

June 24, 2011

**REVISED NOTICE OF  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**

**DATE:** Tuesday, June 28, 2011

**TIME:** 10:45 a.m. – 12:30 Noon - Tour of Pittock CA and surrounding area  
12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. - Lunch  
1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. - Board of Directors' Meeting

**LOCATION:** Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and  
Rural Affairs Office  
401 Lakeview Drive (595236 Highway 59 North)  
Woodstock, Ontario (Map attached)

**REVISED  
AGENDA:\*\***

**TIME**

1. Approval of Agenda 1:30 p.m.
2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest
3. Confirmation of Payment as Required Through Statutory Obligations
4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting  
- Tuesday, May 24, 2011
5. **\*\*Delegation 1:35 p.m.**  
**- Joanne McIntosh on behalf of the citizens of Motherwell**  
**(5 minutes)**
6. Business Arising from the Minutes
  - (a) Ellice Swamp Update 1:40 p.m.  
(B.Mackie)(Verbal)  
(5 minutes)
7. (a) For Your Information Report 1:45 p.m.  
(I.Wilcox)(Report attached)
  - (b) Fanshawe Pioneer Village Update 1:50 p.m.  
(S.Johnson)(Report attached)  
(5 minutes)

	<b>TIME</b>
8. Committee of the Whole – In Camera	
(a) Motherwell Property Matter Update (A. Shivas/ B. Mackie)(Verbal) (5 minutes)	1:55 p.m.
9. Presentation	
(a) Conservation Areas’ Presentation (J.Howley)(Verbal) (30 minutes)	2:00 p.m.
10. Business for Approval	
(a) UTRCA Conservation Areas Funding Issues : Discussion Paper (I.Wilcox(Report attached)(Document #94067 and #93858) (20 minutes)	2:30 p.m.
(b) 2012 Budget Concepts (I.Wilcox)(Report attached)(Document #94021) (20 minutes)	2:50 p.m.
(c) Administration and Enforcement - Section 28 (K. Winfield)(Report attached)(Document 94031) (5 minutes)	3:10 p.m.
11. Business for Information	
(a) Watershed Conservation Centre Update (A. Shivas)(Verbal) (10 minutes)	3:15 p.m.
(b) Quarterly Budget Summary (L.Trottier)(Report attached) (10 minutes)	3:25 p.m.
(c) Employment Programs Report (T.Hollingsworth(Verbal) (5 minutes)	3:35 p.m.
(d) Pittock Dam Gate Painting Phase 3 - Tender Award (R.Goldt)(Report attached)(Document #94041) (5 minutes)	3:40 p.m.

	<b>TIME</b>
12. Standing Committees	.
(a) Joint Health and Safety Committee Minutes - February 17, 2011 (Document #91760) - April 14, 2011 (Document #92823) (5 minutes)	3:45 p.m.
13. Other Business (Including Chair and General Manager's Comments) (5 minutes)	3:50 p.m.
14. Adjournment	3:55 p.m.

---

Ian Wilcox, General Manager

c.c. Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

I.Wilcox	R.Datema	T.Hollingsworth
J.Brick	C.Machan	M.Snowsell
C.Tasker	S.Musclow	L.Trottier
B.Glasman	B.Mackie	K.Winfield
C.Harrington	A.Shivas	Woodstock Sentinel Review
S.Johnson	J.Howley	Stratford Beacon Herald
S.Shivas	G.Inglis	London Free Press

MINUTES  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
TUESDAY JUNE 28, 2011

The members and staff toured Pittock Conservation Area and surrounding properties the morning of June 28<sup>th</sup>.

Following the tour and lunch, J.Boyce, Vice-Chair of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority called the Board of Directors' meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. in the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs Boardroom in Woodstock Ontario. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members:	A.Bannister	T.Jackson
	M.Blackie	D.Lazenby
	J.Boyce	C.Mott
	R.Chowen	J.Northcott
	S.Clark	A.Ralph
	B.French	G.Way

Staff:	R.Datema	S.Shivas
	C.Harrington	C.Tasker
	J.Howley	T.Tchir
	C.Machan	L.Trottier
	B.Mackie	B.Verscheure
	C.Quinlan	I.Wilcox
	A.Shivas	K.Winfield

Solicitor: G.Inglis

Regrets: J.Baechler R. Forbes H.McDermid

J.Boyce advised the members that she would be Chairing the meeting in the absence of J.Baechler who was vacationing in Turkey.

1. Approval of Agenda

J.Boyce referred to the amended agenda as circulated to the members.

T.Jackson moved D.Lazenby seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the amended agenda as circulated.”

CARRIED.

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

The Vice-Chair inquired whether the members had any conflicts of interest to declare relating to the agenda. There were none.

3. Confirmation of Payment as Required  
Through Statutory Obligations

The Vice-Chair inquired whether the Authority has met its statutory obligations in the payment of the Accounts Payable. The members were advised the Authority has met its statutory obligations.

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting  
Tuesday, May 24, 2011

A.Bannister moved – G.Way seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the minutes of the Board of Directors’ meeting dated May 24, 2011 as presented.”

CARRIED.

5. Delegation

The Chair welcomed J. McIntosh, E.Petrie and the delegation representing the citizens of the Village of Motherwell and the surrounding community to the Board meeting.

The Vice-Chair advised the members that J.McIntosh contacted I.Wilcox late last week requesting an opportunity to address the Board regarding the Village of Motherwell. The Vice-Chair and General Manager agreed to waive the normal 10 day requirement for notification to present delegations to the Board.

J.McIntosh and E.Petrie made short presentations outlining the community and citizens concerns as it relates to the preservation and the future of the Village of Motherwell. The citizens would appreciate the buildings owned by the Authority in Motherwell be maintained and inhabited and the Authority advise the community of any current intentions as it relates to these properties. They also requested that the local community be consulted in advance of any changes that are proposed for the UTRCA properties in Motherwell.

J.Boyce thanked the delegation for attending and noted their presentations would be received and noted. She stated that staff would take their comments and concerns under advisement in future discussions and decisions relating to this matter.

6. Business Arising from the Minutes

(a) Ellice Swamp Update

B.Mackie advised the members that although a final solution has not been determined, two beaver dams have been constructed since the last meeting, and the water level has returned to its normal level.

He noted there are ongoing discussions between the Township of Perth East and the Grand River Conservation Authority regarding the possible construction of a berm, however, no decision regarding this matter has been confirmed.

7. (a) For Your Information

The report was presented to the members for their information.

(b) Fanshawe Pioneer Village Update Report

The report was presented to the members for their information.

8. Committee of the Whole – In Camera

There being business to bring before the Committee of the Whole – In Camera

T.Jackson moved – D.Lazenby seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors adjourn to Committee of the Whole – In Camera.”

CARRIED.

9. Progress Reported

(a) A property matter relating to the Village of Motherwell was discussed.

(b) A letter from the Municipality of West Perth was discussed.

J.Northcott moved – S.Clark seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority advise the Municipality of West Perth that the UTRCA manages all of its properties in compliance with its own, municipal, and provincial policies and standards and the Authority assumes Council would be supportive of this position; that rental property leases are a legal contract between the landlord and tenant and are dealt with as an operational matter that will be managed by staff; and further the UTRCA will consult with all of its member municipalities regarding matters of policy, not operational matters. This has always been the Authority’s approach and it is consistent with municipal practice.”

CARRIED.

10. Presentation

(a) Conservation Areas’ Presentation

J.Howley made a presentation relating to the three Conservation Areas. She briefly outlined the history of the Authority and the park operations prior to funding cuts during the 1990's. She compared the past and current operations with emphasis on staff numbers and capital project investments. She highlighted the cuts that have occurred in both areas. She further outlined the statistics relating to overnight and seasonal camping and day use activities. She referred to the unit’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges based on current day operations and compared to the statistics shared earlier in the presentation. She also updated the members on the status of the proposed Business Plan outlining the effort and results of the endeavour.

B.French inquired where the Authority directs revenue from land dispositions. I.Wilcox stated that in the past land revenue has been directed to operations and subsidizing the Conservation Areas' capital projects. In the future the Authority's intent would be to invest any land revenue back into land management. He noted that the Authority cannot continue subsidizing the recreational projects with capital money.

Following a further discussion, the Vice-Chair thanked J.Howley, B.Verscheure, R.Datema, C.Machan and S.Musclow for their participation in the Pittock Tour earlier in the day.

11. Business for Approval

- (a) UTRCA Conservation Areas Funding Issues: Discussion Paper  
(Report attached)(Document #94067)

I.Wilcox summarized the attached report for the members' consideration. He emphasized that the Conservation Areas were created and operated for forty years based on three sources of revenue; gate revenue, municipal levy and Provincial funding. A decision was made for 1997 due to the economic constraints at the time to go to only gate receipts anticipating it would be adequate to keep the parks functional. For the past fifteen years the Conservation Areas have tried to function on gate revenue alone. Based on today's tour and the previous presentation it is obvious the 1997 decision has been detrimental to the Conservation Areas. He advised the members there has never been a decision or discussion that the Board endorsed stating it was inappropriate for municipal funding or provincial funding to be directed to Conservation Areas.

The General Manager presented Recommendation #1 and stated that although no action is required from the Board he felt the members should be aware that the Conservation Areas funding shortfalls are not due to the lack of attendance or the inefficiency of staff. He noted that despite the noted decline in seasonal camping the parks remain popular, busy and well received. The shortfalls are, in part a creation of the UTRCA budget/accounting system and do not reflect the true value of the Conservation Areas as outlined in the attached report.

The General Manager presented Recommendation #2, to support 50% of the Coordinator of Conservation Areas wage and benefits with a new levy. He highlighted the rationale for the recommendation as outlined in the attached report. He stated no action is required from the Board at this time as the matter will be further discussed under Agenda Item 11(b) 2012 Budget Concepts.

The General Manager presented Recommendation #3 and stated that the Board's approval would affirm the Conservation Areas on-going eligibility to apply for capital surcharge funding. He reminded the members that annually the Coordinators submit a list of proposed projects for funding through the capital surcharge levy for Board approval. The General Manager reminded the members that the Board approved two Conservation Area projects for 2011 and this would permit future annual submissions.

Following a further discussion the Chair requested direction from the Board,

A.Bannister moved – S.Clark seconded:

“RESOLVED that the Board of Directors affirm the on-going eligibility of the Conservation Areas Unit

to apply for capital surcharge funding, recognizing this is a levy based source of funding. There is currently an approved motion supporting this funding for 2011. This approach is consistent with past funding practices.

CARRIED.

The General Manager presented Recommendation #4 to recast the Conservation Areas Business Plan as part of our annual year-end Conservation Areas program evaluation as outlined in the attached report.

