reclai</u>

#### TOWNSHIP OF MELANCTHON POLICE SERVICES BOARD

The Township of Melancthon Police Services Board held a meeting on Wednesday, February 18, 2015 at 4:30 p.m. at the Melancthon Township Municipal Office Committee Room. Those present: Municipal Member Dave Besley, Public Member David Thwaites, Provincial Member Bart Malloy, Staff Sgt. Steve Sills, Dufferin OPP, Lynn Van Alstine, Secretary

Public in Attendance: Wayne Hannon

#### Call to Order

Secretary Lynn Van Alstine called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

#### Election of Chair conducted by the Secretary

The Secretary called for nominations for the position of Chair.

Verbal motion - Moved by Malloy, Seconded by Besley that we nominate David Thwaites for Chair. Carried. David accepts the position of Chair.

#### Election of Vice Chair conducted by Chair

Chair Thwaites called for nominations for the position of Vice-Chair.

Verbal motion - Moved by Malloy, Seconded by Thwaites that we nominate Dave Besley for Vice-Chair. Dave accepts the position of Vice-Chair.

#### Oath of Office and Secrecy

David Thwaites and Dave Besley took the Oaths and Affirmations. Witnessed by all present

#### **Declaration of Pecuniary Interest**

Chair Thwaites advised those in attendance that they could declare their pecuniary interest now or at any time during the meeting - None Declared

#### Approval of the Agenda

Additions to New Business: 2015 Schedule of Meetings OAPSB Membership

The approval of the agenda was done by a show of hands.

#### Approval of Minutes

Minutes approved - Carried.

# Issues Arising from Minutes

Discussion with regards to MTO Information (Correspondence)

# Presentations/Delegations

None.

# <u>Correspondence</u>

- 1. Obtaining MTO Information Traffic Collision Report Information
- 2. 2014/15 Reduce Impaired Driving Everywhere (RIDE) Grant Program Contractual Agreement
- 3. 2014 Semi-Annual Contract Policing Costs
- 4. 2015 Municipal Policing Billing Statement Letter from R.A. Philbin, Commander Municipal Policing Bureau

# <u>On File</u>

: \*`

- 1. Township of Mulmur Police Services Board Minutes September 29, 2014
- 2. Town of Mono Police Services Board Minutes September 2, 2014

# <u>Financial</u>

Revenues collected on behalf of the Township of Melancthon was \$1,848.25. (Page 4 of Detachment Commander's Report)

# Detachment Commander's Report

Staff Sgt. Sills reviewed the report for September - December 2014 and explained the statistics, clearance rates and highlights of the activities during this period. One notable item that will form part of these statistics over the next few months will be the presence of the Pan Am Games.

# Committee Reports

None.

# New Business

- 1. Road Closed Signage relocation of signs to better prepare motorists of closures County Roads, MTO - Highway 10 and Shelburne
- 2. Increased traffic on Melancthon roads road monitoring devices to record traffic counts, provide this information to the OPP, collision data is traditionally used for patrolling
- 3. Speeding in Horning's Mills placement of stop signs 4 way at the ball diamond, it was noted that this is already a designated Community Safety Zone, Park Area or possibly Children Playing signs. It was noted that Council direction would be required to put up signs
- 4. 2015 Meeting Schedule February 18, May 20, September 16 and December 16, 2015 at 4:30 p.m.

Public Discussion

None.

# Date of Next Meeting/Adjournment

5:50 p.m. - Moved by Besley, Seconded by Malloy that we adjourn this PSB meeting to meet again on Wednesday May 20, 2015 at 4:30 p.m or at the call of the Chair. Carried.

CHAIR

SECRETARY

# **Denise Holmes**

From:	McCredie, Tristin (MAH) <tristin.mccredie@ontario.ca></tristin.mccredie@ontario.ca>
Sent:	Thursday, July 30, 2015 9:27 AM
То:	Undisclosed recipients:
Subject:	FW: Applications Now Open for Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund

Good morning,

For your information, please see the news release below.

Thank you,

# **Tristin McCredie**

Municipal Advisor Municipal Services Office – Central Region, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 777 Bay Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor, Toronto, Ontario T: 416-585-7356 or 1-800-668-0230 Email: <u>tristin.mccredie@ontario.ca</u>

**From:** Ontario News [<u>mailto:newsroom@ontario.ca</u>] **Sent:** July 28, 2015 11:33 AM **To:** Boyd, Erick (MAH) **Subject:** Applications Now Open for Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund



Newsroom

# News Release

# Applications Now Open for Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund

July 28, 2015

# Province Continues to Invest in Small, Rural and Northern Municipal Infrastructure

Ontario is inviting small, rural and Northern municipalities to apply for infrastructure funding to build and repair critical infrastructure, like roads and bridges, under the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund.

To be eligible for the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund, municipalities must have a population of less than 100,000 as of the 2011 census or be located in northern or rural Ontario. Eligible municipalities will have access to \$100 million per year to revitalize core infrastructure and support asset management planning.

The province approved 78 projects under the first intake of the fund, and expressions of interest for the second intake will

be accepted from July 28, 2015 to September 11, 2015.

This funding is part of the largest infrastructure investment in Ontario's history - more than \$130 billion over 10 years, which will support more than 110,000 jobs per year on average with projects such as roads, bridges, transit systems, schools and hospitals.

Investing in municipal infrastructure is part of the government's plan to build Ontario up. The four-part plan includes investing in people's talents and skills, making the largest investment in public infrastructure in Ontario's history, creating a dynamic, innovative environment where business thrives, and building a secure retirement savings plan.

#### QUICK FACTS

- In 2013, municipalities advised on the design of the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund through provincewide consultations. Based on that feedback, the fund uses a formula to allocate \$50 million per year across 426 communities to support improvements and repairs to road, bridge, water and wastewater projects. Communities can also request additional funding for crucial infrastructure projects through the \$50 million application-based portion of the fund.
- A Conference Board of Canada report estimated that Ontario's public infrastructure investment would add more than \$1,000 to the average annual income of Ontarians in 2014 and lower the unemployment rate by about one percentage point.

#### ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund
- ontario.ca/agriculture-news

# QUOTES

"This second intake of the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund will help municipalities across Ontario repair crucial infrastructure. The province's commitment to investing in small and rural infrastructure will help keep our communities strong while creating jobs."

- Jeff Leal, Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

"Our government is committed to working with communities across Ontario to provide stable, predictable

infrastructure funding to build better roads, bridges and transportation. Investing in infrastructure generates significant economic activity in local communities, creates jobs and helps maintain a strong regional business climate across the province."

- Brad Duguid, Minister of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure

"I'd like to thank the Honourable Jeff Leal, the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, for coming here today to help us celebrate such an important event for our community. As a recipient of the first round of funding from the Ontario Community infrastructure Fund, I can attest to the importance of this fund as a means to help our community grow and prosper."

- Frances Smith, Mayor of Central Frontenac

#### CONTACTS

Chelsea Plante Minister's Office 416-326-6439

Susin Micallef Communications Branch 519-826-3145

Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs http://www.ontario.ca/omafra

Questions about your subscription? Contact us.

Edit your subscription preferences.

Unsubscribe from News on Demand.

Follow Us On Twitter.

Visit the Newsroom.

Disponible en français.

#### © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2008 - 2015

99 Wellesley Street West 4th floor, Room 4620 Toronto ON M7A 1A1

**Total Control Panel** 

To: dholmes@melancthontownship.ca

Message Score: 1

Login

My Spam Blocking Level: High

Block this sender Block ontario.ca

This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.

Medium (75): Pass Low (90): Pass

# **Denise Holmes**

From:	Pam Hillock <phillock@dufferincounty.ca></phillock@dufferincounty.ca>
Sent:	Monday, July 13, 2015 11:25 AM
То:	Ed Brennan; Denise Holmes; Jennifer Willoughby; John Telfer;
	jwilson@eastluthergrandvalley.ca; keith@townofmono.com; suestone@amaranth-
	eastgary.ca; Susan Greatrix; thorner@mulmurtownship.ca
Cc:	Ken McGhee (External); Warren Maycock; Michelle Dunne
Subject:	Integrity Commissioner and Bill 8

Hi Everyone:

Further to my email last week, County Council passed the following motion regarding Bill 8 and also added a clause about reporting back regarding an Integrity Commissioner. Please let me know if you are interested in discussing this further. Thanks!

GENERAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES – June 23, 2015 – ITEM #4 Update on Bill 8

THAT the report from the Clerk/Director of Corporate Services dated June 23, 2015, regarding Bill 8 – Public Sector and MPP Accountability and Transparency Act, 2014, be received;

AND THAT staff be directed to create a Customer Service Policy, Complaints Registry and processes associated with the policy and registry;

AND THAT staff report back on options on the appointment of an Integrity Commissioner after consultation with the area municipal staff.

Regards,

Pam Hillock|County Clerk/Director of Corporate Services County of Dufferin|Phone: 519-941-2816 Ext. 2503| phillock@dufferincounty.ca |55 Zina Street, Orangeville, ON L9W 1E5

DISCLAIMER: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the County of Dufferin. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. The County of Dufferin accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email. The Corporation of the County of Dufferin, 55 Zina Street, Orangeville, Ontario. www.dufferincounty.ca

**Total Control Panel** 

 To: <u>dholmes@metancthontownship.ca</u>
 <u>Remove</u> this sender from my allow list

 From: <u>phillock@dufferincounty.ca</u>

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Login

# **X**DUFFERIN COUNTY

# **REPORT TO COMMITTEE**

То:	Chair McGhee and Members of the General Government Services Committee
From:	Pam Hillock, Director of Corporate Services/Clerk
Meeting Date:	June 23, 2015
Subject:	Bill 8 – Public Sector and MPP Accountability and Transparency Act, 2014

**In Support of Strategic Plan Priorities and Objectives:** Communication and Connections by encouraging public feedback and comments in a variety of innovative forums (2.1.3) and Good Governance by reviewing and updating current policies and procedures (3.3.2)

# Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on Bill 8 – Public Sector and MPP Accountability and Transparency Act, 2014.

# Background & Discussion

Bill 8 received Royal Assent on December 11, 2014 and it expands the power of the Ontario Ombudsman to review public entities in the MUSH (Municipalities, Universities, School Boards and Hospitals) Sector. The Ontario Gazette notes that Bill 8, Public Sector and MPP Accountability and Transparency Act, 2014 and related regulations affecting municipal governments are to be proclaimed in effect on January 1, 2016. The Bill enacts a new Act and amends a number of other Acts by way of schedules. Schedule 5 amends the Excellent Care for All Act, 2010 and creates a Patient Ombudsman; Schedule 6 amends the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act by adding a duty for heads (Clerk) to ensure that measures are in place to preserve the records in their institution in accordance with applicable laws, rules and practices as well as the creation of offences. Schedule 9 makes amendments to the Ombudsman Act.

The Ombudsman's Office was established by the Ontario legislature in 1975 and currently has jurisdiction to receive complaints about Provincial Ministries. It is anticipated that the Ombudsman's expanded duties will include the investigation of any decision, recommendation or act done or not done by a municipality through a complaint process. The Patient Ombudsman will have implications for Dufferin Oaks Homes for Seniors.

Staff has attended several workshops on this topic and recommendations made by the Ombudsman's office and other larger municipalities is that a complaint procedure be implemented and processes in place to deal with complaints. Data analysis could be key to show improvement. When a complainant contacts the Ombudsman, the County of Dufferin will be able to show how the matter was deal with. Essential to accompany a complaints process is Customer Service Standards that staff would have to adhere to.

Council may also wish to consider appointing an Integrity Commissioner. This is an optional appointment and the duties are outlined in the Municipal Act, 2001:

#### Integrity Commissioner

223.3 (1) Without limiting sections 9, 10 and 11, those sections authorize the municipality to appoint an Integrity Commissioner who reports to council and who is responsible for performing in an independent manner the functions assigned by the municipality with respect to,

(a) the application of the code of conduct for members of council and the code of conduct for members of local boards or of either of them;

(b) the application of any procedures, rules and policies of the municipality and local boards governing the ethical behaviour of members of council and of local boards or of either of them; or

(c) both of clauses (a) and (b). 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 98.

#### Powers and duties

(2) Subject to this Part, in carrying out the responsibilities described in subsection (1), the Commissioner may exercise such powers and shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him or her by the municipality. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 98.

#### Delegation

(3) The Commissioner may delegate in writing to any person, other than a member of council, any of the Commissioner's powers and duties under this Part. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 98.

Same

(4) The Commissioner may continue to exercise the delegated powers and duties, despite the delegation. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 98.

#### Status

(5) The Commissioner is not required to be a municipal employee. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 98.

# **Local Municipal Impact**

The legislation affects all municipalities.

# Financial, Staffing, Legal, or IT Considerations

There are no direct staffing, financial, legal or IT considerations as a result of this report; however, if Council chooses to appoint an Integrity Commissioner, a budget would have to be established to pay a retainer.

# **Strategic Direction and County of Dufferin Principles**

Providing a system for customer feedback and processes to address the feedback is in line with the corporate strategic objective to encourage public feedback and comments in a variety of innovative forums and also the review and update current policies and procedures.

- 1. We Manage Change by proactively keeping abreast of new legislation and the affect it has on Dufferin County
- We Deliver Quality Service by providing a forum for residents for feedback allows the County of Dufferin to improve processes and identify areas for improvement
- 3. We Communicate by providing information to the local media, posting information on the website, social media posts, electronic newsletters and newspaper advertising
- 4. We Make Good Decisions by researching legislation and best practices and procedures

# Recommendation

THAT the report from the Clerk/Director of Corporate Services dated June 23, 2015, regarding Bill 8 – Public Sector and MPP Accountability and Transparency Act, 2014, be received;

AND THAT staff be directed to create a Customer Service Policy, Complaints Registry and processes associated with the policy and registry.

Respectfully Submitted,

Pam Hillock County Clerk/Director of Corporate Services

# **Denise Holmes**

From:	Pam Hillock <phillock@dufferincounty.ca></phillock@dufferincounty.ca>
Sent:	Monday, July 13, 2015 11:37 AM
То:	Ed Brennan; Denise Holmes; Jennifer Willoughby; John Telfer;
	jwilson@eastluthergrandvalley.ca; keith@townofmono.com; suestone@amaranth-
-	eastgary.ca; Susan Greatrix; thorner@mulmurtownship.ca
Cc:	Michelle Dunne; Ken McGhee (External)
Subject:	Report regarding Response to Provincial Consultations
Attachments:	Reponse to Consultations.doc

Hi Again:

I've attached a report that the Treasurer prepared that may be of interest. Council approved the following motion regarding the report:

GENERAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES – June 23, 2015 – ITEM #3 County Response to Infrastructure Consultations

THAT the Report, County Response to Infrastructure Consultations, from the County Treasurer, dated June 23, 2015 be received;

AND THAT the points identified be included in the feedback to be sent to the Ontario Government from the County of Dufferin, before September 18, 2015;

AND THAT an additional point be made to ask that the installation of natural gas in less populated areas be eligible for infrastructure funding

Regards,

Pam Hillock | County Clerk/Director of Corporate Services County of Dufferin | Phone: 519-941-2816 Ext. 2503 | phillock@dufferincounty.ca | 55 Zina Street, Orangeville, ON L9W 1E5

DISCLAIMER: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the County of Dufferin. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. The County of Dufferin accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email. The Corporation of the County of Dufferin, 55 Zina Street, Orangeville, Ontario. <u>www.dufferincounty.ca</u>

**Total Control Panel** 

 To: <u>dholmes@melanethontownship.ca</u>
 Remove this sender from my allow list

 From: <u>phillock@dufferincounty.ca</u>

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

<u>Login</u>



# REPORT TO GENERAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE

To: Chair McGhee and Members of General Government Services Committee

From: Alan Selby, Treasurer

Meeting Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Subject: County Response to Infrastructure Consultations

In Support of Strategic Plan Priorities and Objectives: Communications through providing feedback on provincial policy (2.3.2)

# Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide some suggested feedback from the County of Dufferin to the current Ontario Government Consultations.

# Background and Discussion

The Ontario Government in May launched a consultation on Infrastructure Priorities. The Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) sent a Heads-Up Alert to its members on May 22 regarding this consultation. The Alert is attached for information.

(NOTE this consultation is separate from another current consultation, on making changes to specific Provincial Legislation)

The Province released a "Discussion Guide for Moving Ontario Forward – Outside the GTA" through MEDEI, the Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure. The OGRA Alert points out the deadline for feedback is Sept. 18, 2015.

High-level parameters of the infrastructure strategy of the Province are:

- \$31.5 Billion over the next ten years, which includes
  - \$16 Billion within the GTHA (Greater Toronto Hamilton Area)
  - \$15 Billion outside the GTHA, for roads, bridges, transit and other infra. About \$3.5 Billion has already been assigned to specific projects, leaving a further \$11.5 Billion unallocated (over 10 years)

Included in this \$11.5 Billion is a \$15 Million annual commitment towards a Connecting Link program. Details are not yet available on this specific program. The County will be watching for further developments, since this program seems to have a high potential to

apply to Dufferin County. In addition, the funds have been identified for other types of projects such as ultra-high speed broadband which support the Western Ontario Warden's Caucus SWIFT project which the County is a part of.

The Province is asking for feedback now, on how it should design its "framework for prioritizing projects", for the \$11.5 Billion "outside the GTHA" amount. Take note that the Province might well be taking more than a year just to develop its framework, namely throughout all of 2016, and no final framework, or project approvals, would happen until 2017. This report suggests some ways that the County can make its voice heard, through a submission to the Province.

Every local municipality in the County will be impacted by the Province's ultimate decisions on the design of their infrastructure funding plan, for areas outside the GTHA.

# Financial, Staffing, Legal and IT Considerations

The following points are suggested as content for County feedback to the MEDEI. The points are numbered so that, in its recommendation, the General Government Services Committee may specify those points that it wishes the County to include in its feedback. These points come from past experience, based on what has been seen in the design of previous government assistance programs. There might be other points that members wish to add.

- 1. The Province should repeat the strategy it used in the OCIF (Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund) and design a framework that includes both a formula-based and a competition-based segment. The reason is that the formula-based portion ensures that every municipality receives at least some amount of funding. This is supportive of the reality that every municipality has some infrastructure deficits.
- 2. The Province should use, in its formula-based portion, data such as population and tangible capital asset values, and asset condition ratings. However, it should specifically not use other data that measures per-capita income or family income, as these things are not related to the condition of a municipality's capital assets.
- 3. The Province should include a Small Communities component in its annual funding, which it is suggested would be limited to only municipalities with populations under 100,000.
- 4. The extension of ultra, high-speed broadband connectivity should be a specific category of its own, and be eligible for infrastructure funding.
- 5. Municipal statistics such as reserves per capita, or long-term debt levels, typically used to measure the financial position of a municipality, should not be used in determining eligibility in the competition-based portion. The selection criteria should focus instead on the benefits of the specific project being applied for, regardless of the financial condition of the municipal corporation. This

corresponds to the stated MEDEI Guiding Principle of Evidence-Based projects, based on research and business case analysis.

# Strategic Direction and County of Dufferin Principles

The strategic direction of the County includes long term planning, and following a path towards more local funds for infrastructure, and less reliance on external support. In the meantime, while the County works towards a stronger internal commitment of its own resources, the opportunity to receive external support from the Province is still needed.

Through giving its input, the County might help to ensure that future provincial support programs are designed in ways that increase the County's chances of benefitting from those programs.

A response to the MEDEI consultations from Dufferin County would align with all four of the County's Principles:

- We Manage Change by proactively advocating to other levels of government in order to address community needs by investing in new infrastructure (like broadband connectivity) to keep up with the economic demands;
- We Deliver Quality Service by ensuring provincial policy makers receive feedback on financial assistance programs to best meet ongoing infrastructure needs;
- We Communicate by engaging in consultation directly with MEDEI, and indirectly through the County's membership with OGRA to voice County's position;
- We Make Good Decisions by considering financial impacts and seeking support from senior levels of government.

# Recommendation

**THAT** the Report, *County Response to Infrastructure Consultations,* from the County Treasurer, dated June 23, 2015 be received;

**AND THAT** the points identified be included in the feedback to be sent to the Ontario Government from the County of Dufferin, before September 18, 2015.

Respectfully Submitted By, and Original signed by,

Alan Selby, B. Math, CPA, CGA County Treasurer



# CORPORATE SERVICES

July 15, 2015

Ms. Denise Holmes Township of Melancthon 157101 Highway 10 Melancthon, ON L9V 2E6

Dear Ms. Holmes,

RE: Proposed Privatization of Hydro One

The Council of the County of Dufferin at its regular meeting held on July 9, 2015 adopted the following motion:

THAT the resolution from the Township of Melancthon dated June 19, 2015 opposing the privatization of Hydro One, be endorsed.

Yours truly,

, 1 Decempro

Michelle Dunne Deputy Clerk

cc. Hon. Charles Sousa, Minister of Finance Hon. Bob Chiarelli, Minister of Energy Ms. Sylvia Jones, MPP Dufferin-Caledon Dufferin County Municipalities

# COUNTY OF DUFFERIN 55 Zina Street, Orangeville, ON L9W 1E5 | 519.941.2816 ext. 2500 | dufferincounty.ca

Normal Farm Practices Protection Board

Commission de protection des pratiques agricoles normales

 3rd Floor

 1 Stone Road West

 Guelph, Ontario N1G 4Y2

 Tel:
 (519) 826-3773

 Fax:
 (519) 826-3259

3<sup>e</sup> étage 1 Stone Road West Guelph (Ontario) N1G 4Y2 Tél.: (519) 826-3773 Téléc.: (519) 826-3259



# **Normal Farm Practices Protection Board**

#### **PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE ORDER No. 3**

IN THE MATTER OF The Farming And Food Production Protection Act, 1998.

AND IN THE MATTER OF An Application To The Board, Under Section 6 Of *The Farming And Food Production Protection Act, 1998* For A Determination As To Whether A Municipal Bylaw Has The Effect Of Restricting A Normal Farm Practice.

Board File Number: 2014-05: Cox v. Mono

Between:

**Douglas Cox** 

Applicant

and

Town Of Mono,

Respondent

**Before:** 

Marty Byl, Board Member

# ORDER

The Board, in reviewing correspondence in regard to this matter, acknowledges the receipt of several emails and in particular two letters received from Mr. Ernest Rovet LLB, who is acting on behalf of a citizen's group in this matter, the Mono Mulmur Citizen's Coalition, which is seeking standing as a party in this matter. Although previously informed that Mr. Finbar Desir was retiring as Secretary to the Board, Mr. Rovet sent at least one e-mail to Mr. Desir after his departure. This first letter was apparently sent June 4 and resent June 9, and the second June 22. Mr. Rovet alleges certain conditions within the Board's May 13<sup>th</sup> order are in some way exclusionary, among other things. The citizen's group also seeks a decision on the matter of standing, prior to the second Prehearing Conference scheduled for Monday July 20th, 2015.

In Mr. Rovet's June 4/9 letter, he seemingly requests a review of Mr. Desir's email of May 29. This email reiterated portions of the May 13 Order and was sent as a courtesy reminder of dates for making submissions regarding standing. When asked to confirm if he was indeed seeking a review, Mr. Rovet indicated in his June 22 letter that he would like the Board to "reconsider its position on the party status issue".

While the June 22 response is not clear as to what in particular Mr. Rovet wants to be reconsidered, it does appear that the Mono Mulmur Citizen's Coalition wants the Board's request for anticipated testimony summaries and estimates of presentation duration to have been submitted by June 8 to be reconsidered. In neither the June 4/9 letter nor the June 22 letter does Mr. Rovet indicate what order or part of an order that was actually made he wants reviewed.

This response from the Board and Order is intended to address this seeming request for a review.

In his letter dated June 22<sup>nd</sup> Mr. Rovet vacillates between taking umbrage with the Board's orders to date and arguing the merits of the application itself. The Board assumes, as an officer of the court, Mr. Rovet is well aware that the purpose of a Prehearing Conference and subsequent Prehearing Orders are to ready the matter for a full hearing. In particular he suggests that being asked to provide a written list of proposed witnesses and their summarized anticipated testimony is in some way onerous and exclusionary.

The order dated May 13, 2015 reads in part.

"A second prehearing conference will be held where all Parties are to attend, either in person or by an agent or representative.

Those interested in making a presentation under Rule 55 or being added as a Party must submit a written summary of their anticipated testimony or their proposed witnesses' anticipated testimony, including the estimated duration of their presentations or the estimated duration of the examination in chief of proposed witnesses, by June 8, 2015. These individuals and group representatives may attend the second prehearing conference if they chose.

All Parties must submit by June 8, 2015 proposed witness statements for non-expert witnesses. These statements shall be a succinct summary only.

Parties and those seeking Party status should be prepared to identify at the PHC all proposed expert witnesses and to speak to the relevance of their anticipated testimony."

As quoted in the Board's first order in this matter, Rule 23 of the Board's Practice and Procedure reads as follows:

23. (1) In any proceeding the Board, on its own initiative or on the motion of any party or any person seeking party status, may direct the parties to make submissions in writing or may hold one or more pre-hearing or settlement conferences, for the purposes of:

- a. identifying parties;
- b. defining, formulating or simplifying issues;
- c. clarifying, amplifying or limiting an application, intervention or reply;
- *d.* deciding the procedure to be adopted in the proceeding;
- e. disclosure of evidence, including:
  - *i. identifying documents the parties intend to rely on;*
  - ii. exchanging or arranging for the exchange of documents among parties;

iii. identifying witnesses, the nature of their evidence, and their order of presentation;

iv. considering the advantages and disadvantages of filing witness statements and interrogatories and establishing a procedure for their service and filing if needed;

f. setting the date and place for commencement of the hearing;

g. estimating the length of the hearing;

h. deciding any other matters that may aid in the simplification or most just disposition of the proceeding;

i. considering the possibility of settlement of any or all of the issues in the proceeding; and

*j. for any other purpose that the Board deems appropriate.* 

At no time was any party, or those seeking party status, asked to provide a definitive list of witnesses together with will-say statements. The May 13 Order, among other things, merely requested of those interested in standing as a party in this matter, to provide "proposed" witnesses and a summary of their "anticipated" testimony, and requested "anticipated" presentations for those seeking to make a Rule 55 presentation. The e-mail sent by staff on May 29 reiterated portions of this Order via cut and paste and was sent as a courtesy reminder.

The summaries and estimates of presentation duration will be used to inform an order on standing, to better plan for public participation at the hearing, and to estimate the hearing time required for the testimony of parties' witnesses and public presentations, as well as to ensure that proposed testimony is relevant and not unduly repetitious. The need to look further into proposed witnesses was indicated because of the excessively large number of witnesses and experts proposed at the initial Prehearing conference, which suggested possible repetitious and irrelevant testimony. No one will be strictly held to a "proposed" list of witnesses or their "anticipated" testimony.

It is not clear how planning for public participation at the hearing is at all exclusionary, or how setting a date for submissions on standing is exclusionary. The submission due per the May 13 Order is to allow for planning how public participation is to occur, and the allegations of being exclusionary are confusing. It was Mono Mulmur Citizen's Coalition itself that suggested a firm cut-off date for considering requests for standing, albeit well after the date had already been set and communicated to them.

It should also be noted that all parties currently recognized, including those without legal representation, were able to provide their submission on or prior to June 8th.

Interpreting Rule 23, the Board finds that stipulations in the Order regarding proposed witness lists, summaries and proposed presentations are entirely in keeping with the Board's Rules and Procedures, and are neither onerous nor exclusionary.

Accordingly, there will be no review of the May 13 Order at this time. The May 13th Order was itself a reconsideration prompted by this citizens group. This is now the second reconsideration request of a preliminary procedural Order that has not excluded anyone. An order on standing will be made following the second Prehearing Conference, when all the received submissions will have been read and considered and all parties have been provided an opportunity to speak to public participation. Reasons for this aspect of the Order have already been provided.

In reviewing all correspondence related to this matter, from many interested and involved persons, it behooves the Board to admonish and advise all concerned that an application is not to be litigated by email with staff. While unrepresented parties may not appreciate what a hearing process entails, counsel should not be arguing the merits of the case with emails to staff outside of the hearing process. Communications with the Board should be copied to all parties at a minimum.

In order to best facilitate preparation for a full Hearing, no further review requests or motions shall be made without leave of the Board due to the numerous inappropriate attempts to litigate this application with staff and concerns regarding frivolous motions and reconsideration requests that do not relate to orders actually made delaying this matter unnecessarily. Additionally, there appears to be an issue with not reading or misreading Board procedural Orders. The Hearing panel, once selected, may modify this part of this Order. The repeated making of unsubstantiated allegations against the decision-maker before the case has been heard or a panel has been appointed are not conducive to readying the matter for a hearing, nor are they appropriate.

So Orders the Board.

DATED July 16, 2015

He-Byl

Marty Byl, Pre-Hearing Chair

# **Denise Holmes**

From:	AMO Communications < communicate@amo.on.ca>
Sent:	Tuesday, July 28, 2015 4:36 PM
То:	dholmes@melancthontownship.ca
Subject:	AMO Policy Update - Infrastructure Funding

July 28, 2015

# **Infrastructure Funding**

# 2015 Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund (OCIF) Accepting Applications

The Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure announced today that it would begin accepting Expressions of Interest from eligible municipal governments for the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund. OCIF Expressions of Interest are due by September 11, 2015.

OCIF provides \$100 million annually to support small, rural and northern communities. \$50 million of OCIF funding is formula-based and has been allocated previously for this year. The remaining \$50 million is for application based projects. OCIF funding supports core road, bridge, water and wastewater infrastructure.

For more information, please see: https://www.ontario.ca/page/infrastructure-funding-small-communities.

#### Ontario Cycling Funding

Municipal governments are also reminded that the \$10 million Ontario Cycling Infrastructure Fund is accepting Expressions of Interest for projects, due on August 6, 2015 and the Cycling Training Fund is accepting applications until September 4, 2015. Municipalities are encouraged to submit.

For more information on either program, please see the **Ontario Cycling Strategy** website and use the links: <u>http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/publications/ontario-cycling-strategy.shtml</u>.

AMO Contact: Craig Reid, Senior Advisor, creid@amo.on.ca, (416) 971-9856 x 334.

**PLEASE NOTE:** AMO Breaking News will be broadcast to the member municipality's council, administrator, and clerk. Recipients of the AMO broadcasts are free to redistribute the AMO broadcasts to other municipal staff as required. We have decided to not add other staff to these broadcast lists in order to ensure accuracy and efficiency in the management of our various broadcast lists.

**DISCLAIMER:** Any documents attached are final versions. AMO assumes no responsibility for any discrepancies that may have been transmitted with this electronic version. The printed versions of the documents stand as the official record.

**OPT-OUT:** If you wish to opt-out of these email communications from AMO please click <u>here</u>.



#### **Total Control Panel**

 To: <a href="mailto:dholmes@melancthontownship.ca">dholmes@melancthontownship.ca</a>
 Remove this sender from my allow list

 From: <a href="mailto:communicate@amo.on.ca">communicate@amo.on.ca</a>

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

# **Denise Holmes**

From:	Sills, Steven (OPP) <steven.sills@opp.ca></steven.sills@opp.ca>
Sent:	Tuesday, July 28, 2015 12:05 PM
То:	Denise Holmes
Subject:	RE: Horning's Mills

Hi Denise,

Here are the results of the focused patrols in Horning's Mills. We were not successful in obtaining data from our speedspy device.

Steve

#### Evaluation Summary (PFR, Anecdotal, Calls for Service, Meeting dates, Milestones, Lessons Learned):

Over the course of the two week period, information was gathered utilizing RMS and DAR.

Twelve officers dedicated a total of 35.25 hours to this Focused Patrol. During that time, approximately 289 vehicles were observed, both motorcycles and motor vehicles. Three (3) Provincial Offence Notices were issued for speeding.

There were no collisions reported during the duration of the Focused Patrol. R.I.D.E. checks were also conducted in this area, and there were no alcohol related offences to report.

On average, 2.5 hours per day was dedicated to patrols on Main Street in Horning's Mills in response to vehicles travelling at excessive speeds.

Overall, officers reported that most speeds are compliant with the posted speed limits.

The Melancthon Police Service passed two by-laws to erect stop signs in two locations within the complaint area.

From: Denise Holmes [mailto:dholmes@melancthontownship.ca] Sent: 7-Jul-15 1:58 PM To: Sills, Steven (OPP) Subject: Horning's Mills

Hi Steve,

Council has asked me to follow up with you regarding the speeding concerns in Horning's Mills and just wondering if yourOfficers have been out there, have there been any charges laid, etc.?

Thanks so much.

Regards,

Deníse

.
Denise B. Holmes, AMCT | CAO/Clerk | Township of Melancthon | <u>dholmes@melancthontownship.ca</u> | PH: 519-925-5525 ext 101 | FX: 519-925-1110 | <u>www.melancthontownship.ca</u> |

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail This message (including attachments, if any) is intended to be confidential and solely for the addressee. If you received this e-mail in error, please delete it and advise me immediately. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free and the sender does not accept liability for errors or omissions.

Total Control Panel

To: <u>dholmes@melancthontownship.ca</u> From: <u>steven.sills@opp.ca</u> Message Score: 50 My Spam Blocking Level: High High (60): Pass Medium (75): Pass Low (90): Pass <u>Login</u>

Block this sender Block opp.ca

This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.



JUL 2 3 2015

ی برز بند بند سر بند اند اند اند اند با بنا بنا ب

Randy Pettapiece, MPP Perth-Wellington Constituency Office Perth-Wellington Stratford, Ontario

July 21, 2015

Denise B. Holmes CAO/Clerk Township of Melancthon 157101 Highway 10 Melancthon, ON L9V 2E6

Dear Ms. Holmes:

# **Re: Resolution for Fairness in Provincial Infrastructure Funds**

I am writing to inform you of my upcoming private member's resolution in the Ontario legislature and to formally request your support. It reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should guarantee that governmentheld ridings and opposition-held ridings be given equal and transparent consideration on infrastructure funding, and that when funding decisions are made, should guarantee that all MPPs, whether in government or opposition, be given fair and equal advance notice of the official announcement.

The basis for my resolution is simple: When municipalities apply for provincial infrastructure funding, you should expect that your application would be evaluated based on merit. You should expect that it would be evaluated promptly, based on well-defined and transparent criteria. Finally, you should expect that the decision to approve your application would never depend on your MPP's political stripe.

There is, after all, no such thing as Liberal, PC or NDP infrastructure money; there is only *public* money. That money comes from taxes that we all pay; everyone in the province should expect a similar quality of infrastructure and services, regardless of where they live.

Because municipalities rely on provincial partnerships to fund critical infrastructure projects, the consequences of provincial funding decisions can be far-reaching. The provincial government must respect this partnership and ensure that government and opposition-held ridings are given equal consideration when it comes to infrastructure investment decisions. Too often, however, there is at least a persistent perception that public infrastructure dollars have, in at least some cases, been directed according to politics and not according to need.

.../2

Having served as a municipal councillor, I know that the process to apply for infrastructure funding is a major—and sometimes frustrating—undertaking. It often entails significant red tape and investments of staff time and resources. Before making those investments, municipalities need some assurance that, based on clear criteria, your application has a reasonable chance of success. You also need to know that your MPP will advocate on your behalf and, most importantly, decision-makers will be receptive to that advocacy no matter if the MPP serves in government or opposition.

The final section of my resolution deals with infrastructure announcements themselves. These announcements must, I believe, be depoliticized in order to address the perception that opposition-held ridings are disadvantaged—or worse yet, being punished—for voting against the government.

If your municipality supports the intent of my resolution, I would encourage you to consider passing a formal resolution to support it. If your Council decides to proceed in this way, I would appreciate receiving a copy of your resolution as soon as possible. Debate on this resolution is scheduled for October 8, 2015.

I would appreciate your views on this matter, and your own experience in your municipality concerning access to provincial infrastructure funds. If you have any feedback on this issue, or if you require any additional information, please don't hesitate to contact me at 519-272-0660 or by email: <u>randy.pettapiececo@pc.ola.org</u>.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Randy Rottapur

Randy Pettapiece, MPP Perth-Wellington



L

The Corporation of THE TOWN OF SHELBURNE

Municipal Offices: 203 Main Street East, Shelburne, Ont. L9V 3K7 - Telephone: (519) 925-2600 - Fax (519) 925-6134 e-maik shelburne@townofshelburne.on.ca

July 24th, 2015

# PRESS RELEASE SHELBURNE MAKES THE CUTIII VOTE SHELBURNE



Well Shelburne, it is official.... We are one of the last two towns left to compete for "One Horse Town"

Congratulations to everyone involved.

Now the tricky part.... We need every vote from every source possible to beat out Lacombe Alberta.

So.... Share us with every friend, relative and employee and their friend's friend possible to get the word out there...

August 3 til 10th every day vote from every email account you have.

We want to bring country music home to Shelburne and it will take everyone's help, everybody's Facebook friends and then some!

Go get them Shelburne, I know we can do this!