I.Wilcox advised the members that the Authority has struggled with the development of a Conservation Area Business Plan intended to solve the “financial crisis” and patterned after a private business model. He noted that in reality the Conservation Areas cannot function as a for-profit private business based on the scale of the operation, constraints as a public agency, and the Authority’s true-cost accounting system.

The members entered into a discussion regarding funding options such as public private partnerships, re-establishing the Authority foundation, and a specific municipal levy to cover costs of the Conservation Areas.

The General Manager stated for the past several years the Authority has explored several private partnerships and other funding sources to diversify the revenue streams, with limited success. He welcomed the members input regarding this endeavour.

The members entered into a discussion regarding how the operations and opportunities vary from one Conservation Area to another. It was also noted that each area has different strengths and weaknesses.

T.Jackson recommended that the strengths and weaknesses of each area be identified and create an Adhoc Committee to assist with the development of individual Business Plans.

T.Jackson moved – J.Northcott seconded:-

RESOLVED that the Board of Directors defer Recommendation #4 until the operational needs for each of the three Conservation Areas have been identified and reflected in individual Business Plans.”

CARRIED.

- (b) 2012 Budget Concepts  
(Report attached)(Document #94021)

I.Wilcox outlined the report for the members’ consideration. J.Boyce suggested that in the second paragraph, the wording “draft 2011 Budget” be amended to read, “draft 2012 Budget’. Following a brief discussion,

T.Jackson moved – S.Clark seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the Board of Directors approve the recommendation as outlined in the attached report.”

CARRIED.

- (c) Administration and Enforcement – Section 28 Report  
(Report attached)(Document #94031)

The report was presented to the members for consideration.

A.Bannister moved –T.Jackson seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the actions of staff as outlined in the attached report.

CARRIED.

12. Business for Information

- (a) Watershed Conservation Centre Update

A.Shivas presented the monthly progress report relating to the new Watershed Conservation Centre.

- (b) Quarterly Budget Summary  
(Report attached)

L.Trottier presented the attached report for the members’ information.

- (c) Employment Programs Report  
(Verbal)

T.Hollingsworth made a presentation relating to the status of the current employment programs for the members’ information.

- (d) Pittock Dam Gate Painting Phase 3 – Tender Award  
(Report attached)(Document #94041)

The report was presented to the members for information.

13. Standing Committees

- (a) Joint Health and Safety Committee Minutes  
- February 17, 2011 (Document #91760)  
- April 14, 2011 (Document #92823)

The reports were presented to the members for consideration.

R.Chowen moved – T.Jackson seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the recommendations in the Joint Health and Safety Minutes dated February 17, 2011 and April 14, 2011.”

CARRIED.

14. Other Business (Including Chair and General Manager's Comments)

- (a) I.Wilcox advised the members that the Municipal Council Tour has been deferred until Fall, 2011.
- (b) The General Manager reminded the members there will be no Board of Directors' meeting in July and wished everyone an enjoyable summer.
- (c) T.Hollingsworth reminded the members of the 12th Kelly Mohring Memorial Golf Classic scheduled for August 9, 2011 at the Forest City National Golf Club. She welcomed the members to play golf, come for the dinner or volunteer. She also requested the members to consider donating an item or money towards the "Board of Directors' gift basket" to be auctioned off at the tournament.
- (d) J.Boyce referred to the Conservation Ontario's booklet "Your Guide to Conservation Areas In Ontario" and noted it contains useful information on all the Conservation Areas across Ontario. She wished everyone a good summer.

14. Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m. on a motion by S.Clark.

---

Ian Wilcox, General Manager  
/ses  
Att.

---

J.Boyce, Vice-Chair



"Two Eyes" is one of the cultural feature that the trail passes.

## Official Opening of the Oxford Thames River Trail

The Oxford Thames River Trail was a dream born in 2007 with a consultant's feasibility study funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation. The study outlined a trail to be built on county-owned lands along the Thames River, between Beachville and Woodstock.

The Oxford County Trails Council, working in conjunction with a group of Beachville trail enthusiasts, launched a fund raising campaign in January 2010. Their goal: to turn this dream into a reality.

The Trails Council is proud to officially open the first phase of the Oxford Thames River Trail on June 11, 2011. This realization of a five year long dream is just the beginning of what is hoped to be a trail system connecting Woodstock to Ingersoll. This project has come about through the hard work and generosity of many local citizens, as well as partnerships with municipalities, the UTRCA and local businesses.

The trail is designed to allow people to enjoy this beautiful natural area along the Thames River while having minimal impact on the sensitive environment. Interpretive signs will help people to identify the many bird species and to learn about the area's heritage.

Permitted trail uses are walking, bicycling, dog walking (dogs must be on leash), cross-country skiing and snowshoeing. No motorized vehicles are permitted. The Oxford County Trails Council Website is [www.oxfordcountyclub.ca](http://www.oxfordcountyclub.ca)

Contact: Brad Hertner, Community Partnership Specialist

## Cool, Wet Spring Causes Anthracnose

This spring, homeowners may have noticed some trees with wilting, blotchy brown leaves. This condition is called anthracnose. Anthracnose is a fungal leaf disease that is common in years with cool, wet spring weather. The species most often infected are maple, oak, ash and sycamore.

Anthracnose is not usually a serious problem but often causes concern to homeowners. Infected trees may experience some premature leaf drop. However, even heavily infected trees that lose a good percentage of their leaves will experience a second leaf flush, providing the overall health of these trees has not been compromised by other factors.

Warm, dry, sunny days will bring an end to the infection. Leaves that do drop should be collected and sent to a municipal composting facility to prevent them from being a source of infection in future years.

As homeowners the best we can do is to try to maintain the overall health and vigour of these trees. If we experience a drought later this summer, a weekly slow, deep watering will help to minimize any stress that anthracnose may have caused.

Contact: John Enright, Forester



The brown spots on this Red Oak's leaves are a result of anthracnose.



The UTRCA's Aquatic Biologist collects benthos in Nissouri Creek.

## 2011 Water Monitoring Program

The UTRCA water monitoring programs are in full swing for 2011 with both routine stream monitoring and special projects starting up. All the rain this spring has meant high flows in the creeks and some challenges with aquatic monitoring.

A variety of monitoring is done to assess the stream health and pollution levels in the 28 watersheds that make up the Upper Thames watershed. The results are used to measure the effect of land use activities and conservation measures on streams, and to help to target new work. Data is reported through the UTRCA's Watershed Report Cards and other project reports. The following projects are part of this year's stream monitoring program.

### *Stream Water Quality*

UTRCA monitors 24 stream sites monthly for water chemistry (such as nutrients and metals) as part of the Ministry of the Environment's (MOE) Provincial Water Quality Monitoring Network. Bacteria is monitored at these same locations through a partnership with local health units. This monitoring program has run for over 40 years and provides a good measure of long term pollutant levels. The UTRCA added three new long term sites starting in 2010.

### *Fish Communities*

Fish sampling so far this year has included electrofishing demonstrations on Medway, Oxbow and Trout Creeks. Weekends in the early spring were spent assisting the Thames River Anglers Association (TRAA) with their Steelhead (lake-run Rainbow Trout) tagging study.

A total of 29 returning trout were captured, including two of the 19 that were tagged in the spring of 2009. Of the 2009 tags, one has already been turned in, from a fish caught four months after it was tagged from south of Erieau in Lake Erie. This indicates that the migration route for at least some of the lake-bound young fish and returning adults includes the Thames River, Lake St. Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. For more information on the TRAA tagging program, go to [www.anglers.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=39](http://www.anglers.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=39).

Plans are progressing for summer and fall sampling although we are still waiting for word on several project and funding proposals.

### *Benthic Invertebrates*

Benthic invertebrates are excellent indicators of water and aquatic ecosystem quality. UTRCA benthic monitoring was done in late May and early June at 55 sites. Included were those sites that contribute to the water quality scores in the Watershed Report Cards as well as a set of reference (or least impacted) sites. Later in the year, the reference sites will be repeated, and sites monitoring urban and rural development and remedial projects will be sampled.



The UTRCA's Monitoring Technician downloads water level data from a groundwater monitoring well.

### *Groundwater*

The UTRCA has 24 monitoring wells in the Provincial Groundwater Monitoring Network where water levels are monitored continuously throughout the year. The water level (quantity) data is being examined for two pilot projects currently underway for the Ontario Low Water Response Program in partnership with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). Starting in September, the wells will also be sampled for water quality.

The UTRCA has an additional 13 monitoring wells and two related surface water sites that are sampled three times per year for water quality, in partnership with the City of London. An additional four wells are monitored in partnership with the Thames-Sydenham and Region Drinking Water Source Protection Region.

### *Pesticides*

The UTRCA will continue to monitor pesticides as part of an Ontario Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) Agricultural Pesticide Study that started in 2004. This year, three rural stream locations will be monitored from June to November: Otter, Gregory and Reynolds Creeks.

### *Nutrient Management*

The UTRCA renewed a contract with the MOE to continue water quality and stream flow monitoring for an eight-year nutrient management study. The purpose of the project is to assess water quality in streams draining agricultural lands and to look for trends related to nutrient management and other land use practices. The UTRCA monitors seven small agricultural watersheds for this study.

### *Reservoir Monitoring*

UTRCA reservoirs are monitored to assess dissolved oxygen and temperature conditions, to help inform reservoir management decisions. Routine monitoring is conducted from June to September at Fanshawe, Wildwood, Pittock, Stratford and Mitchell Reservoirs.

### *Temperature*

The UTRCA has 20 continuous temperature meters. This year, the meters will be used throughout the watershed to assess stream temperature in order to identify cold, cool and warm water streams, as well as to measure the benefits of stream rehabilitation projects. *Contact: Karen Maaskant, Water Quality Specialist, Karla Young, Monitoring Technician, John Schwindt, Aquatic Biologist, and Cathy Reeves, Aquatic Biology Technician*

## White Perch and Bass

White Perch and White Bass are the only two representatives of the Temperate Bass Family found in Ontario (our more commonly encountered Smallmouth and Largemouth Bass are actually members of the Sunfish Family). Both White Bass and White Bass occur in the Thames River. Anecdotally we are hearing of more being caught in recent years in the London area all the way up to the Fanshawe Dam on the North Thames.

The easiest way to tell these two species apart is to look for horizontal stripes. The White Bass has several horizontal stripes but they are lacking or indistinct on the White Perch. The species also differ somewhat in shape with the bass having a relatively flat back, and the perch having a more humped back. A more technical means for telling them apart involves examining the two dorsal (back) fins, which are joined by a small membrane on the perch but not on the bass. The accompanying photos illustrate another difference in the relative lengths of the spines and soft rays in the anal fins (bottom fin near the tail) of each species.

The White Bass is native to the lower Great Lakes and is generally larger than the perch, averaging 25-30 cm in length.

The White Perch is native to the Atlantic region and is believed to have taken advantage of the various canals to expand its range into the Great Lakes. Like many invasive species, it has the potential to have negative impacts on native fish and fish communities. One concern is that it will compete for food and space with native species. Although edible, it averages only 15 cm in length in our area so rarely gets harvested for food, giving it a selective advantage over other species such as Yellow Perch and Walleye. It is also reputed to feed heavily on the eggs of gamefish, may



The White Bass is native to the lower Great Lakes.



The White Perch is not native to the Great Lakes.

hybridize with White Bass which could weaken their genetic stocks, and has a high reproductive potential which causes it to overpopulate its habitat and become stunted.

Both species feed primarily on small fish and insect larvae. They often travel and feed in large schools, being particularly active near the surface in the evening. As such, they can provide excellent angling opportunities, especially for anglers flyfishing or using light spinning tackle. As there do not appear to be any seasonal regulations or possession limits ([www.mnr.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@mnr/@letsfish/documents/document/mnr\\_e001335.pdf](http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@mnr/@letsfish/documents/document/mnr_e001335.pdf)), these two species provide an excellent angling alternative to our more commonly targeted gamefish.

*Contact: John Schwindt, Aquatic Biologist*

## Great Week at the Water Festival!

This year's St. Thomas-Elgin Children's Water Festival took place May 17-20 at Pinafore Park in St. Thomas. This annual event provided a hands-on learning environment for over 3,000 students from 30 schools in the Thames Valley District School Board, London District Catholic School Board and private schools.

Students discovered the importance of water in their classroom, home and community. The Festival consisted of 44 interactive activity stations linked to the Ontario Curriculum. The activities were grouped around five themes: water conservation, water attitude, water technology, water protection and water science.

This four day festival was made possible by the hard work and dedication of over 100 volunteers per day. A total of 26 UTRCA staff members volunteered their time for at least one day at this year's festival.

The Organizing Committee for the festival included local private businesses, government agencies, and conservation authorities including the UTRCA, all of whom invested staff time and resources into organizing this event.

Many thanks to all of the sponsors, as their generous donations attributed to this successful event.

The Festival has rotated through Middlesex, Oxford and Elgin Counties since 2007. This year was the second time the Festival has been hosted in St. Thomas-Elgin. There is already lots to look forward to for next year's Oxford Children's Water Festival.

Contact: *Christina Baranik, Community Partnership Specialist*



The prairie site at Archie Coulter CA.

## Prairie Partners

On Monday, June 13 the UTRCA partnered with Catfish Creek Conservation Authority to plant 2 acres of CCCA property into prairie. The site is at the Archie Coulter Conservation Area.

A mix of Big Bluestem, Canada Wild Rye Grass and Indian Grass was combined with Smooth Aster, Wild Bergamot, Smooth and Hairy Beardtongue and Black-eyed Susan.

The UTRCA was consulted on species selection and sourcing, and our Truax seeder was used for the project. The seed was obtained from the Rural Lambton Stewardship Network seed processing warehouse in Chatham.

Contact: *Karen Pugh, Resource Specialist*



UTRCA Conservation Services staff prepare the seeder.



UTRCA Conservation Services staff use the Truax seeder to plant the prairie seed mix.

## Family Fishing Week

July 2-10 is Family Fishing Week. This event is a great opportunity for Canadian residents to explore Ontario's fishing licence free. (The conservation licence limits outlined in the Ontario Fisheries Regulations must still be observed.) More information is available at [www.familyfishingweekend.com](http://www.familyfishingweekend.com).

Contact: *Cathy Reeves, Aquatic Biology Technician*

## Upcoming Events

- June 18: The Wild Ride, Wildwood CA
- June 18: Outdoor Day, Fanshawe CA
- July 1: Woodstock Canada Day Celebration, Pittock CA
- July 9: Catch and Release Family Fishing Derby, Wildwood CA
- July 9: Family Fishing Day, Fanshawe CA
- August 9: Kelly Mohring Memorial Golf Tournament, Forest City National Golf Club, London
- August 13: Woodstock Rotary Dragon Boat Festival, Pittock CA

Contact: *Steve Sauder, Marketing Specialist*

## On the Agenda

The following items will be presented at the UTRCA Board of Directors meeting on June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2011. Board meeting minutes are posted at [www.thamesriver.on.ca](http://www.thamesriver.on.ca); click on "Downloads."

- Ellice Swamp Update
- Conservation Areas' Presentation
- Conservation Areas Funding Model Discussion Paper
- 2012 Budget Concepts
- Administration and Enforcement - Section 28
- Watershed Conservation Centre Update
- Quarterly Budget Summary
- Conservation Ontario Electronic Bulletin
- Employment Programs Report
- Pittock Dam Gate Painting Phase 3 - Tender Award
- Joint Health and Safety Committee Minutes

Contact: *Susan Shivas, Executive Assistant*



*Fanshawe Pioneer Village  
June 2011 Update*

*Capital Campaign*

Total raised to date: \$2,792,163

The BIG on HISTORY! Capital Campaign received a BIG gift from the Irish Benevolent Society. A gift of \$3000 will go towards the exterior painting of the Corbett Tavern, now known as the Home of the Irish Benevolent Society.

Additional gifts were received from the Susan Agranove Fund and the Beverly Baines Fund, both funds within the London Community Foundation totaling \$4725 for a new roof on Caverhill Woodworking Shop.

*Grants and Sponsorships*

In June, approvals were received from the Young Canada Works program to employ two students to assist with Collections Management and Education program development. Six student positions were approved through Canada Summer Jobs to support on-site Interpretation, Maintenance and the Toll Gate. Finally, one student position was approved through Summer Student Exchange to assist with summer day camps.

Sponsorship has been received from the London Heritage Council and the Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund totaling almost \$20,000 to support our **1812 Grand Tactical: The Invasion of Upper Canada** on October 1 – 2, 2011.

*Attendance Targets*

Total attendance as of the end of May is 6224, just short of our target of 6300. Cool, wet weather had a negative impact on casual visitation and as a result, earnings from the café and general store are down from the same time last year.

*Upcoming Events*

**Friday Night Summer Concert Series**

*Friday, June 24<sup>th</sup>*

Take a seat, grab a drink and listen to lovely local folk music on a summer evening. This event will begin at 8:30 p.m. in the Pioneer Village Café.

June 24<sup>th</sup> – The London Irish Folk Club

## **Dominion Day**

*Friday, July 1st*

On the 1<sup>st</sup> of July, 1867, Canada became a self-governing colony within the British Empire. We offer you the chance to relive the past and discover the events surrounding the first Dominion Day (now Canada Day). Historical debates, patriotic speeches, cake and lemonade and vintage baseball are a few of the activities that will bring the past to life.

Vintage Base Ball Game between London Tecumsehs and London Area Dodgers at 1:00 pm.

**Sponsored by General Dynamics Land Systems Canada**

## **Victorian Teddy Bear Picnic**

*Sunday, July 10th*

All the bears are gathering today for a Victorian Teddy Bear Picnic. Bring out your favourite stuffed friend for an afternoon of games, story telling, a parade, and afternoon tea.

**Sponsored by Build A Bear**

## **Friday Night Summer Concert Series**

*Friday, July 22<sup>nd</sup>*

Take a seat, grab a drink and listen to lovely local folk music on a summer evening. This event will begin at 8:30 p.m. in the Pioneer Village Café.

July 22<sup>nd</sup> – Three Penny Piece

## **Summer Daycamps**

July 12 - 15    Ages 9 - 12

July 19 – 22    Ages 6 - 8

July 26 - 29    Ages 6 – 8

August 9 – 12            Ages 9 - 12

August 16 – 19            Ages 6 - 8

August 23 – 26            Ages 6 - 8

**ALL NEW! Time Travelers Summer Day Camp:** It's the ultimate summer adventure - travel back in time! Fanshawe Pioneer Village offers a new summer day camp experience for children 6 - 12 who will become part of Village life. Campers will engage in farm and household chores, become apprentices in our Print, Woodworking and Blacksmith shops, learn and play 19th century games, create Victorian crafts. Celebrate the end of a great week with a proper 19th century social.

## **Theatre Royal: Musical Theatre from 1842**

**Tuesday to Thursday** *July 12th – 14<sup>th</sup>*

**Tuesday to Friday** *July 19th – 22<sup>nd</sup>*

**The Miller and his Men, A Musical Melodrama by Isaac Pocock**

Experience musical melodrama as it was performed by the Officers of the Garrison when London was a frontier town. An old miller's beautiful daughter is pursued by two suitors: one

aging, but rich; another young but poor. To win her hand, the young man makes a secret pledge:  
to rid  
the land of the banditti, and restore the fortunes of the old miller. Little does he know but  
someone has darker plans for them all. Cheer the heroes! Boo the villains!

Researched and produced by Mark Tovey  
Directed by Joe Lella  
**Sponsored by: The London Heritage Council**

Performance at 7:30 p.m.  
Tickets: \$15.00 each, admission included.  
Advance booking recommended.

**Fanshawe Frolic: Victorian Dance Weekend at the Village**  
*Saturday, July 30th and Sunday, July 31st*

The whole Village is coming to the ball! Come learn the social dances of a century ago with  
Dance Mistress, Mme. Stephens on Saturday afternoon. Enjoy a country supper in the evening,  
followed by a 19<sup>th</sup> century ball. All dances will be easy to learn and to do. Period costumes are  
encouraged but not required. Bring your whole family back on Sunday afternoon for Family  
Frolic, more dancing and afternoon tea.  
Tickets: \$50.00 per person for the whole weekend  
Advance booking is required.

**Fanshawe Agricultural Fair**  
*Saturday, August 20th and Sunday, August 21st*

Experience all the pleasures of a 19<sup>th</sup> century rural fair with threshing demonstrations, exhibits,  
rare breed displays, musical entertainment and classic cars.

Presented in partnership with Tri-County Heritage Club  
**Sponsored by Casco Inc. and Pioneer HI-Bred Limited**

**Friday Night Summer Concert Series**  
*Friday, August 26<sup>th</sup>*

Take a seat, grab a drink and listen to lovely local folk music on a summer evening. This event  
will begin at 8:30 p.m. in the Pioneer Village Café.  
August 26<sup>th</sup> – Allison Brown & Dan Henshall

*Respectfully Submitted*  
*Sheila A. Johnson*  
*Executive Director*

---

**To:** UTRCA Board of Directors

**From:** Ian Wilcox, General Manager

**Date:** June 14, 2011

**Agenda #:**

**Subject:** Conservation Areas Funding Issues

**Filename:** ::ODMA\GRPWISE\UT\_MAIN.UT  
RCA\_PO.File\_Centre\_Library:940  
67.1

---

Attached please find a copy of "Upper Thames River Conservation Authority Conservation Areas Funding Issues: Discussion Paper." This paper is provided, in part, as an orientation for the Board to the financial challenges of the parks. The paper also offers a set of recommendations for your consideration to bring some financial stability to our Conservation Areas.