#### One Horse Town

Congratulations to Lacombe, Alberta and Shelburne, Ontario! Your towns have been selected as our One Horse Town finalists. WWW.COORSBANQUET.CA

A People Place ..... A Change of Pace

### **Denise Holmes**

Review Discussion Paper	
mnrwaterpolicy@ontario.ca>	
<1	<mnrwaterpolicy@ontario.ca></mnrwaterpolicy@ontario.ca>

Natural Resources Conservation Policy Branch Policy Division 300 Water Street Peterborough, ON K9J 8M5 Telephone: 705-755-5375 Facsimile: 705-755-1971

**Resources and Forestry** 

Ministère des Richesses naturelles et des Forêts

Direction des politiques de conservation des richesses naturelles Division de l'élaboration des politiques 300, rue Water Peterborough (Ontario) K9J 8M5 Téléphone : 705-755-5375 Télécopieur : 705-755-1971



### TO: All Ontario Municipalities

#### RE: Notification of Environmental Registry Posting of the <u>Conservation Authorities Act Review</u> <u>Discussion Paper</u>

As part of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry's (MNRF) commitment to initiate a review of the *Conservation Authorities Act* including addressing roles, responsibilities and governance of conservation authorities in resource management and environmental protection, a discussion paper has been posted to the Environmental Registry to solicit feedback from other ministries, municipalities and stakeholders on the programs and services delivered by conservation authorities on behalf of the province and member municipalities.

The Discussion Paper can be viewed by going to the following link and searching for registry number 012-4509 <u>http://www.ebr.gov.on.ca/ERS-WEB-External/</u>. The discussion paper will be posted for a 90 day period. The deadline for submitting comments is October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

The purpose of this discussion paper is to identify opportunities to improve the existing legislative, regulatory and policy framework that currently governs conservation authorities and the programs and services they deliver on behalf of the province, municipalities, and others.

While feedback on opportunities to enhance any aspect of the existing legislative and regulatory framework is welcome, the focus of the discussion paper is on the three overarching areas of:

- 1. Governance the processes, structures, and accountability frameworks within the Act which direct conservation authority decision-making and operations;
- 2. Funding mechanisms the mechanisms put in place by the Act to fund conservation authorities; and
- 3. *Roles and responsibilities* the roles and associated responsibilities that the Act enables conservation authorities to undertake.

Municipal input in the review process is critical. A number of municipal listening sessions are currently being planned to provide municipal sector representatives with an opportunity to review and provide responses to the questions outlined within the discussion paper. These listening sessions are tentatively being planned for the following dates and locations:

- New Market (week of August 31st)
- London (week of September 7th)
- Ottawa (week of September 21st)

- Thunder Bay (week of September 28th)
- Sudbury (week of September 28th)

If you are interested in participating in any of these sessions, or require any additional information regarding this Environmental Posting please contact Mike Passey, Policy Advisor at 705-755-5877 or at <u>mnrwaterpolicy@ontario.ca</u> to identify which session(s) you are interested in attending. Interest in attending these sessions will help us determine specific dates and locations.

Yours truly,

Jennifer Keyes Manager Water Resources Section Natural Resources Conservation Branch, Policy Division Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry

**Total Control Panel** 

To: <u>dholmes@melancthontownship.ca</u> From: <u>mnrwaterpolicy@ontario.ca</u> Message Score: 1 My Spam Blocking Level: High

Block this sender Block ontario.ca

This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.

Login

High (60): Pass Medium (75): Pass Low (90): Pass



Environmental Registry Registre environnemental



Government of Ontario Site Map

Map Français

About the Registry | Search | How do I ...? | MyEBR | How BR | Home | Advanced Search | Basic Search | Court Action

Policy Proposal Notice:

Title: Conservation Authorities Act Review Discussion Paper EBR Registry Number: 012-4509 Ministry: Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry Date Proposal loaded to the Registry: July 20, 2015

Keyword(s): Compliance | Monitoring | Water | Conservation Comment Period: 91 days: submissions may be made between July 20, 2015 and October 19, 2015.

#### **Description of Policy:**

The Conservation Authorities Act, administered by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), enables two or more municipalities in a common watershed to establish a conservation authority in conjunction with the province. The purpose of a conservation authority is to deliver a local resource management program at the watershed scale for both provincial and municipal interests.

Conservation authorities have played a significant role in Ontario's natural resource management landscape for nearly 70 years, establishing a successful legacy of resource stewardship and an impressive record of protecting people, property, and communities from water-related natural hazards (e.g. flooding, drought, erosion).

In order to ensure that the Act is meeting the needs of Ontarians in a modern context, the MNRF is seeking to engage with ministries, municipalities, Aboriginal communities, conservation authorities, stakeholders and the public to initiate a review of the Conservation Authorities Act, including addressing roles, responsibilities, funding and governance of conservation authorities in resource management and environmental protection.

The posting of a discussion paper is intended to solicit public and multi-sector perspectives on the existing legislative, regulatory and/or policy framework which governs conservation authorities and the programs and services they deliver.

This discussion paper outlines a number of ways to engage in the review and MNRF encourages all parties to participate. The discussion paper focuses on the Conservation Authorities Act and policy framework, not on any individual conservation authority.

#### Purpose of Policy:

The purpose of this discussion paper is to identify opportunities to improve the existing legislative, regulatory and policy framework that currently governs conservation authorities and the programs and services they deliver on behalf of the province, municipalities, and others.

#### Other Information:

While feedback on any aspect of the existing legislative and regulatory framework is welcome, the focus of the discussion paper is on the three overarching areas of:

#### Contact:

All comments on this proposal must be directed to:

Julia Holder Policy Analyst Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry Policy Division Natural Resources Conservation Policy Branch Water Resources Section 300 Water Street Peterborough Ontario K9J 8M5 Phone: (705) 755-5905 Fax: (705) 755-1957

To submit a comment online, click the submit button below:

Submit Comment

1. Governance;

2. Funding mechanisms; and

3. Roles and responsibilities.

Link to the discussion paper: http://apps.mnr.gov.on.ca/public/files/er/Discussion Paper 2015.pdf

The following weblinks provide the supporting/additional information about this notice:

The Conservation Authorities Act <u>http://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90c27</u>
Ontario Regulation 97/04 – Content of Conservation Authority Regulations <u>http://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/040097</u>
Ontario Regulation 139/96 – Municipal Levies <u>http://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/960139</u>
Ontario Regulation 670/00 – Conservation Authority Levies <u>http://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/000670</u>
Conservation Authorities <u>https://www.ontario.ca/environment-and-energy/conservation-authorities</u>

#### Public Consultation:

This proposal has been posted for a 91 day public review and comment period starting July 20, 2015. If you have any questions, or would like to submit your comments, please do so by October 19, 2015 to the individual listed under "Contact". Additionally, you may submit your comments on-line.

All comments received prior to October 19, 2015 will be considered as part of the decision-making process by the Ministry if they are submitted in writing or electronically using the form provided in this notice and reference EBR Registry number 012-4509.

Please Note: All comments and submissions received will become part of the public record. You will not receive a formal response to your comment, however, relevant comments received as part of the public participation process for this proposal will be considered by the decision maker for this proposal.

#### Other Public Consultation Opportunities:

Written comments and other feedback can also be sent directly to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry at <u>mnrwaterpolicy@ontario.ca</u>

Add Notice into My Watch List

The materials on this web site are protected by Crown copyright. You may copy and re-distribute any of the Environmental Bill of Rights information on this web site provided that the contents remain unchanged and the source of the contents is clearly referenced. You are not permitted to alter or add to the contents.

ONTARIO HOME | CONTACTS | HELP | SITEMAP | FRANÇAIS



PRIVACY | IMPORTANT NOTICES

Copyright information: © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 1994-2015

# **Discussion Paper**

# **Conservation Authorities Act**

A review of the roles, responsibilities, funding and governance of conservation authorities under the Conservation Authorities Act.





#### Photo credits:

Cover photos (left to right): Grand River Conservation Authority (Caledonia Dam); Otonabee Region Conservation Authority; Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

Page 6: Conservation Halton

Page 21: Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority

Page 27: E. Hartlen; Long Point Region Conservation Authority

# **Table of Contents**

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Conservation Authorities Act Overview
- 3. Governance
- 4. Funding Mechanisms
- 5. Roles and Responsibilities
- 6. Summary and Questions for Discussion
- 7. How to Provide Input

# References

Appendices



# 1. Introduction

The *Conservotion Authorities Act*, administered by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), enables two or more municipalities in a common watershed to establish a conservation authority in conjunction with the province. The purpose of a conservation authority is to deliver a local resource management program at the watershed scale for both provincial and municipal interests.

Conservation authorities have played a significant role in Ontario's natural resource management landscape for nearly 70 years, establishing a successful legacy of resource stewardship and an impressive record of protecting people, property, and communities from water-related natural hazards (e.g. flooding, drought, erosion etc.). With the increasing pressures of Climate Change on the environment, it is imperative that conservation authorities have the proper tools to successfully build upon this legacy.

Conservation authorities are unique organizations, established on watershed rather than political boundaries in order to better serve local needs and allow for resource management from a science-based perspective. Using the tools provided within the *Conservatian Autharities Act*, and with support from participating municipalities and the province, conservation authorities protect people from water-related natural hazards, provide recreational and educational opportunities, support science and research, and conserve and protect the natural environment. Collectively, conservation authorities are the second-largest landowner in the province after the Crown.

The framework and conditions for natural resource management in Ontario have changed significantly since the Act's creation, and the way conservation authorities operate within that framework has changed along with it. Resource management has become increasingly complex due to increases in population numbers and density, the expansion of agencies from all levels of government involved in resource management and environmental activities and new challenges such as addressing climate change further complicating resource management decisions. In addition, conservation authorities have been evolving as organizations, growing their funding sources and influence and accepting and being assigned additional roles that extend their responsibilities into additional areas of natural resource management and environmental protection. At the same time, the disparity among conservation authorities in resourcing and capacity has and continues to increase.

#### Ontario's Conservation Authorities

Ontario has 36 conservation authorities – the vast majority of which are located in southern Ontario.

Over 12 million people, or 90% of the province's population, live within a conservation authority's jurisdiction.

As a result of these and for other reasons the MNRF is seeking to engage ministries, municipalities, Aboriginal communities, conservation authorities, stakeholders and the public in a review of the *Conservation Authorities Act* to ensure that the Act is meeting the needs of Ontarians in a modern context.

Interest in a review of the *Conservation Authorities Act* has been building over the last several years. The Commission on the Reform of Ontario's Public Service recommended that the MNRF undertake a review of the programs and services delivered by the MNRF and conservation authorities to clarify responsibilities and eliminate any overlap in roles and responsibilities for resource management and environmental protection that are currently shared across levels of government. In addition, municipalities, developers, and conservation authorities have all identified their interest in and support for a formal government review.

The objective of this review is to identify opportunities to improve the legislative, regulatory and policy framework that currently governs the creation, operation and activities of conservation authorities that may be required in the face of a constantly changing environment. The purpose of this discussion paper is to seek feedback on the following three areas:

- 1. *Governance* the processes, structures, and accountability frameworks within the Act which direct conservation authority decision-making and operations;
- 2. Funding Mechanisms the mechanisms put in place by the Act to fund conservation authorities; and
- 3. *Roles and Responsibilities* the roles and associated responsibilities that the Act enables conservation authorities to undertake.

These areas are all closely linked and need to be considered in an integrated fashion. We ask that you read this discussion paper and focus on the questions that are provided.

This discussion paper represents the first step in the Ministry's review. The feedback received in response to the questions outlined below will help the Ministry identify priority areas for review. If specific changes to the existing legislative, regulatory or policy framework are considered in the future, further public consultation will occur as appropriate, for example through subsequent Environmental Bill of Rights Registry postings.

Your opinions and insights are important to us. This discussion paper outlines a number of ways to engage in the review and we encourage everyone to participate. The review of site-specific permit applications and permitting decisions or other local decisions made by conservation authorities are not within the scope of the Ministry's review.



#### Figure 1 – Map of conservation authority jurisdictions<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This map has been produced by the MNRF for illustrative purposes only and should not be relied upon as a precise indicator of conservation authority boundaries

# 2. Conservation Authorities Act - Overview

The *Conservation Authorities Act* was passed in 1946 in response to extensive flooding, erosion, deforestation and soil loss resulting from poor land, water and forestry management practices in prior decades. The Act outlines the process to establish, fund, dissolve, amalgamate and operate a conservation authority.

The creation of the Act and associated conservation authority model was guided by the following principles:

- Local initiative The process to form a conservation authority must be initiated and supported by municipalities within a common watershed, and that programs be locally driven and supported.
- 2. Cost sharing The costs of the projects should be shared by the municipalities in the authority and the provincial government.
- 3. Watershed jurisdiction Conservation authority jurisdictions would, where possible, follow watershed boundaries.

Conservation authority jurisdictions can be loosely characterized in various ways: rural or urban; southeastern, south-central, or south-western; north or south; or according to revenue or geographic scale. Some conservation authority jurisdictions are less than a full watershed while other conservation authority jurisdictions include multiple watersheds. It is difficult to generalize or to speak about a generic conservation authority as the Act enables a great diversity of organizations in scale and operations, with significant variance in resourcing strategies, board structures, relationships, and local programs and activities.

Incorporation under the Act establishes conservation authorities as a distinct legal entity with a degree of autonomy from the individual municipalities and the province that establish it. Conservation authorities are local public sector organizations similar to hospitals, libraries or school boards – they are not agencies, boards, or commissions of the province.

Section 20 of the *Conservation Authorities Act* sets out the purpose (i.e. objects) of a conservation authority:

The objects of an authority are to establish and undertake, in the area over which it has jurisdiction, a program designed to further the conservatian, restoration, development and management of natural resources ather than gas, oil, coal and minerals.

The objects of an authority define the potential scope of programs and services which may be delivered by a conservation authority within its area of jurisdiction. The scope of potential programs is intentionally broad, providing each individual conservation authority with flexibility to develop local resource management programs which are tailored to suit local geography, needs and priorities. The powers granted to a conservation authority to accomplish its objects are outlined within Section 21 of the Act and include, among other things, the power to study the watershed, acquire lands, enter into agreements, erect works and other structures, and charge fees for services.

Amendments to the Act in 1996 and 1998 scoped MNRF approval of conservation authority projects to those completed with MNRF funding and removed provincial appointees from authority boards. These changes gave conservation authorities and participating municipalities greater flexibility to decide local fiscal and program priorities, develop partnerships, and to charge fees for approved services on a cost recovery basis. The province also introduced provisions for conservation authority amalgamation and dissolution and standardized the authority of conservation authorities to regulate development and other activities.

The Act is supported by regulations that direct conservation authorities in the application of levies, the management of conservation areas, and in regulating development and other activities for purposes of public safety and natural hazard management. The province may also make regulations defining any undefined term appearing in the Act. An overview of regulations established under the *Conservation Authorities Act* has been provided in the Appendix.



# 3. Governance

Conservation authorities are local public sector organizations similar to public health units, hospitals, libraries or school boards – they are not agencies, boards, or commissions of the province as there are no provincial appointees on the authority boards. Under the Act, every authority is established as a corporation governed by a municipally-appointed board of directors. Incorporation under the Act establishes conservation authorities as a distinct legal entity with a degree of autonomy from the individual municipalities and the province that establish it. Under the Act, the board of directors is the conservation authority.

Governance<sup>2</sup> of conservation authorities has always been shared between the province and participating municipalities. The province has the primary responsibility for establishing a conservation authority (at the request of two or more municipalities), defining the powers of a conservation authority and directing and monitoring provincially approved programs. Municipalities, through municipally appointed boards of directors, have the primary responsibility for directing and overseeing conservation authority operations. The board is responsible for setting strategic and operational policies, and directing and providing oversight of the Authority's senior management. Oversight of day-to-day operations is typically delegated to a general manager or chief administrative officer who is responsible for directing authority staff.

# 3.1. Conservation Authority Boards

Each conservation authority is governed by a board of directors whose members are appointed by participating municipalities. Board members decide on the programs and policies of the authority, including strategic direction, operational decisions, procurement, staffing and budgets.

The Act lays out the composition of the conservation authority board and some general operational rules, and requires that each conservation authority have administrative policies in place to guide board operations. The Act does not establish a minimum or maximum number of board members however a meeting of the board must have at least three members in order to achieve quorum.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Governance of public sector organizations involves a set of relationships among an organization's stakeholders, interest groups, citizens, boards, management and the government. These relationships are framed by laws, rules, and requirements, and provide the structure through which the objectives of the organization are defined, operating plans are prepared, performance is monitored, and information is communicated among parties (Institute of Internal Auditors, 2014).



As shown in Figure 2, the number of representatives that each municipality can appoint is based on the population of that municipality within the conservation authority's jurisdiction.<sup>3</sup> Alternatively, the total number of board members of the authority and the number of members that each participating authority may appoint may be determined by an agreement that is confirmed by resolutions passed by the councils of all of the participating municipalities.<sup>4</sup>

There is significant variability in the size of conservation authority boards with some authority boards having as few as five board members while others have as many as 28.<sup>5</sup> Board members must reside in a participating municipality and may be appointed for no more than three years at a time.<sup>6</sup>

# 3.2. Relationship with Municipalities

### Figure 2: Municipal Representation on Conservation Authority Boards

The number of representatives that each municipality can appoint is based on the population of that municipality within the watershed:

Population	Number of representatives
10,000 or less	1
10,000-50,000	2
50,000-100,000	3
100,000-250,000	4
250,000-500,000	5
500,000-1,000,000	6
More than1,000,000	7

The creation of a conservation authority must be initiated by two or more municipalities located within a common watershed.<sup>7</sup> Municipalities who want to establish a conservation authority must petition the province to establish the authority in accordance with the requirements of the *Conservation Authorities Act.* Once an authority is created, it can amalgamate with *o*ther authorities and more municipalities can join without the involvement of the province.<sup>8</sup>

Participating municipalities determine who to appoint to the board as their representative(s).<sup>9</sup> Board members are usually elected municipal councillors; however, any individual may be appointed to the conservation authority board.<sup>10</sup> Municipally-appointed representatives have the authority to vote and generally act on behalf of their municipalities.<sup>11</sup>

Because decisions are made collectively by all the participating municipalities in an authority through the conservation authority board, the amount of control each municipality has over conservation authority decisions varies. For most matters, each representative on the board gets one vote, so that municipalities with a larger number of board representatives (as a result of having larger populations)



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Conservation Authorities Act Section 2.(2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Conservatian Authorities Act Section 14.(2.1)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> As reported by conservation authorities in 2012

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Conservatian Authorities Act Section 14.(3) and Section 14.(4)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Conservotion Authorities Act Section 3.(1)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Conservation Authorities Act Section 10 and Section 11

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Canservation Authorities Act Section 14

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> In 2012, over 80% of board members were municipally-elected officials

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Canservation Authorities Act Section 2.(3)

have a larger share in decision-making. For votes on the budget, votes are weighted so that each municipality has the same proportion of the vote as the proportion of the budget it pays.

The number of participating municipalities within each conservation authority is very diverse – some conservation authorities have more than twenty participating municipalities, while others have only two. In some conservation authorities, one or two municipalities may have the majority of the votes on the board.

## 3.3. Relationship with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry

The process to create, operate and fund a conservation authority is established under the *Conservation Authorities Act* and administered by the MNRF. The province approves the creation and dissolution of a conservation authority, the dissolution requiring input from the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry and the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change. The province designates the participating municipalities in the authority, and the authority's area of jurisdiction. The Act establishes the powers of the board and requires the authority to establish operational and administrative procedures. The MNRF provides a minimum standard for operational and administrative procedures which each board can further update or build on.<sup>12</sup>

While the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry is responsible for overseeing the administration of the Act, he or she has limited authority under the Act to intervene in most regular day-to-day conservation authority activities and decisions. Minister's approval is required for projects partially or fully funded by MNRF through provincial grants, for the sale or lease of lands purchased with provincial funding and for the expropriation of land. The Minister cannot intervene in most local resource management or operational decisions.

Prior to Act amendments in the 1990's, the province played a more direct role in overseeing conservation authorities. The province directed conservation authorities by approving their budgets and all projects, appointing provincial representatives to authority boards, selecting the chair of the board, appointing provincial staff to authority advisory committees, and, when requested by the authority, appointing provincial field officers to direct and coordinate the authority's work. While oversight of conservation authorities is still shared between the province and the municipalities that form the authority, over time, the province has given conservation authorities greater autonomy to direct their own operations providing municipal representatives with a greater role in overseeing conservation authority activities.

# 3.4. Relationship with Other Provincial Ministries

With an investment of nearly 70 years of public funding in infrastructure, capacity, staffing, skills, resources, local knowledge, and land, in addition to local understandings and connections, conservation authorities have become attractive vehicles for delivery of other provincial initiatives at a local level.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Section 30 of the Act requires each conservation authority to develop regulations on board administration. These regulations are approved by the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry.

Recent years have seen an increased role for conservation authorities, individually and collectively, in the delivery of other provincial priorities on behalf of, or in partnership with, other provincial ministries – including, but not limited to – the Ministries of Environment and Climate Change, Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Northern Development and Mines, Infrastructure, Education, and Tourism, Culture and Sport.

Conservation authority program relationships with other provincial ministries have grown over time and may be administered directly by individual ministries through various means (e.g. legislation, contracts, memorandums of understanding, etc.). A conservation authority's relationship with other provincial ministries is largely dependent on common interests and capacity, and on the scope of programs and services delivered by each individual conservation authority.

# 3.5. Relationships with Tribunals

Certain conservation authority decisions may be appealed to the Ontario Mining and Lands Commissioner (OMLC) or the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). The OMLC and OMB are independent adjudicative tribunals that conduct hearings and make decisions on matters appealed under specific pieces of provincial legislation. In general, these tribunals are designed to resolve disputes in an informal, less costly and more timely manner than in the courts. In many instances, these tribunals seek to mediate issues first and practice alternative dispute resolution measures to expedite the resolution of matters thereby avoiding the need for a full hearing.

Decisions that have a provincial interest associated with them are referred to the OMLC. Decisions related more closely to municipal interests are referred to the OMB.

#### **Ontario Mining and Lands Commissioner (OMLC)**

Municipalities may appeal general levy apportionments to the OMLC. To date there have been only a few instances of municipalities appealing their municipal levies or levy apportionments the OMLC. Many of these appeals are resolved without proceeding to a hearing.

A person who has been refused a permit or who objects to conditions imposed on a permit by a conservation authority may appeal permit decisions and conditions to the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry. The Minister has assigned the responsibility for hearing these appeals to the Ontario Mining & Lands Commissioner under the authority of the Ministry of Natural Resources Act.<sup>13</sup>

In 2013 the OMLC received seven applications under the *Conservation Authorities Act* with only one matter heard.<sup>14</sup> The majority of cases (including permit appeals) received during 2013 were resolved in less than three months. There is no cost to filing an appeal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Ministry of Natural Resources Act Section 6.(4)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Office of the Mining and Lands Commissioner, 2013

#### **Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)**

The OMB hears appeals by municipalities of municipal levies for special projects. Under the Act, the OMB also approves salary, expenses or allowances made to the members of the authority board of directors.

# 3.6. Relationship with Conservation Ontario

Conservation Ontario, formally the Association of Conservation Authorities of Ontario, is a non-profit, non-governmental organization that represents Ontario's 36 conservation authorities. On behalf of its members, Conservation Ontario builds strategic partnerships, develops programs and champions collective issues/concerns. Conservation Ontario is overseen by a General Manager and directed by a Council made up of two appointed representatives from each conservation authority that elects a six member Board of Directors from among the council members to oversee the association.

Conservation Ontario seeks to influence policy that affects conservation authorities and to provide collective services to the authorities including corporate communications, policy and program development, government relations, partnership development, research and information, evaluation and reporting, education and training, and the provision of insurance and benefits for conservation authority employees.

Conservation Ontario is funded by dues from each conservation authority supplemented by project funding and contract work.

Conservation Ontario is not established through the Conservation Authorities Act, nor is it governed by the Act. The structure, roles and responsibilities and funding of Conservation Ontario are not part of this review.

# 3.7. Other Accountabilities

Conservation authorities are also governed by other legislative requirements that apply to municipalities, such as the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* and parts of the *Municipal Act*, and laws that apply to corporations and employers. Conservation authorities follow accounting standards for the public sector established by the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB). When reviewing permit appeals, the board of an authority reassembles as a Hearing Board under the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*. Most conservation authorities are also registered charities under federal law and must follow rules for charitable organizations.

When undertaking infrastructure projects, conservation authorities are also subject to *Enviranmental Assessment Act* requirements. Conservation Ontario has developed a Class Environmental Assessment for Remedial Flood and Erosion Control Projects which has been approved by MOECC for conservation authorities to follow when planning remedial flood and erosion control projects.

# 4. Funding Mechanisms

Conservation authority revenue comes from various sources including provincial funding, municipal levies, and self-generated revenue. The total approximate annual revenue of all 36 conservation authorities in 2013 was \$305 million.<sup>15</sup>

As shown in Figure 3, in 2013, municipal levies accounted for roughly 48% of all conservation authority revenue, while self-generated revenue represented 40%, provincial funding represented 10% and federal funding represented 2%.<sup>16</sup> Of the provincial funding provided, roughly 3% was provided by MNRF for natural hazards management, while 4% was provided for Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's source water protection program and 3% was provided for various other special projects.<sup>17</sup>

#### Figure 3: Total Conservation Authority Revenue Sources (2013)



The revenue sources for individual conservation authorities are highly diverse and of variable combinations. For example, in 2013 provincial funding accounted for as much as 58% of one conservation authority's annual revenue and as little as 4% for another. In the same year, self-generated revenue accounted for as much as 71% of one authority's revenue and as little as 10% for another.

Table 1 below shows the variability in conservation authority revenue, area and population. This variability means that each conservation authority has a different capacity and ability to offer a different range of programs and services.

In addition to area and population, conservation authority funding needs vary depending on watershed characteristics such as the amount of hazard land and the potential for flooding, drought, etc. and the number and purpose of water and erosion control structures owned and or operated by the authority.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> As reported by conservation authorities through annual statistics collected by Conservation Ontario

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> As reported by conservation authorities through annual statistics collected by Conservation Ontario

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> source protection funding will be shifting to a steady state



Table 1: Diversity of Conservation Authorities' Revenue, Area and Population<sup>18</sup>

Under the Act, conservation authorities are required to have an annual financial audit with the auditor's report provided to participating municipalities and the MNRF. In terms of expenditures, conservation authorities report spending, in total, roughly 43% on water management, 42% of revenue on land management, 12% on administration and 3% on communications.<sup>19</sup> However, expenditures from one conservation authority to another may vary significantly.

# 4.1. Municipal Levies

The Conservation Autharities Act enables conservation authorities to levy the cost of board-approved programs and services against their participating municipalities. In 2013, participating municipalities provided over \$140 million to conservation authorities through municipal levies.

The levy process is complex. First, a conservation authority budget is established and approved by the board. A portion of the budget is paid for with provincial, federal or self-generated revenue, and the rest

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Revenues shown in Millions of Dollars, Area shown in Hectares, Population shown in Millions

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> As reported by conservation authorities through annual statistics collected by Conservation Ontario

is paid by participating municipalities through municipal levies. The total municipal levy amount is divided up among the participating municipalities according to the benefit each one receives from the authority's services, which is determined in different ways for different types of levies. Levies can be categorized as being for maintenance and administration costs, or for capital and project costs.

For most conservation authorities, the majority of the municipal levy amount is for maintenance and administration costs. These costs represent the administrative and operational funding provided to conservation authorities and is divided among all the municipalities according to a formula set out in regulation.<sup>20</sup> This formula is based on the total value of property within each municipality within an authority's jurisdiction so that municipalities with high land values pay more than those with low land values. The total land value is also modified according to the type of property, so that urban property types such as commercial, industrial and multi-residential are worth more than rural property types like residential, forest or farmland. Conservation authorities and municipalities can also agree on a different method of dividing these costs as an alternative to using the land value formula.<sup>21</sup> How costs are divided (the 'apportionment') can be appealed by a participating municipality to the Ontario Mining and Lands Commissioner.

Capital and project costs may be levied only against certain municipalities who will benefit from the project. The conservation authority determines how these costs are divided. This apportionment can be appealed by municipalities to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Additional rules under Ontario Regulation 139/96 (Municipal Levies) also apply to any levies for costs that are not shared with the Province. These additional rules include weighted voting: each municipality gets the same percentage of the vote on the levy as the percentage of the total municipal levy that it pays.

# 4.2. Self-Generated Revenue

Conservation authorities can also generate their own revenue through various means including:

- earned revenues on a 'cost recovery' basis (contracts, fees for service, permits (campsites, entrance fees) related to conservation areas);
- earned income on a 'for profit' basis (rentals, sales, sales of land, resource development such as logging, hydroelectric production);
- commercial/industrial sector partnerships including businesses (gift shops) and joint contracts for resource development (generating hydro-electric power etc.); and
- private sector funding from individuals, corporations and foundations (fundraising, gifts, donations, sponsorships etc.).

In most cases, self-generated revenue may be used at the discretion of the authority board for any board-approved conservation authority program.<sup>22</sup> Additional rules apply to the use of revenue generated through the disposition of conservation authority property.<sup>23</sup> In 2013, self-generated revenue accounted for over \$120 million in conservation authority revenue.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> As set out in Ontario Regulation 670/00 (Conservation Authority Levies)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Ontario Regulation670/00 Section 2.(1)(a)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Policies and Procedures for the Treatment of Conservation Authority Generated Revenue

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Policies and Procedures for the Disposition of Conservation Authority Property

#### Fees for Service

Subsection 21(m.1) of the Act gives conservation authorities the power to charge fees for services. The Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry determines which services conservation authorities may charge fees for. The Minister has given conservation authorities approval to charge fees for permitting services, plan reviews, extension services (e.g. technical advice/ implementation of erosion control measures, technical studies etc.), education services (e.g., tours, presentations, workshops etc.), and any service under other legislation authorized under agreement with the lead ministry.<sup>24</sup>

The MNRF's policies and procedures require each conservation authority to have a fees policy in place which includes a fee schedule, a process for public notification about the establishment of or any proposed changes to fee schedules, a clearly defined review and revision process, and a process for appeals for fees that are proposed or in place.<sup>25</sup>

For planning, and compliance-oriented activities such as regulatory or permitting services, the fee structures should be designed to recover but not exceed the costs associated with administering and delivering the services on a program basis.<sup>26</sup>

While the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry approves the services which conservation authorities may charge fees for, fee amounts are set by individual conservation authorities. Costs vary from authority to authority for the provision of certain services so therefore the fee structures of conservation authorities may vary from one conservation authority to another. Through MNRF policy, conservation authorities are encouraged to review neighbouring conservation authorities' fee structures when developing or updating their own structure.<sup>27</sup>

#### Fundraising

Most conservation authorities also receive funding from individuals, corporations and foundations through fundraising, gifts, donations and sponsorship. Additionally, conservation authorities provide many opportunities for in-kind donations to the organization such as volunteer services.

### 4.3. Provincial Funding

Conservation authorities receive and may apply for funding from the province to support provinciallymandated activities and local projects.

The province provides conservation authorities with funding for provincially mandated programs – including the hazards management program funded by MNRF and the source water protection program funded by MOECC.

The MNRF's hazard management program is funded through two separate transfer payments.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Policies ond Procedures for the Charging of Conservation Authority Fees (1997) – Section 5.1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Policies ond Procedures for the Chorging of Conservation Authority Fees (1997) Section 5.2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Policies and Procedures for the Chorging of Conservation Authority Fees (1997) Section 5.3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Policies and Procedures for the Chorging of Conservation Authority Fees (1997) Section 5.5

Since 2000, MNRF has provided over \$7 million in Section 39 transfer payments annually to conservation authorities to support the approved programs in natural hazard management and public safety. The provincial funds support flood and erosion control operations and maintenance, flood forecasting and warning, ice management, and the authorities' review of Official Plans and Plan Amendments for consistency with natural hazard policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), natural hazards technical studies and administration.

The amount each conservation authority receives from MNRF is a fixed amount based on an average of 1990's operational costs and must be matched by municipal contributions through municipal levies. The MNRF amount provided to each conservation authority was reduced from \$7.6 million annually to \$7.4 million annually in 2011.

Additional funding for natural hazard management is also provided to conservation authorities through MNRF's Water and Erosion Control Infrastructure (WECI) transfer payment program. Since 2003, MNRF has provided conservation authorities with \$5 million annually in capital funding (with a temporary two year reduction to \$2.5M from 2012-14) to invest in major repairs and studies of existing conservation authority-owned or operated water and erosion control infrastructure. This project funding supports conservation authorities in ensuring the safe operation and maintenance of their dams and water control infrastructure. These funds are matched by participating municipalities involved, for an annual investment in water and erosion control infrastructure of \$10 million. The WECI funding program is an application-based program that funds the highest priority projects each year.

Conservations authorities may also receive funding from other federal departments and provincial agencies through transfer payments to implement programs or projects related to other government priorities established under other pieces of legislation.

For example, the Province (through MNRF and MOECC) has provided over \$220 million since 2004 in funding to conservation authorities to fulfill their duties as Source Protection Authorities under the *Clean Water Act*. Funding was used for capacity building, technical studies, and water budgets, and supported source protection committees and authorities in developing the province's first science-based source protection plans for local watersheds. Future levels of funding are expected to move to a steady state once current source protection plans are approved.

Additional funding may be provided to conservations authorities in support of special projects on a project by project or application basis. For example, conservation authorities may receive funding for projects from both the provincial and federal government under the Canada-Ontario Agreement on Great Lakes Water Quality and Ecosystem Health funding program.

# 5. Roles and Responsibilities

The objects of a conservation authority, under the *Conservation Authorities Act*, are to establish and undertake a program to further the conservation, restoration, development and management of natural resources other than gas, oil, coal and minerals. The Act defines the potential scope of programs and services which may be delivered by a conservation authority within its area of jurisdiction. The scope of potential programs is intentionally broad, providing each individual conservation authority with flexibility to develop local resource management programs which are tailored to meet local geography, needs and priorities.

Current roles and responsibilities for conservation authorities fall under the five broad headings outlined below.

### 5.1. Local Resource Management Agency

The *Conservation Authorities Act* provides conservation authorities with the authority to develop local resource management programs or projects that suit local needs and geography. The scope afforded to projects in the Act under S. 20 is broad – anything to "further the conservation, restoration, development and management of natural resources other than gas, oil, coal and minerals." The scale of the authority projects and programs is determined at the local level, decided on by the board.



Collectively through their local programs, conservation authorities play an important role in resource management and environmental protection through stewardship, conservation land acquisition and management, recreation, education, and science and research. These programs may include tree planting, habitat rehabilitation and restoration, water quality improvement and water supply management, ground water monitoring, education and outreach, heritage conservation, management of conservation areas, information management, data collection and mapping, monitoring and the development of technical studies, watershed plans and the development of natural heritage strategies. Every conservation authority board-approved local resource management program is unique, offering a different suite of programs designed to reflect local needs and priorities. Conservation authority local programs are often supported by community volunteers. In 2012 over 37,000 people volunteered to support more than

700 local conservation authority projects.<sup>28</sup>

Conservation authorities also have a role in local resource management as land owners. Conservation authorities have accumulated large land holdings within their jurisdictions through property acquisition, eco-gifting and land conveyances. Conservation authority owned land is considered private land under the *Planning Act*. Some of these lands are operated by the authorities for educational and recreational purposes, for conservation or protection reasons and also for income generation. Conservation authorities may develop their lands to support local programs, or may maintain lands in a natural state in order to protect them and provide ecological and natural hazard management benefits to the public. Conservation authorities may also act as interested parties on development applications near their landholdings. In addition, because of their proximity to watercourses, conservation authorities own or control lands that have a high concentration of cultural heritage resources.

Board-approved local resource management programs may be funded by municipal levies, selfgenerated revenue, or through a contract with another organization. In areas of the province where conservation authorities have not been established, local resource management programs may be developed and administered directly by municipalities.

# 5.2. MNRF Approved Projects under the Act

Section 24 of the Act requires conservation authorities to obtain MNRF approval for projects that are funded by MNRF through the Act. The project that the Minister currently approves under the Act for all conservation authorities is related to public safety and natural hazard management. The increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events associated with climate change has further underscored the importance of this role in protecting persons and property from water-related natural hazards including flooding and drought.

All conservation authorities implement a shared provincial/ municipal program in public safety and natural hazard management. As part of their role in implementing the shared provincial/ municipal program in public safety and natural hazard management, conservation authorities own and or operate over 900 flood control structures including 256 dams, and numerous engineered channels, dykes and erosion control works. Under this shared provincial/ municipal program, conservation authorities also undertake flood forecasting and warning and ice management. To support these and other programs (e.g. hazard input into municipal planning), conservation authorities may also collect and prepare technical data related to natural hazards in their jurisdiction.

As part of the MNRF natural hazard program, the MNRF has delegated to conservation authorities the responsibility for representing the "Provincial Interest" for natural hazard policies (s.3.1) of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (2014) under the *Planning Act* through a Memorandum of Understanding between the MNRF, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) and Conservation Ontario. This delegation does not occur under the *Conservation Authorities Act*. Conservation authorities are to comment on municipal planning policy and site plan applications submitted as part of the <u>Provincial One-Window Plan Review Service</u> to ensure consistency with the natural hazard policies of the PPS (2014). Where MMAH is not the approval authority conservation authorities still perform this role under the Municipal Plan Review. Conservation authority comments

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> As reported by conservation authorities through annual statistics collected by Conservation Ontario

are to be made based on MNRF's *Natural Hazard Technical Guides* (2002) which were developed to support the PPS policies. When undertaking this role conservation authorities are guided by *Planning Act* definitions (e.g. for development, hazardous sites, etc.) and not by definitions under the *Conservation Authorities Act*.