Our June 2011 Board meeting will include a tour of Pittock Conservation Area, a ½ hour presentation regarding the Conservation Areas Unit, and a review of this Discussion Paper. This package of information will then feed into our broader 2012 Draft Budget discussions, also included as part of the June meeting agenda.

If you have questions about the content of the Discussion Paper prior to the June meeting, please call.

Prepared by:

Ian Wilcox

**Upper Thames River Conservation  
Authority  
Conservation Areas Funding Issues:  
Discussion Paper**

**June 2011**

# UTRCA Conservation Areas Funding Issues: Discussion Paper

## Introduction

The Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA) owns and operates three large day-use/ camping facilities at Fanshawe, Wildwood and Pittock Conservation Areas. These facilities provide a high quality outdoor recreation experience to nearly ½ million visitors annually. The Conservation Areas are the most visible face of the UTRCA and present a unique opportunity for the Authority to deliver its key conservation messages to a captive audience while encouraging access to a unique natural area and providing significant economic spin-offs for our local municipalities.

Despite this success, chronic funding shortfalls have plagued the operation of these three Conservation Areas during the past 15 years resulting in operations that are under-staffed with severely deteriorating infrastructure. While a range of corrective measures have been attempted during this time, including repeated rounds of expenditure cuts to staffing and capital, as well as revenue generation partnerships with the private sector, there has been no long-term solution found using the current funding model of self-sufficiency through gate revenues.

While the Board has been aware of these on-going budget challenges for many years, what has been less clear is the underlying funding model for the Conservation Areas. A deeper understanding of our funding model and how the Conservation Areas' budget influences the rest of the UTRCA's programs and services is required so that the Board may either consider changes or, at the very least, better understand our year-end financial situation and place it in context of the Authority's budget as a whole. **Overall, the basis of the argument being put forward in this paper is that the financial 'crisis' faced by our Conservation Areas is largely a product of our existing funding model, not a lack of business or program inefficiencies.** In other words, we have created our own financial problems.

The following paper reviews the evolution of our Conservation Areas funding and concludes with a number of recommendations.

## Conservation Area Funding History

*(Reprinted from a June 15, 2005 Board Report by Alex Shivas)*

*(Note: Minor edits to the original report have been made and information updated to 2011)*

The need for improved recreational facilities within the watershed was discussed in detail in the 1940s. Comprehensive watershed surveys undertaken by the Branch of the Department of Planning and Development addressed not only flood control but the additional challenges of land use, forestry, wildlife and recreation. The first Conservation Report prepared by the Branch for the Upper Thames in 1945, devoted much attention to the need for recreation within the Upper Thames watershed.

The Upper Thames Valley Conservation Report (1952) recommended specifically "*That the 2,226 acres, including the proposed Fanshawe Dam site and the banks of the North Branch of the Thames...be acquired and administered by the Authority as a multi-use recreation area*". The report further detailed the facilities to be provided by the Authority in the proposed Thames Valley Park including:

- Boating and fishing
- Aquatic sports facilities
- Wading beaches for children
- Scenic drives with pullouts

- Picnic sites
- Group and individual camping areas
- Nature trails & ski trails
- An Outdoor Theatre

The basis for this recommendation is also documented in the 1952 Report as follows: *“The planning of recreation facilities in Ontario has in the past been chiefly directed towards two ends: facilities such as parks and playgrounds within the boundaries of cities and towns, and facilities for long and comparatively expensive vacations in the wilderness regions remote from the industrial and agricultural areas of the Province...it is now recognized that a third type of facility has been neglected – the public area within a few miles of the urban worker’s home”*. In regards to camping facilities, the Report stated simply, *“There are no camping areas outside the urban areas in the watershed”*.

In support of the report, the Federal Government set a condition on funding for the construction of Fanshawe Dam in that the Authority would develop a multi-use recreational facility around the reservoir. The Provincial Government further provided statutory approval for such development by amending the Conservation Authorities Act in 1954 to provide funding grants for recreational facilities. Recreation had now become a legitimate component of conservation programs set forth by Authorities across the Province.

Fanshawe Conservation Area was the first to be developed with the opening of a swimming area in 1952. Multi-use recreation facilities were developed at Wildwood Conservation Area beginning in 1965 and at Pittock Conservation Area in 1968.

**Financial Background:**

From the early 1950s until 1993, Provincial grants and municipal levy supported the development and operation of the Conservation Areas. The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) provided grants of up to 50% for capital development costs and 50% of motor pool related costs for the Conservations Areas. In the late 1980s, the capital project budget alone was in excess of \$400,000 annually. However MNR funding for Conservation Areas stopped in 1993 as part of broader provincial financial constraints.

Municipal levy also supported the operations until 1997 covering all staff benefits, capital development management (a separate position no longer in place), 100% of the wages for the Coordinator of Conservation Areas, and 50% of the wages for each Park Superintendent.

In 1997, with the implementation of the UTRCA’s new financial system based on allocating the costs associated with service costs centres, an additional financial burden was placed on the Conservation Area operations. About the same time, restructuring of the organization removed specific financial centres (revenue sources) from the Conservation Area operations (golf courses, cottages, agricultural properties) to fund management of non-revenue producing properties.

The following chart summarizes the annual financial impact on the Conservation Areas budget since 1993, based on 2011 values.

Conservation Area Budget Impacts		
1993 Budget Specifics	1993 Funding Source	Reduced Funding in 2011 \$s
Benefits/Vacation	Municipal Levy	(\$358,000.00)

Superintendent's Position *this position was eliminated in 2006 in order to balance the budget	Municipal Levy	(\$80,000.00)
Motor Pool	50% Provincial Grant	(\$140,000.00)
Capital Development	50% Provincial Grant	(\$125,000.00)
Capital Administration	Municipal Levy	(\$30,000.00)
Property Revenues Remained in Conservation Areas Budget	golf courses, agricultural properties, cottages	(\$340,000.00)
Allocated Costs	Municipal Levy	(\$470,000.00)
<b>Total</b>		<b>(\$1,543,000.00)</b>

**Summary:**

The following is a partial list of issues that have impacted the Conservation Areas as a direct result of the changes to the funding model.

- Reduction of full-time and seasonal staff in an attempt to offset loss of MNR grants and municipal levy,
- Reduction in programs and services while maximizing gate fees,
- Minimal capital development resulting in aging and failing infrastructure,
- Ongoing operating deficit (~\$60,000/year),
- Minimal capacity to deal with new legislation (e.g., drinking water regulations, health & safety).
- Gate fees have been maximized

In summary, the Conservation Areas were planned and built with infrastructure and operations scaled and reliant on three sources of funding: provincial, municipal and gate revenue. Only gate revenues remain. Additionally, the UTRCA's true cost accounting system (allocated costs) has significantly increased overhead expenditures from the original funding model without any additional sources of revenue.

*(This concludes the 2005 Board Report)*

## **Analysis**

### **1. Provincial Funding Cuts**

Provincial funding for Conservation Areas was eliminated in 1993. It is unlikely this funding will be restored and staff are not advocating any further action to re-establish provincial funding.

### **2. Municipal Levy Cuts**

The UTRCA does not have a formal policy restricting Conservation Areas from municipal funding. Rather, a decision was made by the Board of Directors in 1996 to try and eliminate municipal levy funding for Conservation Areas for the 1997 budget year. This action was recommended during an era of significant provincial funding cuts to Conservation Authorities and municipalities. All Conservation Authority programs were reviewed to find ways to reduce costs and since Conservation Areas could still rely on gate revenues, there was hope their programs could survive on that revenue source alone where it was felt other programs that were more reliant on levy could not (e.g., tree planting, water quality monitoring). The reduction in funding to Conservation Areas was therefore one of several attempts to manage this much larger provincial funding constraint. The decision was not based on any principle or objection to the Conservation Areas receiving municipal funding. While the previous funding model of supporting our Conservation Areas with levy had been effective for 40 years, this new practice/funding model was first implemented in 1997 out of necessity and has continued to the present although it can be argued it has been detrimental to the quality of our recreation programs. For the future, the Board has the opportunity and freedom to consider whether reinstatement of some level of levy funding is appropriate for the Conservation Areas.

### **3. Allocated Costs**

Prior to 1997 all administration and overhead costs for all units in the UTRCA were covered directly through levy. Following 1997 the UTRCA switched to a 'true cost accounting' method whereby all overhead costs, now referred to as 'allocated costs,' would be charged to the respective units based on use and/or budget size. Levy funds were also allocated to the units proportionally to help off-set these new costs, except for Conservation Areas. The direction for Conservation Areas was to off-set these new costs with gate revenue as were the other funding cuts. The table below quantifies \$745,405 in allocated costs for the Conservation Areas in 2011.

## 2011 Conservation Areas Budget

Expenses	\$	% of Unit Budget	% of UTRCA Budget
<b>Direct and Indirect Expenses</b>			
Wages and Benefits	\$1,770,894	45.4	29.9
Staff Expenses	\$34,800	0.9	16.7
Materials and Supplies	\$494,775	12.7	25.1
Contracts	\$218,400	5.6	64.0
Taxes/ Insurance/ Safety	\$344,000	8.8	74.3
Utilities	\$283,500	7.3	81.8
Legal Fees	\$6,000	0.2	28.6
Advertising	\$0	0	0
Other	\$0	0	0
<b>Total Direct and Indirect Costs</b>	<b>\$3,152,369</b>	<b>80.9</b>	<b>30.9</b>
<b>Allocated Costs</b>			
Occupancy	\$6,134	0.2	7.2
Information Systems	\$74,776	1.9	19.1
Motor Pool	\$278,000	7.1	47.5
Administration	\$112,364	2.9	19.1
Finance	\$202,724	5.2	42.1
Marketing and Communications	\$71,406	1.9	15.0
<b>Total Allocated Costs</b>	<b>\$745,405</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>28.6</b>
<b>Total Direct and Indirect and Allocated Costs</b>	<b>\$3,897,774</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>30.4</b>

The UTRCA is committed to true cost accounting. This method of allocating overhead costs to each mission centre allows us to understand the 'true' cost of delivering the service and allows the management team to consider efficiencies in delivery of that overhead service. However, every financial management system has its drawbacks and the impact on the Conservation Areas Budget is one such effect. While staff could arbitrarily reduce the rates charged to this unit to improve the appearance of their financial bottom line, this would create challenges in other units. Rather than suggest changes to our system of allocated costs, it is preferred that management and the Board understand how the system works and the strengths and weaknesses of this method. For the UTRCA, a benefit of this method has been that gate revenues actually subsidize the UTRCA's overhead costs to the benefit of the organization as a whole. The drawback has been the appearance of a chronic financial crisis in the Conservation Areas Unit.