The natural hazard program is funded by the MNRF through provincial grants and transfer payments, and cost shared with municipalities. In areas of the province without conservation authorities natural hazards are managed by municipalities under the natural hazard policies of the PPS and flood forecasting and warning responsibilities are undertaken by MNRF.

# 5.3. Regulatory Authority

Each conservation authority has a provincially-approved 'Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses' regulation developed under section 28 of the *Conservation Authorities Act*. Conservation authorities are responsible for regulating development within the regulatory limits described within their respective regulations. In areas of the province without conservation authorities development in hazardous areas is managed by municipalities under the natural hazard policies of the PPS. Conservation authorities' regulatory role is primarily funded through the use of permitting fees and municipal levies.

Under these regulations, conservation authorities are responsible for regulating development and other activities through a permitting process for purposes of natural hazard management. Regulated activities are:

- Development in areas related to water-related natural hazards such as floodplains, shorelines, wetlands and hazardous lands.<sup>29</sup> Under the Act, conservation authorities must consider development applications based on potential impacts to the control of water-related natural hazards which includes flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or the conservation of land; and,
- Interference with or alterations to a watercourse or wetland.

In order to the implement the approved regulation, the authority board sets regulatory policies and practices.

The Conservatian Authorities Act regulation authority was expanded through Act amendments in 1998, and enacted through the 'generic' regulation approved by the province in 2004 and updated individual regulations approved by the Minister in 2006. The updated regulations require conservation authorities to regulate additional water related hazards such as unstable soils and bedrock, erosion and dynamic beaches. MNRF technical support for the regulations is provided through the *Guidelines for Developing Schedules of Regulated Areas* (2005) and the MNRF *Natural Hazards Technical Guides* (2002) developed for the PPS natural hazard policies.

Under the Act, a person who has been refused a permit or who objects to conditions imposed on a permit by a conservation authority may appeal permit decisions and conditions to the Minister of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Hazardous lands is defined in the *Conservation Authorities Act* under S.28 (25) as land that could be unsafe for development because of naturally occurring processes associated with flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or unstable soil or bedrock

Natural Resources and Forestry. The Minister has assigned the responsibility for hearing these appeals to the Ontario Mining & Lands Commissioner.

In 2010, MNRF released the *Policies & Procedures for Conservation Authority Plan Review & Permitting* <u>Activities</u> - a new policy for conservation authorities to clarify and provide best practices for their roles under the *Planning Act* and in the municipal planning process and in their regulatory authority under the *Conservation Authorities Act*. This policy was developed with the assistance of a multi-ministry, multistakeholder committee (the Conservation Authorities Liaison Committee) co-chaired by the MNRF and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and was made up of representatives from the building industry, municipalities, conservation authorities and environmental organizations.

# 5.4. Roles under Other Provincial Legislation

Conservation authorities may be assigned responsibilities under other pieces of provincial legislation. For example, under the *Clean Water Act*, conservation authorities were assigned the duties and responsibilities of source protection authorities. In addition, the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act* assigns the local conservation authority – the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority – a key role in implementing the policies in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan in collaboration with the province, municipalities and others.

In many of these other legislative roles, conservation authorities are a commenting agency and are required to receive notice of proposals made under other pieces of legislation including the *Planning Act*, the *Niagora Escarpment Planning and Development Act*, the *Enviranmental Assessment Act* and the *Aggregates Resources Act*. In these roles, conservation authorities base any comments on board-approved policies that the authority has developed as a local resource management agency. Under the *Planning Act* as a public body and local board, conservation authorities can comment on and appeal municipal planning documents on a range of other PPS policies as directed by conservation authority board-approved policy. This more general PPS policy commenting role is distinct from the MNRF delegated commenting role related specifically to the PPS natural hazards policies.

# 5.5. Service Providers

Under the Act, every authority is a corporation, and as such has the inherent capacity to undertake responsibilities requiring an incorporated organization to accomplish. With an investment of nearly 70 years of public funding in infrastructure, capacity, staffing, skills, resources, local knowledge, connections in resource manage, and common interests, these organizations are attractive vehicles for delivery of initiatives of others whether by agreement or through a contract.

Conservation authorities may enter into agreements with others as may be necessary to carry out a project. As a result conservation authorities may have service agreements or contracts with federal and provincial government agencies and partnering municipalities or others (e.g. school boards, public health units, etc.) to perform a variety of services or tasks.

Some conservation authorities may have roles and responsibilities related to joint federal/ provincial interests such as supporting Environment Canada in implementing the Canada-United States Great

Lakes Water Quality Agreement and working with federal and provincial agencies as well as local groups to restore community waterfronts and Great Lakes "Areas of Concern." Some conservation authorities may be undertaking projects funded under the Canada-Ontario Agreement on Great Lakes Water Quality and Ecosystem Health.

Some conservation authorities provide additional technical services to municipalities through service agreements. Types of services could include data collection and scientific expertise related to natural resource management, stormwater management, identifying natural heritage features and systems on behalf of their municipalities, and or reviewing natural heritage evaluations in support of municipal assessment of *Planning Act* applications or environmental assessments. Under an agreement with a municipality, an authority may assume a regulatory responsibility such as administering municipal tree cutting bylaws or septic system approvals or undertake technical reviews pursuant to the *Planning Act* <u>One Window Plan Review Service</u> on parts of planning policy or site plan applications.



# 6. Summary and Questions for Discussion

The following questions are intended to help focus the discussion. They are organized around the areas of review outlined in Section 1:

- 1. *Governance* the processes, structures, and accountability frameworks within the Act which direct conservation authority decision-making and operations;
- 2. Funding the mechanisms put in place by the Act to fund conservation authorities; and
- 3. *Roles and Responsibilities* the roles and associated responsibilities that the Act enables conservation authorities to undertake.

The questions are general in nature and intended to prompt discussion on a number of focused areas and are not intended to discourage readers from raising questions or providing comments in other areas. Where possible, please provide specific examples and/ or links to supporting information.

### 6.1. Governance

Conservation authorities are governed by the *Conservation Authorities Act* and by a board of directors appointed by the municipalities that form the authority. The province, through the Act, defines the objectives to be pursued by the authority and the power granted to the authority to achieve these objectives. The activities undertaken by conservation authorities in the pursuit of their objectives are directed by a municipally appointed board of directors. Municipal representatives to conservation authority boards are directly accountable to the municipalities that appoint them and conservation authorities must abide by provincial legislative, regulatory and policy requirements.

In the past, the province played a more direct role in overseeing conservation authorities. The province directed conservation authorities by approving their budgets and programs, appointing provincial representatives to authority boards, selecting the chair of the board and, when requested by the authority, by appointing provincial field officers to direct and coordinate the authority's work. The provincial government was involved in approving projects and activities, and monitoring and reviewing conservation authority programs. While oversight of conservation authorities is still shared between the province and the municipalities that form the authorities, changes to the Act, policy and general practice over time have resulted in less direct provincial oversight. These changes have provided conservation authority activities. It has also afforded conservation authority staff greater freedom to make proposals for programming and research for the board's collective review. Because decisions are made collectively by all the participating municipalities in an authority through the board, the amount of control each municipality has over conservation authority decisions varies.

At the same time, conservation authorities are developing new, and enhancing existing, relationships with other provincial ministries and other partners. In some cases, these relationships are managed

through other legislative frameworks, such as through the *Clean Water Act* and the *Lake Simcoe Protection Act*. In other cases these relationships are managed on a project-by-project or authority-byauthority basis by a contract or MOU. There are no processes, standards or tools within the *Conservotion Authorities Act* or supporting framework governing these relationships.

It is difficult to generalize or to speak about a generic conservation authority as the result of the Act has been to enable a great diversity of organizations in scale and operations and capacity, with variance in resourcing or funding and funding strategies, board structures and the level of direct accountability to and interest of municipalities varies.

# **QUESTION #1:** In your view, how well is the current governance model as provided in the Conservation Authorities Act working?

- a. What aspects of the current governance model are working well?
- b. What aspects of the current governance model are in need of improvement?
- c. In terms of governance, what should be expected of:
  - a. The board and its members?
  - b. The general manager or chief administrative officer?
  - c. Municipalities?
  - d. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry?
  - e. Other provincial ministries?
  - f. Others?
- d. How should the responsibility for oversight of conservation authorities be shared between the province and municipalities?
- e. Are there other governance practices or tools that could be used to enhance the existing governance model?

### 6.2. Funding Mechanisms

The Conservation Authorities Act establishes a number of mechanisms which conservation authorities can use to fund their activities. The Act allows the MNRF to provide conservation authorities with funding to support Ministry approved programs. As a corporate body, conservation authorities may also receive or apply for funding from the province to deliver programs on its behalf. Local resource management programs and services can be funded through municipal levies and conservation authorities can self-generate revenue through service and user fees, resource development and fundraising.

Conservation authority revenue across Ontario's 36 conservation authorities is as varied as the programs and services offered by each authority. While the province provides all conservation authorities with funding towards approved natural hazards activities, the ability of each conservation authority to deliver other programs and services largely depends on the ability of each authority to

locally fund programs and services. Conservation authorities with large populations within their jurisdictions generally have a greater tax base to draw from, as well as more opportunities for self-generated revenue, so they can offer more programs and services at a lower per capita cost.

In addition, conservation authority funding needs vary depending on the size of their respective jurisdictions, population levels, watershed characteristics (such as the amount of hazard land and the potential for flood, drought, etc.) and the number and purpose of water and erosion control structures owned and/ or operated by the conservation authority.

**QUESTION #2:** In your view, how are the programs and services delivered by conservation authorities best financed?

- a. How well are the existing funding mechanisms outlined within the Act working?
- b. What changes to existing funding mechanisms would you like to see if any?
- c. Which funding mechanisms, or combination of funding mechanisms, are best able to support the long term sustainability of conservation authorities?
- d. Are there other revenue generation tools that should be considered?

### 6.3. Roles and Responsibilities

The *Conservation Authorities Act* enables conservation authorities to undertake a wide range of activities on behalf of provincial, municipal and other interests through several roles. These roles have been enabled through the Act, and the responsibilities have followed. Conservation authorities are the only resource management agencies in Ontario that are organized on a watershed basis.

The Act provides conservation authorities with the power to develop their own suite of programs and services tailored to the capacity and expertise of each individual authority and the local needs and interests they serve. This flexibility allows conservation authorities, and the municipalities that fund them, to focus their resources on areas of greatest need to the local population. It also results in variability in the scale and range of programs and services delivered by any individual conservation authority. Some conservation authorities offer a basic program primarily focused on stewardship, conservation land acquisition and management, recreation, education, and science and research. Other conservation authorities may offer the same programming at a much broader scale and complexity in addition to a wider range of programs that can include, for example, promotion of green infrastructure, development of strategies such as natural heritage strategies, land acquisitions strategies, and extensive watershed and water management planning. Some conservation authorities invest in resource development initiatives such as hydroelectric generation, large scale waterfront developments in lake fills, and income generation projects such as marina operation, cottage rentals and ski hills.

Recent years have seen an increased interest in reviewing conservation authority roles in resource management in Ontario. The Commission on the Reform of Ontario's Public Service in particular called on the province to undertake a review of the programs and services delivered by both the MNRF and conservation authorities to clarify responsibilities and eliminate any duplication. Other concerns have been raised regarding the lack of clarity in the scope of conservation authority roles and responsibilities especially in relation to municipalities and the province. Specifically questions have been raised

regarding conservation authorities' regulatory role and the intention of the regulations, with some key regulatory terms undefined in legislation (e.g. conservation of land and interference with a wetland).

QUESTION #3: In your view, what should be the role of conservation authorities in Ontario?

- a. What resource management programs and activities may be best delivered at the watershed scale?
- b. Are current roles and responsibilities authorized by the *Conservation Authorities Act* appropriate? Why or why not? What changes, if any, would you like to see?
- c. How may the impacts of climate change affect the programs and activities delivered by conservation authorities? Are conservation authorities equipped to deal with these effects?
- d. Is the variability in conservation authorities' capacity and resourcing to offer a range of programs and services a concern? Should there be a standard program for all authorities to deliver? Why or why not?
- e. What are some of the challenges facing conservation authorities in balancing their various roles and responsibilities? Are there tools or other changes that would help with this?
- f. Are there opportunities to improve consistency in service standards, timelines and fee structures? What are the means by which consistency can be improved? What are some of the challenges in achieving greater consistency in these areas?

### 6.4. Other Areas of Interest

Broad input is critically important to ensure that a range of perspectives, opinions and ideas are collected. While we encourage respondents to focus on the discussion questions provided above we welcome feedback on additional areas.

**QUESTION #4:** Are there any other areas, questions or concerns regarding the Conservation Authorities Act or conservation authorities in general that you feel should be considered as part of the review?

# 7. How to Provide Input

We want to hear from you. If you have comments or suggestions that should be considered in the review of the *Conservation Authorities Act*, please take advantage of this opportunity to provide us with your feedback. All comments received in response to this discussion paper will be read and considered in moving forward.

### Send us your comments

We strongly encourage your participation in the discussion. Written comments can be provided by:

Responding to the Environmental Bill of Rights Registry posting by searching the EBR Registry number 012-4509 on the following website: <u>www.ontario.ca/EBR</u>

Or

Emailing us at: mnrwaterpolicy@ontario.ca

Or

Submitting answers to the questions outlined in this paper through: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/caactdiscussionpaper

The deadline for providing comments is October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Comments collected in response to this discussion paper will be used to inform decisions regarding whether or not to pursue changes to Ontario's existing legislative, regulatory and policy framework for conservation authorities. The review of individual conservation authorities, the specific programs and services they deliver, and site-specific permit applications and permitting decisions are not within scope of the Ministry's review.

All Ontarians are encouraged to learn more about Ontario's conservation authorities and the important role that they play in resource management and environmental protection.

To find out more about conservation authorities and the programs and services they provide please visit:

https://www.ontario.ca/environment-and-energy/conservation-authorities
To locate your local conservation authority please visit: <u>http://www.conservation-ontario.on.ca/about-us/conservation-authorities/ca-contact-list</u>



## References

Commission on the Reform of Ontario's Public Services. (2012). *Public Services for Ontarians: A Path to Sustainability and Excellence*. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.fin.gov.on.ca/en/reformcommission/">http://www.fin.gov.on.ca/en/reformcommission/</a>

Government of Ontario. (1990). *Conservation Authorities Act*. (R.S.O. 1990, Chapter C.27) <u>http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws\_statutes\_90c27\_e.htm</u>

Government of Ontario. (1997). Conservation Authorities Policies and Procedures Manual.

Government of Ontario. (2010). *Policies and Procedures for Conservation Authority Plan Review and Permitting Activities*. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.web2.mnr.gov.on.ca/mnr/water\_erb/CALC\_Chapter Final\_Apr23\_Final.pdf">http://www.web2.mnr.gov.on.ca/mnr/water\_erb/CALC\_Chapter Final\_Apr23\_Final.pdf</a>

Government of Ontario. (2014). *Provincial Policy Statement*. Retrieved from <u>http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=10463</u>

Institute of Internal Auditors. (2014). Assessing Organizational Governance in the Public Sector. Retrieved from http://www.ontariocanada.com/registry/downloads/Ontario%20Regulatory%20Policy.pdf

Office of the Mining and Lands Commissioner. (2013). *Annual Report*. Retrieved from <u>https://dr6j45jk9xcmk.cloudfront.net/documents/4271/omlc-annual-report-2013-2014-en.pdf</u>

Appendices

## **List of Conservation Authorities**

Conservation Authority	Acronym*
Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority	ABCA
Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority	CRCA
Catfish Creek Conservation Authority	CCCA
Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority	CLOCA
Credit Valley Conservation Authority	CVC
Crowe Valley Conservation Authority	CVCA
Essex Region Conservation Authority	ERCA
Ganaraska Region Conservation Authority	GRCA
Grand River Conservation Authority	Grand RCA
Grey Sauble Conservation Authority	GSCA
Halton Region Conservation Authority	Halton RCA
Hamilton Region Conservation Authority	HRCA
Kawartha Region Conservation Authority	KRCA
Kettle Creek Conservation Authority	KCCA
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority	LSRCA
Lakehead Region Conservation Authority	LRCA
Long Point Region Conservation Authority	LPRCA
Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority	LTVCA
Lower Trent Region Conservation Authority	LTCA
Maitland Valley Conservation Authority	MVCA
Mattagami Region Conservation Authority	MRCA
Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	MVC
Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority	NPCA
Nickel District Conservation Authority	NDCA
North Bay-Mattawa Conservation Authority	NBMCA
Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	NVCA
Otonabee Region Conservation Authority	ORCA
Quinte Conservation Authority	QCA
Raisin Region Conservation Authority	RRCA
Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	RVCA
Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority	SVCA
Sault Ste. Marie Region Conservation Authority	SSMRCA
South Nation River Conservation Authority	SNRCA
St. Clair Region Conservation Authority	SCRCA
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	TRCA
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	UTRCA

\*As used within this Discussion Paper

# **List of Conservation Authority Regulations**

Conservation authority activities are guided by a series of regulations established under the Act.

**Section 27 (2) O. Reg. 670/00 Conservation Authority Levies Regulation.** Outlines means for determining apportionment by the conservation authority of the levy payable by a participating municipality for maintenance costs on the basis of the benefit derived each municipality, either by agreement or using 'modified current value assessment' under the Assessment Act.

Section 27 (3) O. Reg. 139/96 Municipal Levies Regulation. LGIC regulation that outlines how 'nonmatching' municipal levies are decided with a 'weighted' vote at a conservation authority board Meeting convened to do so.

Section 28 (6) O. Reg. 97/04 - Content of Conservation Authority Regulations under subsection 28 (1) of the Act Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses. Lieutenant Governor in Council regulation governing the content of regulations made by authorities including flood event standards and other standards that may be used, and setting out what must be included or excluded from regulations made by the authorities and approved by the Minister.

Section 28 O. Regs. 42/06, 146/06-182/06, 319/09, – Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation. Regulation enables conservation authorities to regulate development in areas prone to water-based natural hazards (i.e. shorelines, floodplains, wetlands) for impacts to the control of the water-based hazards (i.e. flooding and erosion) or for changing or 'interfering' with a watercourse or wetland for purposes of public safety and natural hazard prevention and management.

Section 29 O. Regs. 98/90 -136/90 – Conservation Areas Regulation. Discretionary regulation applies to conservation areas owned & operated by the conservation authority, outlines prohibited activities or activities requiring a permit and rules of use (i.e. control of animals, vehicles, with provisions for enforcement).

Section 30 "Mandatory Regulations'- All conservation authorities were required to make regulations outlining administration functions of the board. Originally Minister approved, these regulations are now 'by-laws' which can be amended without Minister approval if amendments conform to the approved generic template provided to conservation authorities in 1985.

**Section 40 Regulations.** The province may make regulations defining any term that is used in the *Conservatian Authorities Act* and that is not defined in the Act. This regulation making authority has not yet been used.

Atkinson Farms Ltd. 705257 County Rd 21 Melancthon ON L9V 2A2

July 16, 2015

Township of Melancthon 157101 Highway 10 Melancthon ON L9V 2E6

Attention: Members of Council

I am requesting renewal of our agreement regarding the location of a pump and associated equipment and piping on road allowance between Concessions 2 and 3 Old Survey, Township of Melancthon, from and including Lot 31 southbound to and including Lot 28 for irrigation purposes. All guidelines and restrictions remain the same.

Yours truly,

Non Attrate

Marc Atkinson Atkinson Farms Ltd.

**RECU/RECEIVED** - 6 -07- 2015 To Tounship of melanethon Committee of adjustment Page 1 File No B4/15 Proposed severance-Part Lot 32 Concession 3NE agriculture - agriculture Los line seems to have moved. Original NO1. los linetpence matched mine, Now fincs is further east. School house was on the new flower led. There was only small distance from old school to fence on east. Twent there for eight us and often was on that side and sat there in shale of these force upon of where it is now isthe . 3 hectars changed. If another house goes up in furture or added on it should be built on. 3 hectors. If more al distance uill change to proposed Building site (shop). Two houses not allowed on some property I would like 2nd house gov bedand breakfast brussiness which trendeque of bearing unabrosed bailing as ployed my farm. There are a lot of primary shops in nelanethon example one Marcoat enterpies 238480 Fie no. -7 on Rd 4th line NE which should read. 4th line SE. County Rd 2 goes North. 4th line melanthon goes south at that corner). The hulding istoo large when pasted by concel and still is large by your hy laws My property open to my grandfathers day. Dave Patterson. We have had 5 generations walk on this land. My grandfather was Act2-AUG 1 3 2015

Page 2. not allowed a Black Smith Shop on this property. so he had his shop in Dunals, My grandmather had a millenary shop above Hills store I now appartments + pizza place lunere she second + manufactured dothing Bolistranceled by hower buggy surgering to work. Why is council notusing space of Horningsmills Dundalle, ov. Shellowne Trodustrial sites Or creating a central Industrial gone where one hand roads used not wraking al reads Where safety is a must, hazard moterial stored \* used properly a no children on property. How many on farm Ireanices are there in Melandhon -7 ounship now. How many on farm business daryou plan to pass -72 before you declare we have enough. This is prime agriculture being used Lot 32 con. 3NE is already agriculture which is used to dispose of Turbery boros + carcasso, legs unngs etc. No 2. These large loved are not broke down by Large manuse spreader layon top of ground for ferlitizer. They are from larget usbay barn on their property. I can see ones on field when spreading. These fields have run off water mencipal dream which flows to did by at mp athys dreiver therinto Heard Bien ad bidge on County Rd 9. This is a huge Casel ai Tring Bonar Kot Ung Justa W. europ Blach German Low mak orrash ent. elim'L' mark ly a request of Unent I da Hoover which Delmar

Brown Thit not followed across Hoover property. Pare 3. Water from rere plousito grand river which does not need to have pollection from Tubey barn and shop comicals used for manufacturing. This molecular housed as hours and marken any severance takes place. Atwood dead animal provide Sins for proper despose. Thaveto use my green In for household waster this is a larger amound. Tell me why this has been allaced + how \_\_\_\_ long will if continue NO3. Proposed entrace should be wide to acconnate large trucks strailers. There is already entrance to this Rand in addition to the house entrance on. 3 hectare. Ttisto the west of house near large apple trees. also there is a clearle entrance to field next to reightow Dolman Brown. These entrances all are on County Rd. 9 prothinde. This detch waterplow runs east on noth side road to County Rd 2. This should be on your map I Degal entrance to be removed lefor severance. This entrance ling used now there is no tile culred Plus never -7 Would you address to proper people" Removed" No 4. Thoreased Troffic flow Wilsthere be more Tractor trailerstrarelling on melancthan Line 2 sideroad This readisnot usal enough no shalderallasance 53ft traders are nootravelling this soad no signs saying large truck travel plus hill &

Page 4 hidden entrance as hill tap. These trucks travel 1/2 load season with manufactured goods . Winter time there was 3 in detablon melanethon rederoad line 2 down from crossoad Caunty Rdq. Ditch Jotal a work ai erent leaber what no geen a lot of tractor trailers, cube wand, tandem delivery trucks pick up trucks & trailers picking up & delivering histomore cientifo tol D. Emet printer of marcial + loieton war and vertano angle in motion + final product being shipped. I have counted 10 truches on this road line 2 will be on the for a chourt Do you run road counter on those serion day roads Will manufaiting goods travel lach & forth lituan -2 forms on AyRaq+ melanchowline 2. This shop will make 3" manufacturing, on farm Jusiness for Owen + alma 200ver Those goods will not travel by stiel steer with large hay wagen attached as I have seens. -> | are roads going to be graded more and pot holes filled and calcium applied. As they are now this is not done a lot of holes a sign should be roads used by tractor trailer use an our risk ho shoulders or based share road douise marine Hall states \$ 100.000 is required to repain 1 belometer of read + that 14 shops would be required to repaired to less pokersone spite alim I marth This was in Dundals. Herold.

Hages

リ

## Dundalk Herald WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 2015

# Letter to the Editor

I am writing in regards to the article published in the Wednesday, June 24th edition of the Dundalk Herald concerning the increasing and numerous fabricating shops approved by council.

Brian Milne said that it provides a good tax base. Any "extra" tax dollars (on average \$7,000 annually) are nowhere close to what is required for the roads budget, as it costs \$100,000 to repair every kilometre of road. Put another way; the township would need the revenue from 14 shops to rehabilitate less than 1 mile of road. Shops are up to 750 square meters or 8,070 square feet which is equal to six houses.

Karl Chittka believes the vehement protests are due to the applicants being from the Mennonite community. I would like to clarify that it makes absolutely no difference if the shops belong to Baptists, Rastafarians or Buddhists.

It is the shops themselves that residents of this township

scress).

anneoon

wno

Ten are these on

JANE,

aw no

oppose because of the noise, the pollution, the increased traffic (because shop A will weld, then shop B will paint, then shop C will perform another task), which causes great damage to our roads as well as the loss of precious fertile land that once grew the food we put on our tables.

The fabricated products, such as large industrial waste bins, 5,000 gallon fuel tanks and car part racking to name but a few, are manufactured under the guise of "farm use." They leave the area for points south; they are not utilised or made available for local ag operations. The revenue these shops receive is most definitely not "secondary nor does it merely subsidize the family, it is primary.

It makes no sense, and there is not one good reason, to have these shops scattered about the countryside when there is an underutilised industrial area in Dundalk where the factories could be situated, together. -Louise Morfitt Hall

bangin

so lenno

 $\alpha \gg \infty$ 

phone number of by law officer

the ent

an

antos

Normero

R.R. #2 Dundalk

server inforced

ADec)

Ly proc

#### Page 7

Page 6. Lack to you. The Marcood exterpine Irilding is still to large noted by council not following their own by laws Wildlife trail ison land cons. 3 lot 32, it also goes through my farm. This bail has been used since my grandfathers day. Deer, Jokes rakts, wild turkey sugers use this trail No 7. 13 cyctes were short by local hunters last unter not far from this trail. There is a den of fores in histiletind my farmand cootes I would like address of The Frist Matire Indeans rear by . Deerin hay fields. who rule over the grand River. Thankyou for your time and consideration. Tremain Carol Hawton Cot31 M elameton

RECU/RECEIVED - 8 -07- 2015 J. hyon Melanctuon ON

July 8/2015

Township of Melancthon 157101 Highway 10 Melancthon ON LOV 2FB

Council Men, bers

Ne: Magased Severence Part hot 32 Con 3 NE Moratorium on any Juture applications for on-farm shops

## A. Proposed Severance

I request that consent for the proposed severance be derived. The main reasons for this request are set out below.

1. As inrefutably set out in the diggnam provided with the Notice, the primary purpose of this severance is to provide a land platform on which to locate an one-farm shap. The PPS is very specific respecting the creation of lots in prime aquicultural areas. Lots may only be created for aquicultural uses. hocating a shop on the new lot is not consistent with the PPS. I would further add that any new lot created under this provision must large the restriction. For agricultural use only. 2. The new lot is not of a fize sufficient to be viable for the type of agriculture common in this area; a requirement of the PPS. It is noted that the County OP sets out a minimum lot size of 100 acres for the Green Belt. On AFRA (chaft Guidelines) goes fiether and puts forth this minimum for mon general applicability livestock and cash crop operations are the dominant. forms of agriculture.

The original land survey, completed in the 19th century, that sets out 50 acre lots in some parts of the Township has little relevance to the land requirements of modern agriculture. In this regard I previously presented data that showed that nearly 90 pivemt of those original 50 acre lots had been combined into larger farms of 2 or more lots. We really cen't ack for beter evidence that, with main, the old so acres lot is not a viable agricultural lot size for Melancton. The fact that of the severed lands only some 19 ha are tillable further exacerbates the deficiency relative to that required for a viable agricultural unit.

3. The warant form allocally has two soverances, the nation large severance of some 5 ha off the western side and the 0.3 he residential lot. These two severences should, a priorie, precelude any further severences.

2

- 4. The existing form required a nother large glosp enterprise, (priviously approved) to augment the 75 ha agricultural operation. In view of this necessary support on the existing form there is no justification for reducing it so drastically (some 40 percent) and creating what uself be clearly 2 non-viable agricultural units.
  - 5. My previous correspondence on this matter of Nou is /2012 is brought forward as additional discussion of some of the above points.

I request that I be notified of any decision in respect of this matter.

B. Monator i um on processing any future apprications for on-farm shops.

I was troubled to hear at the last-low Courseil meetings the possibility that the paved 4th hime NE should be downareded to gravel because the corporater did not have the funds to mointain it as a paver raad. There can be little doub that the cumulative effect of the ± 20 industrial shops already approved (I'm sure the Stelf have an updated accurate coant.) has been heavy whicle loading impacts on our roads, for which they were never designed. Many of these shops generate heavy which that is 20 times the paverage farm. Indeed due two shops up the 2th him NE generate more heavy traffic them all the other 25 farms between the roads I and 9 combined. With the many new purchases west of 10 Huy and in the Corbetton area the Towishup ghoreld expect a number of new applications for shops in this area. Can we applied that the next candidates for downgradoing to grave are the 2nd him Sw and the 26D side normal.

I have to seriously question the actions of the Corporation in continuing to approve these on form shops on the one hand while on the other say that the Corporation can't afford to maintain the current infrast necture: The network of paved roads in the Township represent a critical and prime egset and mugt be maintained.

Considering the above I request that the Corporation effect a monitor ium on any future applications for on - farm shops. Daring this moratorium I request the Corporation undertake the following.

- <del>-</del> - - -

• • • •

1. A professional study of the impact of 50 shops, (that's where we're heading) located in the 'New Survey' area, ident; by to what extent and where our infastructure is most universable. It is not a question of one or two shops but the cumulature effect of a retwork of a large number of shops concentrated in the western porteins of the Township.

Å

· 2. Take stops to ensure that contributions to the funding for the maintenance of our infrastructure is shored equitably between the two main users of equicaltural lands - agricultural farms and on-farm shops.

1-request that I be advised of cell future applications for on-farm shops.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Sincerely H.Lyon 

· · · · · · · · · · · ·

- · · -

## **Denise Holmes**

From:	Shari Page <spage@tritoneng.on.ca></spage@tritoneng.on.ca>
Sent:	Monday, July 13, 2015 10:22 AM
То:	dholmes@melancthontownship.ca
Cc:	Christine Furlong
Subject:	Township of Southgate, Notice of Project Commencement, Class EA, Dundalk Water
	System
Attachments:	Township of Melancthon (D.Holmes).pdf

Good morning,

On behalf of the Township of Southgate, please find attached, Notice of Project Commencement for the Township of Southgate, Class Environmental Assessment for the Dundalk Water System, Dundalk, Ontario.

A hard copy of this letter and notice will follow by mail, however, we would like to know your preference for receiving future correspondence for this project whether it be email only, mail only or if you would prefer both. Kindly let us know.

Should you require further clarification to any of the attached, please do not hesitate to contact myself or Christine Furlong of our office.

Kind regards, Shari

Shari Page



Triton Engineering Services Limited 105 Queen Street West, Unit 14 Fergus, ON N1M 1S6 Tel - (519) 843-3920 • Fax - (519) 843-1943 • <u>www.tritoneng.on.ca</u>

This email message and any files transmitted with it are proprietary and confidential information of the sender and are intended only for the person(s) to whom this email is addressed. If you have received this email message in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone of email and destroy the original message without making a copy.

#### **Total Control Panel**

To: <u>dholmes@melancthontownship.ca</u> From: <u>spage@tritoneng.on.ca</u> Message Score: 50 My Spam Blocking Level: High

Block this sender Block tritoneng.on.ca High (60): Pass Medium (75): Pass Low (90): Pass Login

This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.



105 Queen Street West, Unit 14 Fergus Ontario N1M 1S6 Tel: (519) 843-3920 Fax: (519) 843-1943 e-mall: info@tritoneng.on.ca

ORANGEVILLE • FERGUS • GRAVENHURST

July 13, 2015

Township of Melancthon 157101 Highway #10 Melancthon, Ontario L9V 2E6

Attention: Ms. Denise Holmes, CAO/Clerk

RE:

TOWNSHIP OF SOUTHGATE DUNDALK WATER SYSTEM CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OUR FILE: T4609A

Dear Madam:

The Township of Southgate owns and operates the Dundalk municipal water system. The system utilizes groundwater as its water supply source and includes two supply wells (Well D3 and Well D4). Figure 1 shows the location of the existing wells. The capacities of Wells D3 and D4 are 1,182 m<sup>3</sup>/day and 1,637 m<sup>3</sup>/day respectively resulting in a system firm capacity (capacity with the largest supply out of service) of 1,182 m<sup>3</sup>/day. The water storage facility at Well D3 is an above ground pre-stressed concrete structure with an approximate volume of 1,364 m<sup>3</sup>. The water storage facility at Well D4 is an in-ground reinforced concrete structure with an approximate volume of 187.7 m<sup>3</sup>. Both storage facilities are utilized as treatment components to ensure adequate chlorine contact time prior to discharge to the water distribution system.

Reserve capacity calculations for the Dundalk water system indicate that the existing firm capacity is not adequate to permit continued growth and development in the community. As a result, the Township is undertaking a Schedule B Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) to examine options to address the identified issues. The following problem statement has been developed for the project:

The Township of Southgate is committed to delivering responsive and cost effective municipal services that provide for the economic, social and environmental well-being of its ratepayers now and in the future. Reserve capacity calculations for the Dundalk municipal water system indicate that an increase in water supply is required to accommodate new growth and development in the Dundalk urban centre and to provide additional system firm capacity and supply redundancy. Proposed growth will also require an evaluation of water system operating strategies and water storage requirements to ensure adequate distribution system pressure and fire protection for the community.

Please find enclosed a notice of project commencement for the Class EA. At this time, the Township requests your preliminary comments relating to the project so that effective consultation can occur with all stakeholders and that all environmental features and constraints (source water

protection, natural/social/economic environments, etc.) are identified and potential impacts assessed early on in the project. Your municipality is being advised of the project as there is the potential for Well Head Protection Areas (WHPA) to cross municipal boundaries depending on the extent of additional water taking needed to address the water supply deficit.

We look forward to receiving your preliminary comments and should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

TRITON ENGINEERING SERVICES LIMITED

Tilton

Christine Furlong, P.Eng/ Project Engineer

CMF/sjp

- Encl. Figure 1: Location Plan Notice of Project Commencement
- cc: Jim Ellis, Public Works Manager, Township of Southgate





#### TOWNSHIP OF SOUTHGATE

#### CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

#### DUNDALK WATER SYSTEM

#### NOTICE OF PROJECT COMMENCEMENT

The Township of Southgate owns and operates the Dundalk municipal water system. Reserve capacity calculations for the Dundalk municipal water system indicate that an increase in water supply is required to accommodate new growth and development in the Dundalk urban centre and to provide additional system firm capacity and supply redundancy. Proposed growth will also require an evaluation of water system operating strategies and water storage requirements to ensure adequate distribution system pressure and fire protection for the community.

The Township is initiating a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) in order to address water system supply, storage and operational issues in Dundalk. The project is being planned under Schedule B of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (October 2000, as amended in 2007 and 2011). Public input and comments are invited for incorporation into the planning of this project. Public Information Centres for this project will be held as the project progresses to share information with and solicit input from interested stakeholders.

As part of the public consultation program, a project contact list is being created. Stakeholders included on the list will receive information regarding the project including formal Notices. To be placed on the project contact list, to provide comments or to request further information, please contact both of the following:

Jim Ellis, Public Works Manager Township of Southgate 185667 Grey County Road 9 R.R. #1 Dundalk, ON NOC 1B0 Phone: 519-923-2110 Toll Free: 1-888-560-6607 Fax: 519-923-9262 E-mail: jellis@southgate.ca Christine Furlong, P. Eng. Triton Engineering Services Limited 14-105 Queen Street, West Fergus, ON N1M 1S6 Phone: 519-843-3920 Fax: 519-843-1943 E-mail: cfurlong@tritoneng.on.ca

This Notice first issued July 15, 2015.

Raylene Martell Clerk Township of Southgate





## TOWNSHIP OF MELANCTHON POLICE SERVICES BOARD RESOLUTION

Number **MOVED BY:** DATE: SECONDED BY

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** the Police Service Board invite ounil to most with the Bornal to decuss tel, il. i nog cer roles and Dia NEW eand

Carried ( ) Defeated ( ) Lost ( )

CHAIRPERSON

Recorded Vote	<u>Yea</u>	Nay	<u>Abstain</u>
<b>Board Member Malloy</b>	()	( )	()
<b>Board Member Besley</b>	()	()	()
<b>Board Member Thwaites</b>	()	()	( )

## Lynn Van Alstine

From:	Denise Holmes < dholmes@melancthontownship.ca>
Sent:	August-28-14 1:41 PM
То:	Lynn Van Alstine
Cc:	Wendy Atkinson
Subject:	Fwd: NVCA Summary Findings for Efficiency Audit
Attachments:	Media Release - NVCA Summary of Proj Findings.pdf; Untitled attachment 00102.htm

For the Agenda Package, please.