In reviewing allocated costs charged to the Conservation Areas Unit, it can be argued that roughly \$200,000 of the Unit's \$745,000 in allocated costs can be considered a 'subsidy' to the organization as a whole. This would include Administration costs and roughly 50% of finance allocated costs. This is a subjective assessment based on two considerations: 1) Administration was never historically charged to the Conservation Areas and it is an entirely new expense with the introduction of true cost accounting with no associated revenue source and 2) finance allocated costs appear excessive from a park operations perspective (\$200,000) given that this business function could probably be expensed directly by one staff position for half the cost. If the argument is accepted that the Conservation Areas subsidize the finance and administration of the UTRCA as a whole at a value of \$200,000, then this must be considered as a balancing factor when considering the Unit's annual \$60,000 operating deficit. This perspective suggests an annual net gain of \$140,000 for the UTRCA as a whole. Past discussions have focused on the shortfall in the Conservation Areas budget alone without considering the overall benefits to the UTRCA.

#### **4) Conservation Areas as a ‘Business’**

The Conservation Areas were created and funded by the Province and local municipalities to provide access to public land, to fill a gap in local outdoor recreation opportunities and to provide local economic spin-offs. The Conservation Areas were never planned or constructed using a private sector, profit-based business model.

Despite this premise, there was a shift in thinking and approach to Conservation Areas funding during the 1990s that attempted to impose a private sector business model on operations. This paradigm shift has been unsuccessful. No private sector business would construct a day use/camping facility over such a large land base with this amount of capital infrastructure. Maintenance costs alone for land management (grass cutting, trails, road plowing, security and maintenance) and infrastructure (roads, bridges, buildings, pools, splash pads, docks, launch ramps, etc.) challenge the practicality of employing a profit based private sector business model. The private sector can also focus purely on profit whereas the Authority’s Conservation Areas must place flood control responsibilities and natural areas protection ahead of recreational use and, as a government organization, we typically exceed rules and standards regarding health and safety, work place equity, policy development and implementation, financial audits and disclosure, and corporate image as well as sharing, cooperating and assisting other Conservation Authorities in the operations of their parks.

Given this reality, it is more appropriate for the Conservation Areas Unit to compare their funding model and performance with similar government developed and operated parks. Two examples include:

- 1) Ontario Parks: Operations are supported by gate revenue (78%) and provincial tax revenue (22%). Capital is funded 100% by provincial tax revenue.
- 2) Grand River Conservation Authority: Wages and benefits of all superintendents (six staff) and the program director (Coordinator) are funded by municipal levy. Remaining operating expenses and capital are funded by gate revenue.

In both of these examples public funding is an accepted revenue stream to ensure quality outdoor recreation opportunities are provided.

#### **5) Coordinator Responsibilities Beyond Conservation Areas**

The Coordinator of Conservation Areas spends considerable time on broader Conservation Authority issues including strategic planning, serving as a member of the UTRCA Management Team, assisting with workplace health and safety, assisting with Administration Office grounds maintenance including snow clearing, participating in broader Conservation Ontario initiatives (e.g., Chair of A.D. Latornell Conservation Symposium, Annual Conservation Ontario Conservation Areas Workshop , assisting with province-wide Conservation Areas marketing), periodically serving as Acting General Manager, assisting in Authority financial audits, and serving as a liaison with other units to coordinate flood emergency response, dam operations, and broader property management issues. It is clear these actions support the interests of the Authority as a whole but funding for the position is still reliant 100% on gate revenue. Consideration should be given to restoring public funding at some level for this position.

#### **6) Business Plan Efforts**

The Conservation Areas Unit has put a great deal of effort into development of a Business Plan during the past four years. This plan was intended to solve the ‘financial crisis’ and was patterned after a private business model. This planning effort has changed direction several times as staff have struggled to consider a profit-based model to ensure financial benefits would result.

In fact, business planning has been practiced continuously for the past 15 years as the Conservation Areas have struggled to meet budget targets. This has included frequent customer surveys, intensive idea generation sessions, expenditure cuts, new partnerships and new revenue generation activities. Some of these ideas have been limited by the Authority's role as a public agency as compared to options a private sector operator could pursue. While new ideas will always be explored and implemented, it is staff's belief that park operations are already very efficient and the goal of profitability is unrealistic given the scale of operations, constraints as a public agency, our true cost accounting system and the influences of weather on attendance and therefore gate revenue.

Recommendations in this paper evolved from our recent business planning efforts and they are seen as more realistic than what could be achieved through a private sector business model.

**Recommendations:**

Recognizing that our Conservation Areas are our most visible asset with nearly ½ million visitors per year, and recognizing the funding history of the parks, their financial and operational support for the rest of the UTRCA, and that there are significant local economic spin-offs from park operations, the following recommendations are provided for the Board's consideration:

1. Understand that annual Conservation Area funding shortfalls are, in part, a creation of the UTRCA budget/ accounting system and do not reflect the true value of the Conservation Areas. Shortfalls are more than off-set by the allocated cost 'subsidy' paid by the Conservation Areas to UTRCA operations as a whole.
2. Support 50% of the Coordinator of Conservation Areas wage and benefits with new levy. This amount is estimated at \$50,000 and new funding would be phased in over two years starting in 2012 at \$25,000/year. This funding recognizes the broader role the Coordinator plays in the operations of the UTRCA, and it is consistent with past funding practices as well as the current funding practices of other Conservation Authorities.
3. Affirm the on-going eligibility of the Conservation Areas Unit to apply for capital surcharge funding, recognizing this is a levy based source of funding. There is currently an approved motion supporting this funding for 2011. This approach is consistent with past funding practices.
4. Recast the Conservation Areas Business Plan as part of our annual year end Conservation Areas program evaluation to explore operating efficiencies and opportunities for new partnerships and activities to support the key messages of the UTRCA as well as unique outdoor recreation opportunities.

These recommendations suggest a funding model that strikes a balance between the current practice of using only gate revenue, and past practices of significant public funding. If implemented, the Conservation Areas program would gain the stability it has lacked for the past 15 years and the program could focus on its priorities of providing high quality outdoor recreation experiences and conservation messages rather than being preoccupied exclusively with economics.

**To:** UTRCA Board of Directors  
**From:** Ian Wilcox, General Manager  
**Date:** June 13, 2012  
**Subject:** 2012 Budget Concepts Memo

**Agenda #:**

**Filename:** ::ODMA\GRPWISE\UT\_MAIN.UT  
RCA\_PO.File\_Centre\_Library:940  
21.1

### Recommendation:

That the Board of Directors review the attached list of funding needs and provide direction to staff regarding preparation of a 2012 Draft Budget, as well as development of a three year budget plan. Staff recommend development of a Draft 2012 Budget including all of the listed funding needs, recognizing the Board will have the opportunity to review and adjust the budget prior to its circulation to member municipalities.

### Introduction

UTRCA staff are set to begin development of the 2012 Draft Budget. The following report presents a list of anticipated funding needs for the next three year period and is provided to the Board of Directors for discussion and direction back to staff. This three year budget plan offers the advantages of informing municipal councils of expected levy pressures during their elected term, and it allows the UTRCA to plan increases over multiple years, easing the funding burden in any one year for municipalities.

As a reminder, the 2012 budget development process includes the following steps:

**June 2011-** Approval of budget concepts to assist staff in developing a first draft 2012 budget.

**September 2011- October 2011-** Review and Approval of a Draft 2011 Budget, and a new draft three year budget plan.

**November 2011- January 2012-** Circulation of the draft budget to municipalities for comment.

**February 2012-** Approval of the 2011 Budget at the UTRCA's Annual General Meeting.

### Context

The UTRCA receives funding from four sources of revenue:

Direct Revenue (permit fees, campground revenue, land lease, etc)	=	48%
Contract Revenue (Competitive proposals for special projects)	=	20%
Municipal Levy	=	29%
MNR Transfer Payment (Restricted to Flood Control only)	=	3%

Municipal Levy represents our core funding and allows the UTRCA to generate revenue from other sources. This financial leveraging (we raise an additional \$2 for every dollar invested by municipalities) is a key message for our municipal partners allowing us to demonstrate true value for their investment.

Contract Revenue will be the focus of budget discussions in the Fall. For now it important for the Board to understand that contract revenue is a key source of funding allowing us to pursue innovative new special projects and programs but that it is by no means secure. We begin each budget year forecasting contract revenue but there is no assurance that we will be successful in generating the expected funding.

Contract funding that is unconfirmed at the start of the year is referred to as 'soft' revenue and represents the risk taking nature of the UTRCA. While this financial uncertainty can be uncomfortable at times, it does allow this Authority to further leverage municipal funding toward innovative and creative environmental programs and technologies and experience has shown repeatedly that the reward far exceeds the risk.

While the Board needs to understand the entire scope of the Draft 2012 Budget, this early discussion is primarily focused on the levy portion of revenue.

### **Anticipated Funding Needs 2012-2014:**

The following list of funding needs has been developed based on recommendations from the UTRCA's Strategic Plan and Management Team discussions. Rather than a 'wish list' these items are viewed as necessary to ensure the UTRCA is able to continue to deliver effective programs and services. The list has been divided into two sections; the first, titled 'Regular Increases,' includes annual wage and business expense increases as are typically anticipated. The second list, titled 'New Initiatives,' presents areas of our business where growth or change is necessary.

These funding needs and associated costs are summarized in Table 1 on the final page of this report.

### **Regular Increases:**

#### **1. Salary Merit Increases:**

The UTRCA utilizes a six step merit increase salary system. An annual merit increase is provided to staff based on an annual performance evaluation recommendation. Merit increases are reviewed and approved by the Hearings and Personnel Committee. Currently 59 of the Authority's 79 permanent and contract staff are at job rate (no further merit increases available) while 20 staff are still eligible. This ratio minimizes the impact of merit increases on the annual budget. Annual merit increases are budgeted from \$15,000-\$16,000 per year for the next three years.

#### **2. Cost of Living Wage and Benefits Increases:**

The Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the period April 2010 to April 2011 is 3.3% with inflation expected to increase with economic recovery. Elements driving the CPI include energy (17.1% increase), gas (26.4% increase) and electricity (7.0% increase). Using the past year's CPI as a guide, cost of living wage increases for the next three years are proposed as follows:

2012- 2.5%

2013- 3.0%

2014- 3.0%

#### **3. Uncontrollable Business Expense Increases:**

A fixed increase of \$25,000/ year is proposed to address uncontrollable cost increases. Examples of areas where uncontrollable increases have occurred include insurance premiums, fuel, legal expenses, new health and safety standards, utilities, lease renewals, audit fees, Conservation Ontario levy, regulatory requirements (e.g., Electrical Safety Authority, Technical Safety Standards Authority), etc.

#### **4. Capital Maintenance Levy:**

This levy has been in place for several years and is utilized to fund capital maintenance and repairs. This funding is critical to our Asset Management Plan. The levy is set at 7.5% of General Levy. No increase is proposed as part of this report, however, the amount of this levy does automatically increase as General Levy increases since it is calculated as a percentage. It is estimated the Capital Maintenance Levy will increase between \$8,500-\$9,500 each year for the next three years.

## **New Initiatives**

### **5. Conservation Areas Coordinator Wage, Benefits and Overhead (50%):**

It is recommended that 50% of the Conservation Areas Coordinator's wages, benefits and overhead now be supported by municipal levy (See Conservation Areas Funding Issues Discussion Paper, included as part of the June 2012 Board Agenda). This recommendation is part of a series of adjustments that are necessary to ensure the financial viability of the Conservation Areas. This recommendation is easily rationalized as at least 50% of the Coordinator's efforts in recent years have been supportive of broader Authority initiatives and are not necessarily specific to the Parks. Examples include work on the organizing committee of the Lattornel Conservation Symposium (currently serving as Chair), developing and delivering Authority wide health and safety training (Book 7, AODA, fire drills, WSIB Safe Communities), serving as primary contact for London's Emergency Response, human resources support, and support for facility management (security systems, drinking water testing and distribution, Administration Office grounds maintenance, etc.).

It is proposed that this increase be phased in over two years: \$25,000 in levy would be added in each of 2012 and 2013 for a total increase of \$50,000.

### **6. Increased Land Management Capacity:**

The Lands and Facilities Unit was created in 2006 to address a serious gap in our ability to manage Authority owned conservation lands. The unit was funded primarily through the reallocation of existing levy funding. Further investment is required to meet minimum standards for land management (e.g., management planning, site development and maintenance, due diligence, risk management, signage, enforcement, etc.). Immediate needs include 50% wage and benefit support for a biologist/ecologist position to support management planning. Total cost would be \$40,000. A full time technical position is also required to assist with implementation of policies/procedures on UTRCA lands (e.g., hazard tree procedures, encroachment, hunting policy development and implementation, trail development, etc.). Total cost for wages and benefits would equal \$70,000. The total investment requested equals \$110,000. The Board of Directors approved a \$22,000 levy increase in 2011 in support of this investment; the remainder is proposed to be phased in during the next three years with a \$36,667 increase in each of 2012 and 2013, and a final increase of \$14,666 in 2014.

### **7. Information Management Capacity:**

Resource information is the cornerstone of our conservation business. With technological advances, data is more abundant and more complex. New investment is necessary to ensure the Authority utilizes an information management system that can effectively store, analyze and share this information, ensuring staff and the Board are making informed decisions. Specifically, a database developer/administrator is required to coordinate and structure the flow of resource data. Additional software and hardware will also be required. Costs are estimated at \$100,000. In 2011 the Board of Directors approved an increase of \$22,000 from levy to support this initiative. The remaining \$78,000 is proposed to be phased in during the next three years with \$25,000 requested for each of 2012 and 2013, and \$28,000 requested for 2014.

### **8. Flood Control/ Climate Change Mitigation Capacity:**

Investment is required to adapt our flood control programs to a changing climate, and to deal with aging infrastructure through contract administration of capital projects. Additional funding totaling \$120,000 is required to support a junior engineering technician position, consultant support and modeling expenses. This funding will be secured through WECI and other provincial sources; no additional levy funding is being requested for this initiative.

#### 9. Operating Reserve Creation:

The UTRCA needs to begin to develop a budgeted operating reserve (none currently exist) as part of prudent financial management. A resolution was passed by the Board in November 2004 requesting staff to begin development of an Operating Reserve however, in application this has not been accomplished as the approach was dependent on year-end surpluses which have not materialized. Specific budgeting for an operating reserve is now recommended to ensure we have the capacity to deal with the relatively large variations we experience in annual revenue.

An ultimate target of 2.5% of General Levy is proposed as the annual contribution to a newly created operating reserve. This would amount to roughly \$56,000 per year. It is recommended that this contribution come from municipal levy and that the increase be phased in over a three year period (\$18,666/ year).

#### 10. Source Water Protection Coordinator Wage, Benefits and Overhead (50%)

Source Water Protection Planning is being supported 100% financially by the Province of Ontario. This funding arrangement will be revisited following completion of this planning phase at the end of 2012. There is every expectation that Conservation Authorities will have on-going responsibilities regarding Source Water Protection but that it will no longer be fully supported financially by the Province. In anticipation of these changes, 50% of the Coordinator's wage, benefits and overhead are included as a new levy responsibility in recognition of the position's role in protecting municipal drinking water supplies as a requirement under the *Clean Water Act*. This cost will be phased in during 2013 and 2014. There will be no financial impact to levy in 2012.

Prepared and Recommended by:

Ian Wilcox, General Manager  
Att.

# Table 1: UTRCA 2011-2014 Budget Plan

	Total Investment Needed	Funding Phase-In (\$)					
		2011	2011%	2012	2012%	2013	2014
<b>Regular Increases</b>							
1. Salary Merit Increases	Staff dependent	\$14,000	0.4	\$15,000	0.4	\$15,000	\$16,000
2. Cost of Living Wage and Benefits Increase	2.0%, 2.5%, 3.0%, 3.0%	\$69,235	2.0	\$88,240	2.5	\$108,600	\$111,600
3. Uncontrollable Business Expense Increases	\$25,000/yr	\$10,108	0.3	\$25,000	0.7	\$25,000	\$25,000
4. Capital Maintenance Levy	7.5% of General Levy	\$7,500	0.2	\$8,500	0.2	\$8,500	\$9,500
<b>Total Cost of Regular Increases</b>		<b>\$100,843</b>		<b>\$136,740</b>		<b>\$157,100</b>	<b>\$162,100</b>
<b>% Levy Increase of Regular Increases</b>		<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>
<b>New Initiatives</b>							
5. Conservation Areas Coordinator Wage (50%)	\$50,000	\$0	0.0	\$25,000	0.7	\$25,000	\$0
6. Land Management Capacity Increase	\$110,000	\$22,000	0.6	\$36,667	1.0	\$36,667	\$14,666
7. Information Management Capacity	\$100,000	\$22,000	0.6	\$25,000	0.7	\$25,000	\$28,000
8. Flood Control Capacity Increase/ Climate Change	\$120,000	WECI funded	0.0	WECI funded	0.0	WECI funded	WECI funded
9. Operating Reserve (Goal = 2.5% of General Levy)	\$56,000	\$0	0.0	\$18,666	0.5	\$18,666	\$18,666
10. Source Protection Coordinator Wage (50%)	\$50,000	\$0	0.0	\$0	0.0	\$25,000	\$25,000
<b>Total Cost of New Initiatives</b>		<b>\$44,000</b>		<b>\$105,333</b>		<b>\$130,333</b>	<b>\$86,332</b>
<b>% Levy Increase of New Initiatives</b>		<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.1</b>
<b>Total Increases</b>		<b>\$144,843</b>		<b>\$242,073</b>		<b>\$287,433</b>	<b>\$248,432</b>
<b>Total % Levy Increase</b>		<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>
<b>Total Municipal Levy</b>		<b>\$3,599,998</b>		<b>\$3,842,071</b>		<b>\$4,129,504</b>	<b>\$4,377,936</b>

## 2012 Considerations:

- London budget target of 1.5%
- Provincial and Federal Budget Constraints
- Last year for 100% Source Water Funding
- CPI = 3.3%
- 0.9% increase in OMERS contribution

---

**To:** Chair and Members of the UTRCA Board of Directors  
**From:** Jeff Brick, Coordinator – Hydrology & Regulatory Services  
**Date:** June 14, 2011 **Agenda # 10 (b)**  
**Subject:** Administration and Enforcement – Sect. 28 Status Report - **Filename: Document#**  
Development, Interference of Wetlands and Alteration to **94031**  
Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation

---

**Recommendation:**

**That the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the actions of staff as outlined in the attached report.**

A summary of staff activity related to the Conservation Authority's *Development, Interference of Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation* (Ont. Reg. 157/06 under Ontario Regulation 97/04) is presented below. This report generally covers the period from May 10 to June 14 inclusive.

**Application #29/11**

**City of London**

**Blakie Road and Breck Avenue – City of London**

- approval required for sanitary sewer and watermain installation plus road reconstruction
- regulated lands in Dingman Creek subwatershed
- plans prepared by Spriet Associates
- staff approved and permit issued June 8, 2011

**Application #3711**

**Union Gas Limited**

**Parkinson Road from Norwich Avenue to Oxford Road 4 – City of Woodstock**

- proposed NPS 10 Gas Pipeline relocation.
- plans prepared in accordance with DFO measures to mitigate impacts to fish and fish habitat.
- staff approved and permit issued May 13, 2011

**Application #41/11**

**Cyril J. Demeyere Limited Consulting Engineers**

**Harris Street, Ingersoll – Sweaburg Road, Township of South-West Oxford**

- proposed installation of municipal water and sanitary sewer mains to accommodate the reconstruction of two MTO-Highway #401 Service Centres (Host Kilner Service Centres (HKSC)).
- plans prepared by Cyril J. Demeyere Limited Consulting Engineers.
- staff approved and permit issued May 13, 2011

**Application #42/11**

**Upper Thames River Conservation Authority**

**Wildwood Dam, Lot 1, Concession 14 – Township of Perth South**

- proposed borehole sampling and test pit excavation in support of technical investigations intended to review dam stability.
- plans prepared by UTRCA and AMEC consulting.
- staff approved and permit issued May 13, 2011

**Application #43/11**

**Longwood Oaks Ltd.**

**2635 Bateman Trail – City of London**

- permit requested for watercourse alteration of unnamed tributary in Dingman Creek subwatershed as part of Copperfield Subdivision development
- detailed plans prepared by Development Engineering (London) Limited
- staff approved and permit issued May 12, 2011