Regards,

Denise B. Holmes, CAO/Clerk Melancthon Township

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sheryl Flannagan <<u>sflannagan@nvca.on.ca</u>>

Date: August 28, 2014 at 12:14:38 PM EDT

To: "Brian Milne, Warden, Grey County" <<u>warden@grey.ca</u>>, Dan Best <<u>bestd@greyhighlands.ca</u>>, Deborah Ferrier <<u>dferrier@barrie.ca</u>>, "Denise B. Holmes" <<u>dholmes@melancthontownship.ca</u>>, Eric Wargel <<u>ewargel@townshipadjtos.on.ca</u>>, George Vadeboncouer <<u>cao@wasagabeach.com</u>>, Greg Murphy <<u>gmurphy@essatownship.on.ca</u>>, Jay Currier <<u>jcurrier@townofbwg.com</u>>, John Brown <<u>jbrown@collingwood.ca</u>>, John Skorobohacz <<u>jskorobohacz@innisfil.ca</u>>, John Telfer <<u>itelfer@townofshelburne.on.ca</u>>, Keith McNenly <<u>keith@townofmono.com</u>>, Mark Aitken <<u>mark.aitken@simcoecounty.ca</u>>, Office of the CAO New Tecumseth <<u>bholly@nwtecumseth.ca</u>>, Robert Brindley <<u>robert.brindlev@springwater.ca</u>>, Robin Dunn <<u>rdunn@oro-medonte.ca</u>>, Sonya Pritchard - Dufferin County <<u>cao@dufferincounty.ca</u>>, Sue McKenzie <<u>smckenzie@clearviewtwp.ca</u>>, "Susan M. Stone" <<u>suestone@amaranth-eastgary.ca</u>>, Terry Horner <<u>thorner@mulmurtownship.ca</u>>, Troy Speck <<u>cao@thebluemountains.ca></u>

Subject: NVCA Summary Findings for Efficiency Audit

Good Morning,

Please find attached the summary of the project findings for the Efficiency Audit recently completed at the NVCA.

1

Should you have any questions please feel free to contact our Chair, Nina Bifolchi at <u>council4@wasagabeach.com</u>

Thanks,

Sheryl

#### Sheryl Flannagan, B.A., CMM I HR Specialist, CHRP Candidate

**Director, Corporate Services** Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority John Hix Conservation Admin. Centre, Tiffin Centre for Conservation 8195 8th Line, Utopia, On LOM 1T0 Tel 705-424-1479 ext. 228, Confidential Fax 705-424-4694



#### Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority

#### Service Delivery and Operational Review Project

#### Summary of Project Findings, List of Project Recommendations

The firm of Gazda, Houlné & Associates (GHA) was mandated by the Board of Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA) to carry out a Service Delivery and Operational Review Project (Efficiency Audit). The Project involved two phases: Phase I – Service Delivery and Operational Review, and Phase II - Updated Performance Management Program for the Senior Management Team. The first 7 pages of the Report summarize the Project findings from Phase I with the last 3 pages listing the Recommendations submitted to the Board for review and consideration.

The consultants completed the following information/data collection, reviews and analyses:

- Confidential one-on-one structured interviews with 25 management, professional/technical and administrative support employees
- One-on-one interviews with 26 members of the Board
- Confidential Telephone Survey Feedback interviews (N=34) with:

18 Member Municipalities, CAOs/Planning Staff

16 Other Stakeholders including Member Counties, adjacent Conservation Authorities (CAs), representatives of the development industry/consulting engineering firms and NGOs/special interest groups

- Assessment of Board execution of roles, specific responsibilities
- Assessment of NVCA organization setup against generally accepted organization design criteria and best practices in the municipal sector
- Comparative analysis of the organization, staffing, service delivery and revenues/expenditures of NVCA vs. 8 similar sized and representative CAs.

A presentation was made to the Board on May 23, 2014 and to the Senior Management Team on July 17, 2014 providing the findings from the above reviews and analyses. The presentation to the Board was made in closed session to ensure the confidentiality of the responses made by the interviewees. The consultants gave a special report at the July 18, 2014 Board meeting clarifying for the public and the Board members the reasons for the in-camera meetings. At the August 22, 2014 Board meeting, there still was some misunderstanding on the part of certain members of the public regarding the closed sessions. Attachment A supplies the consultants' answers to questions pertaining to the in-camera meetings.

All of the Project findings were synthesized on two Exhibits, one identifying the strengths to be retained in the organization realignment/staffing setup and service delivery and a second Exhibit indicating the improvements requirements. Summary highlights of the reviews and analyses are provided under the headings that follow. In regard to the 85 interviews conducted, it should be noted that the findings do **not** reflect the opinions or perceptions of the consultants. Instead the findings report the actual views of the various interviewees and need to be accepted, for "better or worse", as their views on what is working as well as what requires improvement.

#### **Results, Structured Employee Interviews**

In the Phase I – Service Delivery and Operational Review Project presentation, there are a number of Exhibits covering employee perceptions on what is working and what requires improvement in the current organization, staffing and service delivery at NVCA. To summarize the findings contained in the Exhibits, employees gave an overall positive response to the items shown the following page:

		% Positive Response
1.	Ability to provide concise description of key responsibilities	100
2.	Frequency and fairness of performance reviews	100, 95
3.	Accuracy of current position title, subordinates titles	88,100
4.	NVCA program of employee benefits	96
5.	Working relationship with immediate supervisor (average, 3 factors)	90
6.	Working relationship/interface between most Departments	90
7.	Changes to responsibilities in order to increase value	88
8.	More satisfaction than dissatisfaction with the work itself	84
9.	No or few instances of duplication/overlap of functions	83
10.	Teamwork, cooperation, coordination within and between Departments	83, 75
11.	Function/duties well described in current position description	80
12.	Physical working conditions re: amount and type of equipment including IT	79
13.	Overall compensation including internal pay equity	76, 74
14.	Communications within Department	74
15.	"To spec", on time delivery of services by the Departments, 46 of 62 specific services rated as satisfactory	Varies

All of the foregoing represents strengths that should be retained to the fullest extent possible in the proposed organization realignment, staffing and service delivery for NVCA. Turning to the areas identified for improvement or corrective action at NVCA, employees expressed a negative response for the following items (listed in order of the amount of dissatisfaction expressed):

		% Negative Response
1.	Formal succession planning process in place	76
2.	Replacement charting	62
3.	Communications between Departments	60
4.	Employees expressing interest in advancement at NVCA	52
5.	More weaknesses than strengths in current organization setup	44
6.	Working relationship/interface between some Departments	44
7.	Compensation, external equity (i.e., market competitiveness of salaries)	41
8.	Work direction from more than one supervisor (multiple bosses)	37
9.	Concerns re: hours of work (i.e., enough time to complete daily/weekly work)	32
10.	Perceived helpfulness of performance reviews in improving employee's performance	29
11.	"To spec", on time delivery of services by the Departments, 16 of 62 specific services rated as requiring improvement	Varies

It should be noted that the number of factors with a positive response (N=15) outnumber the factors given a significant negative response (N=11). This finding demonstrates the importance of utilizing an interview tool that obtains balanced information/data, i.e., identification of current strengths as well as improvement requirements.

#### Results, Interviews with Members of Board

The project methodology also called for structured interviews to be conducted with members of the Board (N=26) covering ratings on service delivery by Department. The results of the ratings on service delivery by members of the Board were compared to the ratings by NVCA Staff. As regards the ratings on factors common to all Departments, four were rated as highly satisfactory:

	% Satisfaction		
Common Factor	NVCA Staff	Board	Total
Services provided to the public in a friendly, courte- ous manner	98	92	94
Departments handling requests/enquiries promptly	96	81	85
Departments "do it right the first time"	98	87	90
Employees sufficiently knowledgeable about their duties/tasks	98	94	95

With respect to the remaining common factors, some selective improvements were identified for the extent to which certain Departments were: 1) well managed/supervised, 2) adequately staffed at the management level, 3) adequately staffed at the working level, and 4) providing cost efficient and effective service delivery overall.

Turning to the 62 specific Department services rated by NVCA staff and Board members, the table below summarizes the results of the ratings of service delivery by Department. Services are indicated as requiring improvement if one-third (or more) members of the Board and NVCA Staff so specified.

	No. Services	OK as Is		Requires Improvement	
Department	Rated	No.	%	No.	%
Land Operations & Stewardship Services	14	<b>1</b> 1	79%	3	21%
Engineering & Technical Services	10	8	80%	2	20%
Planning	11	9	82%	2	18%
Corporate Services/Administration (Office of the CAO)	27	18	67%	9	33%
Total	62	46	74%	16	26%

In general, the majority of services rated by the Board and NVCA Staff were considered "OK as is". The consultants did provide more detailed information during the presentation to the Board and to the Senior Management Team on each area of service delivery where improvement requirements were indicated.

#### Results, Telephone Feedback Survey with Stakeholders

Originally, the Project work scope called for a limited consultation of a representative group of stakeholders (N=8-9). During the completion of the Project, it became evident that a much larger group of stakeholders would need to be consulted. A total of 34 confidential telephone interviews were conducted with: 1) 18 Member Municipality CAOs/Planning Staff, 2) 7 NGOs/Special Interest Groups, and 3) 9 Member Counties, adjacent Conservation Authorities, development industry representatives/consulting engineering firms. The same survey questionnaire was used for all of the stakeholder interviews. A total of 10 factors were rated by the 85 interviewees. The factors where there was a high overall positive response included:

	% Positive Response
Courteous and professional treatment by NVCA Staff	85
Delivery of environmental education programs	85
Delivery of core services, i.e., Watershed Management, Flood Control	70
Follow-through on agreements/arrangements made	69

#### One-third or more of the respondents indicated improvement was required for the following factors:

	% Negative Response
Provision of good value for the levy contribution, user fees charged	54
Application of solution finding rather than problem identification approach	45
Timely response to Member Municipalities, stakeholders, customers/clients	36 *
Partnering with other concerned parties in the conservation sector (e.g., government departments/agencies, other CAs)	36
Effective management of 12 conservation areas, 12,000 acres of land holdings	36
Use of plain, easy to understand language	32
*Note: Stakeholder ratings were lower on this item than those of the Board and N	IVCA Staff.

There were a total of 290 ratings of which 98 or 34% indicated requirements for improvement. Some Board members expressed concern that the stakeholders' findings may have been skewed by either the developer interests or the environmental advocacy groups. This was not the case. Focusing only on the ratings of Member Municipalities, Member Counties and adjacent CAs, 33% of the ratings indicated requirements for improvement.

#### **Results, Assessment of Board Role Execution**

The consultants developed a NVCA Board job description covering key roles with specific responsibilities for each of five areas: 1) Direction, 2) Financial Stewardship, 3) Governance, 4) Legislation, and 5) Representation of Member Municipalities. The Board members were asked to rate the execution of some 20 specific responsibilities in the five areas. The CAO/Secretary-Treasurer and Directors also rated the Board on role execution. One of two ratings was given: 1) maintain execution as is, or 2) implement improvements.

There was high over-satisfaction with execution of 7 Board responsibilities:

- Review and approval, policies for NVCA
- "Big picture" budget (operating and capital) monitoring
- Expenditure controls and safeguards
- External auditor appointment and review of annual reports
- Compliance monitoring mechanisms in place for federal and provincial legislation including Conservation Authority Act
- Full compliance with the spirit, intent and provisions of the Conservation Authority Act
- Review and updating of NVCA regulations.

There was agreement on 7 responsibilities requiring improvement in execution:

- Setting of implementation priorities for the Strategic Plan
- Policy and program for asset management
- Corporate risk assessment and control
- Succession Planning for the Senior Management Team
- Acting on behalf of the "collective" public good for Member Municipalities and various stakeholders
- Interface between Member Municipalities and group/associations; working relationship with NVCA staff
- Attendance at social, cultural and special NVCA events/affairs.

For the balance of the responsibilities rated (N=6), there were mixed ratings on Board execution.

#### Findings, Board Setup, Size and Representation

The consultants analyzed the current setup of the NVCA Board in relation to the amount of Member Municipality levy contribution. The 9 largest Member Municipalities (with two Board representatives) contributed 82% of the total municipal levy but accounted for only 65% of the vote. By contrast the 3 smallest Member Municipalities contributed 1% of the levy but accounted for 12 percent of the vote. The only time a weighted vote was used was for the annual budget. For all other important matters (e.g., policy approval, election of the Chair, Vice Chair), the weighted vote did not apply.

With the current number of Board members at 26, NVCA is well above the median of the representative comparator group of 8 Conservation Authorities at 16.

During the interviews with the Board, the consultants asked the 26 members to comment on the Board size and representation. The following responses were obtained:

Reduce	Maintain Status Quo			
Board Size	or No Comment			
22 (84%)	4 (16%)			
Address Basis	Maintain Status Quo			
of Representation	or No Comment			
21 (81%)	5 (19%)			

The consultants also reported findings covering the Board modus operandi as regards: 1) use of Board committees, 2) Department Head attendance at Board meetings, 3) Board member tenure, 4) Board member education/training, and 5) Board meeting materials. These aspects are covered later in this Report in the Project Recommendations submitted for Board consideration and approval.

#### Breakdown of Education & Experience of NVCA Management, Professional/Technical Staff

One of the organization strengths mentioned during the interviews was the "highly experienced, educated staff" that NVCA has in place. Of the 22 management and professional/technical staff, 18 or 82% have a University degree (BA or BSc), with four having a Masters degree.

Turning to work experience, the management and professional/technical staff have an average of 10 years experience with NVCA and 17 years of conservation-related experience. The factual data confirms the perception of the employee interviewees as regard the qualifications of the staff. These data represent a potential risk for NVCA. Without market competitive compensation in place and career paths for employees, the Conservation Authority could experience some difficulty in retaining a well qualified staff as recent turnover experience has demonstrated.

# Results, Comparative Analysis (Benchmarking), NVCA vs. 8 Representative Conservation Authorities

There are 36 Conservation Authorities (CAs) in Ontario, 31 of which are located in South Western, Central and Eastern Ontario. Of the 31 CAs, 8 are small sized (i.e., annual budget of \$2.5M or less, fewer than 20 full-time employees) and 8 are large sized (i.e., over \$10M in annual budget, median full-time staff of 110). In terms of size, the consultants targeted the middle 50% of the 31 CAs (N=15) from which comparators were selected for the benchmarking exercise. The following comparator group was selected based on similar size, rate of Member Municipalities' growth and extent of planning activity:

#### GAZDA, HOULNÉ & ASSOCIATES INC.

		2012 Total Expenditures	No., Full-Time Employees (Permanent)	Square Kilometers	Population	Population Increase (2006-2011) + (-)	3-Year Avg. Plan Re- views/ Transactions (2010-2012)
1.	Mississippi Valley	\$2,668,630	28	4,455	257,531	9.3%	338
2.	Kawartha Region	\$2,738,846	27	2,563	53,708	2.2%	122
3.	The Cataraqui Region	\$3,959,625	22	3,393	174,523	2.7%	334
4.	Nottawasaga Valley	\$3,995,261	30	3,646	189,705	6.4%	366
5.	Saugeen Valley	\$4,407,851	22	4,675	74,868	1.2%	330
6.	Central Lake Ontario	\$5,768,265	41	638	301,897	8.6%	278
7.	South Nation River	\$5,948,824	40	4,146	281,439	7.0%	506
8.	Essex Region	\$7,627,310	31	1,681	333,529	(1.2%)	630
9.	Lake Simcoe Region	\$11,755,181	80	3,303	355,600	5.5%	541
	Median	\$4,407,851	31	3,393	257,531	5.5%	338
	NVCA % of Median	91%	97%	107%	74%		
92%					1		

Taking into account the four size criteria, NVCA would be close to the median on average, i.e., 92% overall on the size measures. NVCA is also close to the median on population growth and planning activity. This means the median of the comparator group can be used as reference benchmark in analyzing organization, staffing, service delivery and revenues/expenditures.

In terms of organization setup and staffing, all of the CAs in the comparator group are headed by a CAO or General Manager & Secretary/Treasurer. Reporting to the top position, the trend average of the comparator group is to have four Department Heads as is the case at NVCA. The majority of the 8 comparator CAs make use of only 3 management levels (i.e., CAO, Director and Manager or Supervisor). NVCA utilizes 4 levels (CAO, Director, Manager and Supervisor/Coordinator). In terms of overall staffing, NVCA aligns with the norm, i.e., is right sized, not under or over staffed vs. the median of the comparator group.

#### Breakdown of Revenues and Expenditures, NVCA vs. 8 Representative Comparators

The consultants examined the pattern of revenues and expenditures among the 8 CAs in the comparator group and NVCA. In reviewing the financial data, the consultants noted that there was considerable variation from year to year in revenues and expenditures. This being the case a three-year average for the period 2010-20-12 was calculated. The results of the analyses are summarized in the following tables.

	3-year Average (2010-2012) Breakdown of Expenditures				
	Land Man- agement (%)	Water Man- agement (%)	Communications (%)	Administration (%)	Total* (%)
NVCA	19	57	5	19	100
Avg., Comparator Group	28	53	4	16	101

	3-year Average (2010-2012) Breakdown of Revenues				
	Government (%)	Municipal Levy (%)	Municipal Projects (%)	Self Generated (%)	Total* (%)
NVCA	21	42	1	35	99
Avg., Comparator Group	24	42	11	23	100

\* Note: Total percentages are 100% ± 1% due to rounding of the numbers.

Based on the above benchmarking data, NVCA would strive through proactive balance sheet management to:

- Reduce proportion of budget expenditures allocated to Watershed Management and Corporate Services while increasing expenditures for Land Operations.
- Increase revenues from government grants/subsidies and Member Municipality projects while reducing dependence on the municipal levy and higher than market average planning user fees.

#### **Conservation Authority Foundation Experience**

In completing the documentation for the 31 CAs in South Western, Central and Eastern Ontario, the consultants found that 25 or 81% had a Foundation in place. This finding would lead one to surmise that a Foundation is an important adjunct to a CA in terms of revenue generation and education/outreach. Closer examination shows that this is **not** so. Less than half of the Foundations (N=12) generate significant revenues. In NVCA's comparator group, both Essex Region CA and Lake Simcoe Region CA have Foundations in place that generate substantial revenues.

#### Synthesis of Findings and Improvement Requirements

As stated on page 1 of this Report, all of the findings were synthesized on two Exhibits, one identifying strengths to be retained going forward and a second addressing improvement requirements. In addition, at the end of each of the 85 interviews, the respondents were asked to provide a "short list" of improvement requirements for consideration by the Board and the Senior Management Team. The employees interviewed identified 9 improvements on the "short list", the Board members identified 9 and the various stakeholders identified 7. It was interesting to see that there was a good deal of overlap between the three groups of interviewees on the items on their "short lists". The consultants then determined the top 10 improvement requirements most frequently mentioned by the total group of interviewees. These are listed below in order of frequency mentioned.