**Application #44/11**

**Lesak Holdings Inc.**

**11 Oxford Street East – City of London**

- proposed construction of triplex within regulated area, outside flood plain of N. Thames River
- detailed site, grading and drainage plans prepared by Bos Engineering & Environmental Services and EngPlus
- staff approved and permit issued May 25, 2011

**Application #45/11**

**Tyler Barnwell**

**7 Moir Street – City of London**

- permission sought from UTRCA for deck construction in West London proposed SPA
- staff approved and permit issued May 11, 2011

**Application #46/11**

**Stewardship Oxford**

**County Road 74 – Zorra Township**

- pond rehabilitation project proposed on P. Hause property adjacent to Golspie Swamp
- project supported by Stewardship Oxford, with design input from UTRCA staff, including B. Glasman
- staff approved and permit issued May 20, 2011

**Application #48/11**

**Oak Country Homes Limited**

**19 King Street East – Town of Ingersoll**

- proposed reconstruction of recently demolished building (demolition previously approved under UTRCA Permit #3-11).
- plans prepared by M. E. Morrison of M. C Engineering - A Division of 392583 Alberta Ltd. show previous building foundation to be reinforced in place and proposed building to be constructed in accordance with approved UTRCA flood hazard policies.
- staff approved and received consent of the UTRCA Hearings and Personnel Committee (May 24, 2011).
- permit issued May 31, 2011

**Application #49/11**

**2122088 Ontario Limited**

**70 Glenview Crescent – City of London**

- application to reconstruct a deck and add a side porch on existing residence
- plans prepared by deck contractor, deemed minor works in accordance with Board policy
- staff approved and permit issued May 25, 2011

**Application #50/11**

**Town of St. Marys – Tim Wolfe**

**Mike Dunnel Field (The Flats) – Town of St. Mary's**

- permit required for temporary dock for the St. Mary's Heritage Festival radio controlled boat regatta
- permit and DFO "Dock and Boathouse Construction" Operational Statement issued May 30, 2011

**Application #51/11**

**City of London**

**331 Thames Street – City of London**

- permit required for installation of sculpture and pathway within Ivey Park and Peace Garden
- on edge of flood plain
- staff approved and permit issued June 10, 2011

**Application #52/11**

**Damir and Allison Matic**

**13044 Eight Mile Road – Middlesex Centre**

- proposal to install in-ground pool and deck within regulated area, outside flood plain
- satisfactory site plans prepared by pool contractor
- staff approved and permit issued June 8, 2011

**Application #53/11**

**Christine Kelsey**

**6 St. Patrick Street – City of London**

- second storey addition proposed within West London proposed SPA
- consistent with Board's interim policies for SPA's
- staff approved and permit issued June 10, 2011

**Application #55/11**

**478001 Ontario Inc.**

**31 Griffith Street – City of Stratford**

- proposed storage unit building construction.
- plans prepared by R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited show building to be constructed in accordance with approved UTRCA wetland policies.
- staff approved and permit issued June 6, 2011

**Status Report – Unauthorized Filling**

**3623 Homewood Lane**

**City of London**

The Conservation Authority received an e-mail from a neighbour late on May 19/11 that fill was being brought onto the subject property and being leveled by a bulldozer. Staff investigated the site the morning of May 20 and reviewed Regulation Limit mapping to verify the location of fill placement and to assess whether any wetlands or watercourses were being impacted. Staff are working with the owner of 3623 Homewood Lane and his contractor to ensure that positive drainage is maintained and that the impact on existing deciduous trees is minimized. Some additional coniferous trees are to be planted on the site as well. Rainy weather in late May and early June hampered the work but conditions have improved sufficiently to allow for UTRCA requirements to be addressed. A further update will be provided to the Board.

**Status Report – Unauthorized Wetland Interference**

**102 Culloden Road**

**Town of Ingersoll**

While attending a site visit to a neighbouring property (May 12, 2011), UTRCA staff noticed construction activity in progress on the subject property in an area designated as wetland. Evidence of excavation and site grading had occurred and concrete was activity being poured within the wetland boundary as staff arrived on site. The landowner informed us the works were for the installation of a Green Energy (solar) Project. We advised the landowner that the works were occurring in contravention of Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act and he was subsequently issued a violation letter. The landowner later informed us he would be applying for a permit for the works. We have received his application and are currently reviewing it.

**Status Report – Unauthorized Filling**

**584085 Beachville Road**

**Township of South-West Oxford**

UTRCA staff received a complaint of filling on the property in an area designated as both flood plain and erosion hazard. UTRCA staff attended a site visit to Foster Creek (May 27, 2011) and noticed a large amount of broken asphalt and fill material had been dumped on and over the west bank of the watercourse. A violation letter has been issued to the landowner but we have currently been unable to contact him. UTRCA staff will continue to monitor this site and attempt to make contact with the landowner(s).

Recommended by:

Prepared by:

---

Jeff Brick, Coordinator  
Hydrology & Regulatory Services

---

Karen Winfield  
Land Use Regulations Officer

---

Mark Snowsell  
Land Use Regulations Officer

#11(b)

**Upper Thames River Conservation Authority**  
**Statement of Operations & Surplus**  
**For The Period Ending May 31, 2011**

	2011 Budget	2011 Actual	2010 Actual
<b>Revenue</b>			
Municipal general levy	2,244,289.00	2,244,311.00	2,138,099.00
Dam / Flood control / Levy	1,085,762.00	2,150,762.00	1,280,097.00
Specific project funding	101,600.00	6,553,515.79	1,687,453.60
Provincial transfer - M.N.R. Section 39	351,425.00	0.00	0.00
Provincial sources	2,819,365.00	1,279,423.73	1,506,484.00
Federal program funding	173,263.00	160,005.95	120,636.14
Conservation areas	3,193,287.00	1,617,686.81	1,761,758.64
Direct land & asset management	931,080.00	746,449.17	603,079.93
Direct fees for service	1,862,798.00	1,069,895.69	1,236,575.92
Donations / sponsorships	151,049.00	145,858.67	160,500.49
Interest income	40,000.00	33,256.67	4,954.88
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>12,953,918.00</b>	<b>16,001,165.48</b>	<b>10,499,639.60</b>
<b>Mission Cost Centre Expenditures</b>			
Community partnerships	1,281,521.00	316,664.34	319,684.66
Flood Control	1,333,844.00	585,594.46	688,457.12
Environmental planning	592,820.00	231,948.40	238,463.57
Soil conservation	517,824.00	226,585.41	180,812.03
Forestry	730,896.00	368,526.11	366,365.43
Environmental monitoring	251,964.00	132,882.07	172,420.39
Research	715,803.00	270,695.28	240,804.90
Recreation	3,897,774.00	1,235,885.44	1,363,730.84
Environmentally significant areas	514,202.00	228,340.23	248,223.88
Lands & facilities	757,170.00	1,196,941.79	424,409.54
Source water protection-utrca/scrca/ltvca	1,573,000.00	557,280.73	609,915.88
Source Protection -Technical Studies	635,000.00	31,604.87	249,548.09
Source Protection- Early Actions	0.00	3,973.94	13,776.00
Other	0.00	216,187.45	9,075.49
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>12,801,818.00</b>	<b>5,603,110.52</b>	<b>5,125,687.82</b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenue over expenditures	152,100.00	10,398,054.96	5,373,951.78
Net surplus (deficit) in Service Cost Centres	(118,211.00)	(3,474.69)	(58,512.50)
Benefits	0.00	(4,839.40)	13,014.00
	(118,211.00)	(8,314.09)	(45,498.50)
Appropriations (to) from reserves and reserve funds	(33,889.00)	0.00	0.00
<b>Net surplus (deficit) for the year</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>\$10,389,740.87</b>	<b>5,328,453.28</b>

---

**To:** UTRCA Board of Directors  
**From:** Jeff Brick, Coordinator Hydrology and Regulatory Services  
**Date:** June 14, 2011 **Agenda #:**  
**Subject:** Pittock Dam Gate Painting, Phase 3 **Filename:** ::ODMA\GRPWISE\UT\_MAIN.UT  
Tender Award RCA\_PO.File\_Centre\_Library:  
94041

---

### Report on Tendering Process

UTRCA purchasing procedures require that when the lowest tender is proposed for acceptance, a report is to be provided to the Board of Directors summarizing the tender process. The following information is provided for the information of the Board.

For 2011 four contractors were invited to bid and Tenders were received from contractors June 6, 2011 for the painting of the last two of the five gates at Pittock Dam. The gates at Pittock have not been painted completely for over 30 years. A tendering process was completed in 1993 but it was not awarded due to budget constraints at the time. Gate painting was planned in the UTRCA 20 year capital Repair Plan for 2009 to 2011.

Contractors were required to be registered with the Ontario Ministry of Transport as qualifying for bridge painting. The work consists of removing the current paint, priming, and painting of the gate. Side seals will also be replaced. The work requires enclosing of the work area and capture of spoil to meet environmental requirements. The work is scheduled to be completed during August and September this year. Tenders were as follows:

- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| a) Jacques Daoust Coatings Management Inc. (JDCMI) | \$225,100.52 |
| b) Dayson Industrial Services Inc.                 | \$252,481.55 |
| c) Glavin Coating & Refinishing                    | \$277,076.00 |
| d) Harrison Muir Inc.                              | \$345,554.00 |

The above tenders include a contingency allowance of \$30,000 and H.S.T. AECOM consultants as approved by the Board at their April 2011 meeting investigated the work, prepared and distributed tender documents, and reviewed the bids. AECOM advised that the bids were in order and staff have accepted the lowest tender subject to submission of required information and signing of a contract.

### Project Budget

The project has approved 2011 WECEI funding (50%) and 2011 Capital Repair funding from mainly the City of London and the County of Oxford. Other watershed municipalities contribute a minor amount. The total estimated cost of the project for 2011 submitted for funding was \$260,000. The final costs to the Authority including the contingency of \$30,000, net HST costs for the low bid, and the consultant's cost proposal accepted by the Board at their April 2011 meeting are expected to be less than \$238,000. A number of small contingency items were incurred over the last two phases were included in the tender this year so that the use of the contingency is less likely.

Recommended by:

Prepared by:

Jeff Brick, Coordinator  
Hydrology and Regulatory Services

Rick Goldt, Supervisor  
Water Control Structures

**JOINT HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**MINUTES**  
**February 17, 2011**

I. Wilcox called the JH&SC meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., Thursday February 17, 2011 at the Fanshawe Park Lunchroom in London.

Members Present:    I. Wilcox            K. Sockett            B. Mackie  
                              B. Williamson        S. Cahill

H&S Specialist:     C. Ramsey  
Human Resources:    S. Viglianti

Regrets:    B. Shepherd        K. Ebel

**1.    Minutes of the Previous Meeting**  
      - December 3, 2010

B. Williamson moved – S. Cahill seconded:  
      *“RESOLVED that the minutes of the JH&SC Meeting dated, Thursday,  
      December 3, 2010 be approved as presented.”*

CARRIED

**2.    Business Arising from the Minutes:**

- a)    New member training – training has been completed and will be taken off the agenda
  
- b)    S. Viglianti stated that she has not received 2010 Equipment Training task procedures from Pittock and Wildwood for returning staff. K. Sockett stated that staff at Wildwood will be re-trained in 2011. I. Wilcox asked how long training records need to be kept. The Committee discussed the matter and suggested that trainers need to decide and it should be added to the new system.

**Task:** C. Ramsey to talk to R. Datema regarding missing records

- c)    No further documentation is required. The issue regarding the electrical panel at Wildwood Dam is resolved.
  
- d)    Adam Berkelman wrote a canoe procedure and sent it to ORCKA (Ontario Recreational Canoeing and Kayaking Association) and requested comments/suggestions. B. Williamson sent the procedures to the Authority staff who use canoes for comments. Scott Gillingwater forwarded concerns with the required training and footwear.

**Task:** C. Ramsey to ask the coordinators to decide who should be canoe trainers and inquire if there are any exemptions for footwear (steel toes).

- e)    Coordinators need to discuss the logistics of opening the back gate in the spring.

**Task:** C. Ramsey to discuss the entrance and safety issues with the coordinators and draft an email regarding this matter.

f) I. Wilcox discussed the IT meeting he had regarding training and documentation. S. Viglianti will set up a meeting with HRMS to see if it has the capabilities we need. Following the meeting C.Ramsey will schedule a meeting with Bill Matetich.

### 3. New Business:

#### a) Workplace Inspections

Inspections took place at the following Conservation Areas:

##### **Fanshawe C. A.**

\* On December 17, 2010 the following structures were inspected: all Fanshawe CA Buildings (B.Shephard);

- Registration Office – missing ceiling tiles in office
- Watson Porter Pavilion – no hazards
- Water System Buildings (F3 &F5) – no hazards
- Chlorination Bldg. – no hazards

\* On January 28, 2011 the following structures were inspected: all Fanshawe CA Buildings (B.Shephard);

- Registration Office – missing ceiling tiles in office (repeat)
- F3 Pumphouse – dirty personal protective equipment
- F5 Pumphouse – dirty personal protective equipment, water from raw tap splashing on electrical equipment
- Maintenance Buildings – eye wash station expired – unit drains onto floor, emergency exit doors stuck closed
- Watson Porter Pavilion – no hazards
- Chlorination Bldg. – no hazards

##### **Wildwood C.A.**

\* On January 28, 2011 the following structures were inspected: Visitor Centre, workshop, park office, compound (K.Sockett);

- Office – no hazards.
- Lunchroom – no hazards
- Workshop – no hazards
- Drive Shed – no hazards.
- Fuel Shed – no hazards
- Well #1 – no hazards
- Visitors Centre – no hazards

##### **Fanshawe Administration Offices**

\* On December 9 and 22, 2010 the following structures were inspected: Administration Office Building, both Portables, and offices at the north end of Fanshawe Dam (B.Williamson);

- Administration Office – no hazards
- Offices at north end of Fanshawe Dam – white powder spilled on floor of chemical storage
- ESA/Parks portable – no hazards
- Conservation Services portable – no hazards

\* On January 8, 2011 the following structures were inspected: Administration Office Building, both portables, hydro plant and the offices at the north end of Fanshawa Dam). (B.Williamson);

- Administration Office – no hazards
- Offices at the north end of Fanshawe Dam – no hazards
- ESA/Parks portable – no hazards
- Conservation Services portable – no hazards
- Dam tunnel, catwalk – housekeeping in dam tunnel – tools on floor and stairs

**Pittock C.A.**

- no inspections have been completed since last meeting

**Motor Pool/ Workshop Building**

- no inspections have been completed since last meeting

b) **First-Aid Accident Reports:**

-fell on ice and hit both knees and right hand

c) **Workplace Task Procedures for Approval**

\* no workplace procedures for approval

d) **H&S Specialist Update:** no update

e) **Coordinator Update:** I.Wilcox presented an update regarding the new Watershed Conservation Centre.

f) **Human Resources Update:** no update.

**4. Other Business:**

- a) B. Williamson mentioned fall arrest on the Dam Catwalk and the Committee discussed the requirements.

**Task:** B. Williamson will look into the requirements.

**5. Next Meeting:**

**The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday April 14, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. to be held at Wildwood Visitor's Centre.**

**6. Adjournment:**

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned on a motion by B.Williamson at 11:35 a.m.

---

B. Shepherd, Worker Co-Chair

---

I. Wilcox, Management  
Co-Chair

**JOINT HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**MINUTES**  
**April 14, 2011**

B.Mackie called the JH&SC meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., Thursday, April 14, 2011 at the Visitor Centre at Wildwood Conservation Area.

Members Present:    K. Sockett                    B. Mackie                    K.Ebel  
   S. Cahill

H&S Specialist:    C. Ramsey  
Human Resources:    S.Viglianti

Regrets:                    B. Shepherd                    I.Wilcox                    B.Williamson

**4.    Minutes of the Previous Meeting**  
      - February 17, 2011

Minutes deferred to the next meeting

**5.    Business Arising from the Minutes:**

- a) Training records – Human Resources is receiving documentation, however, this will increase once more seasonal staff start.
- b) The Canoe Procedure is still being worked on. The Committee discussed training requirements and felt that UTRCA staff should become train-the-trainers in order to train staff. C. Ramsey to discuss in more detail with B. Williamson.
- c) Accpac is being reviewed to see if it meets the Authority’s requirements for training documentation.

**6.    New Business:**

**a)    Workplace Inspections**

Inspections took place at the following Conservation Areas:

**Fanshawe C. A.**

\* On February 24, 2011 the following structures were inspected: all Fanshawe CA Buildings (B.Shephard);

- Registration Office – no hazards
- Maintenance Buildings – no hazards
- Watson Porter Pavilion – no hazards
- Chlorination Bldg. – no hazards
- F3 Pumphouse – dirty personal protective equipment
- F5 Pumphouse – dirty personal protective equipment

\* On March 28, 2011 the following structures were inspected: all Fanshawe CA Buildings (B.Shephard);

- Registration Office – no hazards
- Maintenance Buildings – no hazards
- Watson Porter Pavilion – no hazards
- Chlorination Bldg. – no hazards
- F3 Pumphouse – dirty personal protective equipment
- F5 Pumphouse – dirty personal protective equipment

### **Wildwood C.A.**

\* On February 28, 2011 the following structures were inspected: Visitor Centre, workshop, park office, compound (K.Sockett);

- Office – no hazards
- Lunchroom – no hazards
- Workshop – step stool leaning against the wall, label missing from chlorite container
- Drive Shed – no hazards
- Fuel Shed – no hazards
- Well #1 – no hazards
- Visitors Centre – leaning table, light covers need replacing

\* On March 30, 2011 the following structures were inspected: Visitor Centre, workshop, park office, compound (K.Sockett);

- Office – chemical not store properly
- Lunchroom – no hazards
- Workshop – no hazards
- Drive Shed – wood stakes leaning by shelf
- Fuel Shed – hazardous waste bin needs to be dumped
- Well #1 – no hazards
- Visitors Centre – basement housekeeping

\* On April 30, 2011 the following structures were inspected: campground (K.Sockett);

- Office – no hazards
- Lunchroom – no hazards
- Workshop – faded WHMIS labels
- Drive Shed – car port – plywood leaning against the wall
- Fuel Shed – no hazards
- Well #1 – no hazards
- Visitors Centre – no hazards
- Gatehouse – no hazards
- Washroom A – no hazards
- Washroom B – no hazards
- Washroom C – no hazards
- Well #2 – toilet leak
- Well #3 – no hazards
- Beach washroom – centre storage – hangers required for mops and brooms
- Marina washroom – no hazards
- Marina – no hazards
- Sign room – no hazards
- Rec. Centre – hoses need to be hung

### **Fanshawe Administration Offices**

\* On February 25, 2011 the following structures were inspected: Administration Office Bldg. both Portable Offices, and the offices at the north end of the Dam (B.Williamson);

- Administration Office – no hazards
- Offices at the north end of the dam – no hazards
- ESA/Parks portable – no hazards
- Conservation Services portable – no hazards
- Dam tunnel, cat-walk – no hazards

\* On March 16, 2011 the following structures were inspected: Administration Office, both Portable offices, and Hydro Plant (B.Williamson);

- Administration Office – no hazards
- Offices at the north end of the Dam – no hazards
- ESA/Parks portable – no hazards
- Conservation Services portable – no hazards
- Dam tunnel, cat-walk – no hazards

\* On April 4, 2011 the following structures were inspected: Administration Office, both Portable offices, and Hydro Plant (B.Williamson);

- Administration Office – no hazards
- Offices at the north end of the Dam – no hazards
- ESA/Parks portable – no hazards
- Conservation Services portable – no hazards
- Dam tunnel, cat-walk – no hazards

### **Pittock C.A.**

- no inspections have been completed since last meeting

### **Motor Pool/ Workshop Building**

- no hazards

### **b) First-Aid Accident Reports:**

- Scraped right elbow on sharp bush – no lost time
- Pinched finger between gator and trailer tongue – no lost time
- Scratch on upper knuckle of left pointer finger – no lost time
- Scratches to first two fingers on right hand – no lost time
- Scratch to right eye – no lost time

### **c) Workplace Task Procedures for Approval**

There were no new procedures brought forward. C. Ramsey discussed how new proposed procedures should be sent to the network before being presented to the JH&SC. This would permit staff the opportunity to comment on the proposals. The Committee is having issues with staff wanting to change the procedures after they have been approved. This should help resolve the issue.

### **g) H&S Specialist Update: No update**

### **h) Coordinator Update : No update**

- i) **Human Resources Update:** No update

**5. Other Business:**

- (a) K. Ebel outlined issues the Committee is having getting Part 2 certification complete.

**Task:** C. Ramsey to contact the Health and Safety Network to find out the status of the certifications.

- b) K. Sockett asked about the status of the Spills Procedure. C. Ramsey and E. Stockman will write the procedure.

**5. Next Meeting:**

**The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday June 16, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. to be held at Pittock CA.**

**6. Adjournment:**

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned on a motion by S. Cahill at 11:10 a.m.

---

B. Shepherd, Worker Co-Chair

---

I. Wilcox, Management, Co-Chair