- 1) Adopt a solution finding rather than strict policy (to the letter) enforcement approach; shift to more collaborative/consultative approach with customer/clients vs. dictating what has to be done.
- 2) Shorten turnaround times on development applications; "it just takes too much" in terms of time expended and cost to get applications approved.
- 3) Improve communications and the working relationship between the Board and NVCA staff; reestablish practice of having Department Directors attend Board meetings.
- 4) Build closer and more collaborative working relationships with Member Municipalities; shift away from dictating policy and budget to Member Municipalities; harmonize policy application and budget process for Member Municipalities served by multiple CAs.
- 5) Acknowledge that NVCA does not have the resources to "do everything for everybody"; focus should be on the Conservation Authority's primary mandate; clarify which services are mandated/legislated vs. discretionary and which services should be covered by the municipal levy vs. funding from other sources.
- 6) Investigate ways and means to establish more sustainable funding.
- 7) Increase CAO and Senior Management presence and engagement of staff; strengthen leadership approach, i.e., more transparency, collaboration and relationship building.
- Increase efforts in all Departments to track and identify best practices in other CAs, Member Municipalities for possible implementation at NVCA; place more emphasis on "working smarter not (just) harder".
- 9) Conduct "all staff" meetings on a quarterly or trimester basis; increase internal communications.
- 10) Maintain an appropriate sized staff at NVCA; make fuller use of outsourcing and partnering with other stakeholders and CAs.



#### List of Project Recommendations, Phase I - Service Delivery & Operational Review

Taking into account the synthesized findings and the "short list" of recommended improvements, the consultants prepared 26 Recommendations for the Board to review and consider. The Recommendations were discussed by the Board of Directors at the August 22, 2014 Board Meeting including the list of 15 Recommendations prioritized previously by the board for implementation in 2014. The Board received the Recommendations and directed the Efficiency Audit Committee to present a report with staff input outlining implementation details for further discussion and approval.

- **Recommendation 1:** Implement the organization realignment covering full-time permanent management/supervisory and professional technical positions; allocate balance of full-time positions in the administrative and operating support category while not exceeding 31 headcount; with permanent full-time contract staff, do not exceed total full-time complement of 34-35.
- **Recommendation 2:** Take necessary steps by the CAO and Department Heads to maximize the use of part-time and seasonal employees including cost effective deployment of student interns, coop students and seconded staff from other CAs, Member Municipalities.
- **Recommendation 3**: Conduct a follow-up review by the Planning Standing (or Ad Hoc) Committee of the Board on the implementation status of the recommendations (N=36) contained in the independent 2010 Planning Program Review.
- Recommendation 4: Direct the CAO and Department Heads to develop and implement an action program to build closer working relationships with all (not just some) Member Municipalities; program to include increased NVCA presence at Member Municipalities, harmonization of policies for Member Municipalities served by more than one CA, use of consultative (vs. dictating) approach for the budget process with Member Municipalities.
- **Recommendation 5:** Mandate the CAO and the Director of Corporate Services to review the NVCA expenditures breakdown vis-à-vis the median of the comparator group; the review to determine actions to be taken to reduce percentage of expenditures allocated to Watershed Management and Administration and increase amount for Land Operations; report to be submitted to Finance & Administration Standing (or Ad Hoc) Committee with recommendations for consideration by the Board.
- **Recommendation 6:** Same as above (including Board Committee report) for the review of the NVCA revenue breakdown vs. the median of the comparator group; the review to identify actions to increase percentage of revenue coming from grants/subsidies and municipal projects with less reliance on the municipal levy as well as planning user fees/charges.
- **Recommendation 7**: Implement a multi-phase program of internal communications covering: 1) expansion of the role and output of the internal Communications Committee, 2) conducting of "all staff" meetings on a quarterly or trimester basis, 3) greater use of employee newsletters/bulletins, 4) increased management presence, and 5) annual or semi-annual meet and greet functions for NVCA staff and the Board.
- Recommendation 8: Establish a Finance & Administration Standing (or Ad Hoc) Committee to complete an identification of options and alternatives for the Board to consider re: the definition of NVCA's primary mandate; schedule a special

meeting of the Board to discuss the mandate and decide on the services to be covered by the municipal levy and services funded by other revenue sources or outsourced.

- **Recommendation 9:** Operationalize NVCA's Strategic Plan making it actionable, directly linking strategies prioritized by the Board on an annual basis to the work plans of the CAO and Department Heads (i.e., top down bottom-up Corporate Plan).
- Recommendation 10: Reduce Board size to match median of the comparator group at 16.
- Recommendation 11: Implement a new voting protocol for the Board in order to achieve fairer representation of Member Municipalities in terms of levy contributions. The nine largest levy contributors would have two votes and the balance, a single vote with the exception of the three Municipalities making the smallest levy contributions. The latter group would have a single vote or be represented by one of the other Member Municipalities.
- **Recommendation 12:** Reestablish practice of having Department Heads attend all Board meetings so as to gain a better understanding and awareness of individual Board member view and concerns.
- **Recommendation 13:** Promote practice among Member Municipalities of full term service (4 years) by Board members.
- **Recommendation 14:** For four of the Board meetings per year, the meeting would be scheduled for four hours (9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.) with a shortened agenda for regular business (9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.) and an in-camera two-hour session for Board continuing education/training.
- **Recommendation 15:** Implement the Performance Management Program application for the CAO and the Senior Management Team (Phase II Recommendations).

The Board directed the Efficiency Audit Committee to include in their report with staff input details for implementation of the balance of the Recommendations in 2015.

- Recommendation 16: In conjunction with the Board direction given re: NVCA's primary mandate, determine current NVCA service delivery that is to be outsourced in full or in part.
- Recommendation 17: Charge the CAO and Department Heads to investigate ways and means NVCA can implement a solution finding approach in dealing with target customer/client groups, i.e., Member Municipalities, small individual land/property owners (agricultural and non-agricultural), consulting engineering firms, developers, other CAs, and upper tiers of government.
- **Recommendation 18:** Revisit planning fee schedule in conjunction with the completion of Recommendation 5; taking into account comparative data from the reference group of CAs, identify opportunities and stage implementation of reduced user fees/charges to better align with other CAs in the comparator group as well as market practices (i.e., "going rate").
- **Recommendation 19:** Working with a seconded financial expert (one from the Member Municipalities or other sources), charge the CAO and Senior Management

Team to develop a sustainable funding model and mechanism with pilot project implementation.

- **Recommendation 20:** Complete a feasibility study for establishing a NVCA Foundation with recommendations to the Finance & Administration Standing (or Ad Hoc) Committee; study to determine the critical success factors based on experience of revenue generating Foundations now operated by 12 CAs.
- Recommendation 21: Create a new Senior Development Officer and Funding Coordinator to work with the Department Heads to identify, track, evaluate and prepare applications/submissions of grants, subsidies and sponsorship from the public, para-public and private sectors.
- Recommendation 22: Complete a best practices review with the assistance of a seconded financial expert of Asset Management Programs in place in Member Municipalities and CAs; prepare a report for the Finance & Administration Standing (or Ad Hoc) Committee on next steps for NVCA.
- Recommendation 23: Undertake a market compensation review to determine the market competitiveness of NVCA salaries.
- Recommendation 24: Expand the use of career paths to eliminate/reduce the number of deadend jobs at NVCA, contributing to retention of qualified staff members; career paths example: Planning Technician, Planner I, Planner II, Senior Planner, Manager Planning and Regulations.
- **Recommendation 25:** Address the 7 improvements referenced in role execution by the majority of the Board members; action plan to be prepared and recommended to the Board for implementation by the Ad Hoc Committee.
- Recommendation 26: Re-establish Standing (Advisory) Committees of the Board with specific terms of reference and modus operandi to be recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Questions about the Phase I Project findings and Recommendations should be directed to the Board Chair, Ms. Nina Bifolchi.

At the August 22, 2014 meeting, the Board approved the Phase II Recommendations dealing with the restart of the Performance Management Program at NVCA, establishment of a market competitive salary structure and implementation of a formal Succession Plan for the CAO/Secretary-Treasurer and Director positions.

Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority

Service Delivery and Operational Review Project

Answers to Questions Regarding Project Review Process Including Use of Closed Session

- Question 1: The consultants' report covering the findings and recommendations of the Service Delivery and Operational Review Project was presented in closed session. Why was this necessary?
- Answer: There are eight criteria in the NVCA Board of Directors/Governance Regulations, for a meeting to move into "in-camera" closed session to address matters pertaining to:
  - 1) security of the property of the Authority
  - 2) personal matters about an identifiable individual, including Authority staff
  - a proposed or pending acquisition/disposition/leasing of land for Authority purposes
  - 4) labour relations or employee negotiations
  - 5) litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the Authority
  - 6) the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor/client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose
  - 7) a matter in respect of which a council, board, committee or other body has authorized a meeting to be closed under another Act
  - 8) the subject matter relates to the consideration of a request under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Criteria 2 and 6 apply to the presentation made in camera on May 23rd.

Regarding Criterion 2, findings related to an identifiable individual were discussed throughout the presentation, and specifically on the 10 presentation slides and 2 Report Recommendations.

# Question 2: How did the second criterion relating to client privilege apply to the May 23<sup>rd</sup> presentation?

Answer: As a matter of standard practice in conducting a Service Delivery, Organization and Operational Review, the interviews are conducted with the assurance of confidentiality. This means that interviewee responses were not to be revealed or published in a manner that would identify any interviewee. The interviewees consisted of NVCA employees, Board members, Member Municipality CAOs/Planning Staff, and other stakeholders.

Taking the employee interviewees as an example, there would be no problem if the Survey responses to a questionnaire item were reported for the total employee group. As an illustration, let us say 20 of 25 employee interviewees or 80% indicated that there was no duplication/overlap of function among Departments in the organization under review. This would lead to a conclusion that duplication/overlap of function is not an area of concern. However, this would not be the case if all of the 20% dissatisfaction was expressed by employees in one Department or at a particular level in the organization (e.g., Senior Management, Managers/Supervisors, Professional/ Technical or Administrative/Operation Support).



For this reason, the consultants used a methodology that provides for four different breakdowns of the total group of employee interviewees, 1) management level/ employee category, 2) Department, 3) years with NVCA, and 4) years of Conservation-related experience. If a 100% positive, or more importantly, negative response occurred for a questionnaire item for any of the breakdowns, it is possible to identify the respondents. In a number of instances, there was a 100% response noted for the questionnaire item for the various interviewees.

Having the presentation in closed session was not done for purposes of secrecy or to avoid transparency, but rather to protect the confidentiality of the participants providing input to the Project as promised and assured.

In 25 years of carrying out such projects for municipalities, the consultants have never had a breach of confidentiality.

#### Question 3: Could you explain the Project review process?

Answer:

As a matter of standard practice in carrying out a Service Delivery, Organization and Operational Review, the consultants follow a specific process:

1) Design structured interview questionnaires for the participants providing input to the Review Project.

**Note:** A key aspect of the employee and Board member interviews involved ratings of some 62 specific services delivered by the NVCA Departments.

- 2) Identify Project Review participants to be interviewed and conduct confidential one-on-one interviews.
- 3) Score the interview results, utilizing the various response breakdowns.

**Note:** The nature of the questions covered permit the identification of what is working well (i.e., "not broke, do not fix") as well as what requires improvement.

As a case in point, there are two key Exhibits included in the final Report. One lists strengths in the areas of service delivery, organization, staffing and Board governance to be retained going forward and a second listing improvement requirements covering the same areas.

- 4) Identify a representative group of Conservation Authorities to be used in benchmarking organization, staffing, expenditures, revenues, Board size and representation, and best practices.
- 5) Synthesize the findings from the: a) employee interviews, b) Board member interviews, c) Member Municipality interviews, d) other stakeholder interviews, e) Board role execution against its specific responsibilities, and f) results of benchmarking analysis involving 8 similar sized Conservation Authorities.
- 6) Prepare a Report and Presentation for the Board covering Project findings and Recommendations (N=26).
- 7) Present findings and Recommendations to the Board in closed session.
- 8) Repeat above Step for the CAO and Senior Management Team.
- 9) Assist the Board in the review and approval of the Project Recommendations.
- 10) Prepare a Summary Report including the Project Recommendations for release to the public.



It is necessary to complete Steps 7), 8) and 9) before Step 10 can be done. NVCA's customers/clients, Member Municipalities and stakeholders not only want to know what was found in the Review and the Recommendations made by the consultants, but also what the Board and the CAO/Senior Management Team are going to do with the Recommendations. It avoids a situation where the Project Report is filed away without any concrete improvement action taken.

# Question 4: When will the Survey Report findings and recommendations be made available to the public?

**Answer:** This will occur after the August meeting of the Board.

HILL AGRA MACHINERY INC 276 MAIN STREET MELANCTHON **ONTARIO** CANADA L9V 1X8 Email: hillagramachinery@gmail.com Tel: 1 519 925 3618 Fax: 1 519 925 6441

July 27th 2015

To: Township of Melancthon 157101 Highway 10 Melancthon Ontario Canada L9V 2E6

## Re: Fire Cleanup Lot 4, Lot 5, Plan 30A

Thank you for your letter re: the above, dated July 17th 2015 and Section Theorem July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2015.

Please be advised that the bulk of the heavy burnt out machinery has been removed from the fire site.

This was done by Demmans Excavating this week. There is still a few items left that Mr. Demmans will take care of next week.

I have also made arrangements for Mr. Demmans to remove the ash and rubbish and truck it to the transfer station.

In relation to your option of building a fence, I feel this is no longer required due to the completion of the heavy machinery removal.

I would also like to extend to council, the information that the neighbours across the road does not want a fence.

Also the neighbour to the south side does not a want a fence.

I own property to the west, adjacent to the fire site, and I don't want the two properties separated by a six foot fence.

Should any other neighbour approach me, i would be happy to try and address their concerns.

I feel that I have done my best since the tragic loss I have suffered, to address the concerns of council and at the same time try to keep a small portion of my business viable . I have been able to recover a considerable number of useable items from the rubble and I have been able to restore same to saleable condition.

I have also recently purchased new machinery items to fill ongoing orders, for my many customers, in North America and Europe.

I look forward to co-operating with Council, through the last stages of the clean up.

Should you need more information, please contact me. You are always welcome to do an on site visit.

Thank you.

S F.L. HII

UF 1 - August 13, 2015



July 13, 2015

Township of Melancthon 157101 Hwy. # 10 Melancthon, ON L9V 2E6

Dear Council:

This letter is to explain the reasoning for the application for Amendment to zoning By- Law 51-2014.

The purpose of a fertilizer facility is to provide a variety of nutrients products that are required for different crops that we grow in are community. All crops and fields have a variety of nutrient requirements and the facility allows us to make separate prescriptions for each field based on soil testing.

The reason for increasing the height of the facility allows us to:

1. Have the appropriate height of the elevator leg to reach the storage bins.

2. Be able to increase the storage bins to allow a drive through access under the tower to reduce the handling of product, for convenience and speed to the farmers.

Both of our current facilities at Orangeville and Stayner are set up this way.

The potential Fertilizer Facility consist of a few components:

1. Fertilizer tower will reach a height of approx 25 meter plus the Turn head (Penthouse) to total 27 meters

2. The receiving elevator leg which moves the product from the incoming trucks to the top of the tower will be 35 meters.

3. The shipping elevator leg which moves the blended product to a future shipping bins will be 25 meters

The goal for Holmes Agro is to keep up with customers needs. By increasing the heights all the facility allows us to do maintain the daily shipping requirements that the growers have with their increasing size of equipment and planting speed.

We would appreciate the Council taking time to review our request to increase the height of the fertilizer facility.

Sincerely

Holmes Agro

Jeff Holmes

1727560 Ontario Inc. o/a Holmes Agro P.O. Box 218, 473088 Cty. Rd. #11, Orangeville, ON L9W 2Z6 519-941-0450 Fax: 519-941-0931 Redickville: 519-925-3138 Stayner: R.R. # 2, 1042 Klondike Park Road, Stayner, ON L0M 1S0 705-428-4444 Fax: 705-428-4440 DEL 1 - August 13, 2015

#### TOWNSHIP OF MELANCTHON NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF A COMPLETE APPLICATION FOR A ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND NOTICE OF A PUBLIC MEETING CONCERNING A RELATED PROPOSED ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

TAKE NOTICE that the Township of Melancthon has received a complete application to amend Municipal Zoning By-law 12-79, as amended. The purpose of the rezoning is to amend the Township's Comprehensive Zoning By-law to change a zoning provision on a property zoned Rural Commercial Exception (C3-6) in the West Part of Lot 20, Concession 1, O.S.

AND PURSUANT to Section 34 (12) of the Planning Act, the Zoning By-law amendment application file is available for review at the Municipal Office. Please contact the Municipal Clerk to arrange to review this file.

#### NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING WITH COUNCIL

TAKE NOTICE that the Council for the Corporation of the Township will be holding a Public Meeting under Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13, as amended, to allow the public to comment on the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

The Public Meeting is being held for the application described below to enable interested members of the public to understand and comment on the Zoning By-law Amendment.

#### DATE AND LOCATION OF THE PUBLIC MEETING

Date:	Thursday, August 13, 2015
Time:	5:45 p.m.
Location:	Township of Melancthon Municipal Office (Council Chambers)

#### DETAILS OF THE ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

The application affects a property located in the West Part of Lot 20, Concession 1, O.S. in the Township of Melancthon. A key map has been appended to this Notice which identifies the subject lands.

The purpose of the proposed By-law is to amend Restricted Area (Zoning) By-law No. 12-79, as amended, to increase a maximum height provision related to a fertilizer blending facility proposed as part of the development of the subject property. The By-law would change one of the site specific C3-6 zoning provisions applying to the subject property to increase the maximum permitted height of a fertilizer blending facility from 25 metres to 36 metres. The effect of the proposed rezoning would be to permit such a blending facility to have a maximum height of 36 metres in order to maximize its efficiency as part of a permitted farm service and supply depot.

Information relating to this application is available at the Township of Melancthon Municipal Office for public review during regular office hours.

#### FURTHER INFORMATION AND MAP OF LAND SUBJECT TO THE APPLICATION

A key map has been appended that identifies the lands that are subject to this amendment.

The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that sufficient information is made available to enable the public to generally understand the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment. Any person who attends the meeting shall be afforded an opportunity to make representations in respect of the proposed amendment.

If you wish to be notified of Township Council's decision in respect to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment, you must submit a written request (with forwarding addresses) to the Clerk of the Township of Melancthon at 157101 Highway 10, Melancthon, Ontario, L9V 2E6 fax (519) 925-1110

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Township of Melancthon before the by-law is passed, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the Township of Melancthon to the Ontario Municipal Board.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Township of Melancthon before the by-law is passed, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Further information relating to the proposed amendment is available to the public for inspection at the Township of Melancthon Municipal Office on Monday to Friday, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

,

Mailing Date of this Notice: July 16, 2015

nin & folma

Denise Holmes, CAO/Clerk Township of Melancthon



AREA AFFECTED BY PROPOSED ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT