

September 14, 2011

**NOTICE OF  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**

**DATE:** Tuesday, September 27, 2011

**TIME:** 12:00 p.m. - 12:45 p.m. Tour of Watershed Conservation Centre

12:45 p.m. - 1:15 p.m. Lunch

1:15 p.m. - 3:15 p.m. UTRCA Board of Directors Meeting

**\*\*\* Please advise S.Shivas prior to September 22, 2011 whether or not you plan on attending the Watershed Conservation Centre tour. Please dress casually and wear safety footwear. The Authority can, if required supply hard hats.**

**LOCATION:** UTRCA Administration Office Boardroom

**AGENDA:**

	<b>TIME</b>
1. Approval of Agenda	1: 15p.m.
2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest	
3. Confirmation of Payment as Required Through Statutory Obligations	
4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting - Tuesday, August 23, 2011	
5. Business Arising from the Minutes	.
6. (a) For Your Information Report (I.Wilcox)(Report attached)	1:20 p.m.
(b) Fanshawe Pioneer Village Update (S.Johnson)(Verbal)(5 minutes)	
7. Delegations - None	
8. Committee of the Whole – In Camera	
(a) City of London Road Widening Project – Wonderland Road North (A.Shivas)(Document #95519)(10 minutes)	1:25 p.m.

9. Presentation
10. Business for Approval
  - (a) Core Services Review  
(I.Wilcox)(Report attached)  
(Document#95749)(10 minutes) 1:35 p.m.
  - (b) Draft 2012 Budget  
(I.Wilcox)(Report attached)  
(Document #95554)(25 minutes) 1:45 p.m.
  - (c) Administration and Enforcement - Section 28  
(M.Snowsell/K. Winfield)(Report attached)  
(Document #95526)(5 minutes) 2:10 p.m.
  - (d) Amendments to Ontario Regulation 157/06  
– UTRCA’s “Development, Interference with  
Wetlands and Alteration Shorelines and  
Watercourses Regulation”  
(I.Wilcox/M.Snowsell) (Report attached)  
(Document #95742)(10 minutes) 2:15 p.m.
  - (e) Dams-Concrete Inspections and Repair Strategy  
Consultant Contract Award  
(R.Goldt)(Report attached)(Document #95694)  
(10 minutes) 2:25 p.m.
  - (f) London Dykes Stability Review  
Consultant Contract Award  
(J.Brick)(Report attached)(Document #95686)  
(10 minutes) 2:35 p.m.
11. Business for Information
  - (a) Quarterly Financial Summary  
(Report attached)(L.Trottier)  
(10 minutes) 2:45 p.m.
  - (b) Watershed Conservation Centre Update  
(A. Shivas)(Verbal)(10 minutes) 2:55 p.m.
12. Other Business (Including Chair and General Manager’s  
Comments) (5 minutes) 3:05 p.m.
13. Adjournment 3:10 p.m.

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

London Free Press

MINUTES  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 27, 2011

Following a tour of the Watershed Conservation Centre and lunch, J.Baechler, Chair of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority called the Board of Directors' meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. in the UTRCA Administration Boardroom, London, Ontario. The following members and staff were in attendance:

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

Staff:	J.Brick	S.Shivas
	C.Harrington	M.Snowsell
	J.Howley	C.Tasker
	S.Johnson	L.Trottier
	M.Shifflet	I.Wilcox
	A.Shivas	

Solicitor: G.Inglis

J.Baechler thanked the staff for organizing and conducting the tour of the Watershed Conservation Centre.

1. Approval of Agenda

J.Baechler referred to the agenda as circulated to the members.

H.McDermid moved – G.Way seconded:-

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

CARRIED.

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

The 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 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, August 23, 2011

A.Bannister moved – T.Jackson seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the minutes of the Board of Directors’ meeting dated August 23, 2011 as circulated.”

CARRIED.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business to discuss arising from the previous minutes.

6. (a) For Your Information

The report was presented to the members for their information.

(b) Fanshawe Pioneer Village Update Report

S.Johnson outlined the 1812 Invasion of Upper Canada event scheduled for the weekend of October 1, 2011. She outlined the upcoming Fall events, including the “Fall on the Farm” and the “Haunted Village Hayrides”.

She advised the members that the Village’s attendance is on target for 2011. Staff are currently planning events and programs for 2012.

7. Delegations

There were no delegations.

8. Committee of the Whole – In Camera

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

H.McDermid moved – J.Boyce 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 City of London was discussed.

A.Bannister moved – H.McDermid seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the disposition of a 0.0949 hectare parcel of land to the City of London located adjacent to Wonderland Road North (Miggisie

Lawson Park), being Parts 1 and 2 of Reference Plan 33R-17650, to accommodate the Wonderland Road North widening and utility installation project as the disposition furthers the objects of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority.”

CARRIED.

10. Presentation – There were no presentations.

11. Business for Approval

(a) Core Services Review  
(Report attached)(Document #95749)

I.Wilcox highlighted the report for the members, and advised them that this information will form part of his presentation to the member municipal councils this Fall.

T.Jackson moved – H.McDermid seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors accept the report as presented.”

CARRIED.

(b) Draft 2012 Budget  
(Report attached)(Document #95554)

I.Wilcox presented the attached report for the members’ consideration.

The members discussed the proposed draft 2012 Budget and staff’s recommendation to increase the municipal levy by 6.7%. Following a lengthy discussion the members stated that in view of the current economic climate and the financial pressures being imposed on the member municipalities, it is their recommendation that the 2012 Draft Budget be revised based on a 3% municipal levy increase.

T.Jackson moved – B.French seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors direct the General Manager to revise the 2012 Draft Budget based on a 3% increase in the municipal levy for circulation to the member municipalities for comment.”

CARRIED.

(c) Administration and Enforcement – Section 28  
(Report attached)(Document #95526)

The report was presented to the members for consideration.

A.Bannister moved – H.McDermid seconded:-

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

CARRIED.

- (d) Amendments to Ontario Regulation 157/06  
- UTRCA's Development, Interference with  
Wetlands and Alteration Shorelines and  
Watercourses Regulation  
(Report attached)(Document #95742)

M.Snowsell outlined the report for the members' consideration.

J.Boyce moved – S.Clark seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority Board of Directors supports staff in their continued efforts to amend Ontario Regulation 157/06, consistent with Ministry of Natural Resources procedural guidelines, revised July 2011.”

CARRIED.

- (e) Dams-Concrete Inspections and Repair  
Strategy Consultant Contract Award  
(Report attached)(Document #95694)

J.Brick outlined the attached report for the members' consideration.

J.Boyce moved – M.Blackie seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the budget for the Dams Concrete Repair Investigation and Plan project be increased from \$100,000 to \$150,000 + HST to accommodate the recommended consultant cost proposal (with Provisional items).”

CARRIED.

- (f) London Dykes Stability Review  
Consultant Contract Award  
(Report attached)(Document #95686)

J.Brick outlined the attached report for the members' consideration.

A.Ralph moved – S.Clark seconded:

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the recommendation that the team of AECOM/LVM be awarded the contract for the core components of the London Dykes Stability Review at an estimated cost of \$173,301 including contingencies + HST as their work proposal represents the best value for the work required.”

CARRIED.

12. Business for Information
  - (a) Quarterly Financial Summary  
(Report attached)

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

H.McDermid moved – B.French seconded:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the report as presented.”

CARRIED.

- (a) Watershed Conservation Centre Update

As a result of the members touring the Watershed Conservation Centre, the monthly update was deferred until the next meeting.

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

The General Manager advised the members that although the year end revenue/expenditures have not yet been confirmed, it would appear that the Conservation Areas will have a shortfall of approximately \$50,000. He outlined steps being taken within the three conservation areas to reduce expenditures. He also noted that the Conservation Areas' Business Plan will be presented to the Board for consideration sometime this Fall.

I.Wilcox noted that this Fall could be busy for members and staff. He outlined the following potential activities for the members' information.

Governance Policy Workshop – The workshop will consist of a day and a half. Potential dates will be circulated to the members as soon as possible. He encouraged all the members to attend.

Voluntary Budget Workshop – The workshop is an opportunity for L.Trottier to explain the details of the budget for the members' information. He suggested the workshop be scheduled for the morning of October 25<sup>th</sup>, prior to the Board of Directors' meeting.

Municipal Council Meetings – Invitations will be extended to the members to attend their respective Council meetings with the General Manager.

Tour of the Glengowan Area - As a result of the recent discussions relating to property in Motherwell, it was suggested that the members tour the Glengowan area to view the properties and houses. It was suggested the tour could take place the morning of November 22<sup>nd</sup> followed by the Board of Directors meeting to be held at Wildwood Conservation Area.

I.Wilcox stated that the dates and details regarding the above events/activities will be confirmed.

J.Baechler stated that she liked commencing the Board of Directors' meeting at 1:00 p.m. and inquired whether the members would consider amending the starting time for future meetings.

H.McDermid moved – J.Northcott seconded:-

“RESOLVED that in future the UTRCA Board of  
Directors’ meeting will commence at 1:00 p.m.

CARRIED.

14. Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m. on a motion by J.Boyce.

---

Ian Wilcox, General Manager

/ses

Att.

---

J.Baechler, Chair



AMO delegates visit the Fanshawe Dam inspection tunnel.

## AMO Annual Conference

The City of London hosted the 2011 Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) Annual Conference on August 21 to 24. On Monday, August 22, a number of conference delegates visited Fanshawe Conservation Area. These delegates were part of a conference study tour entitled “Green Tourism / Sustainable Heritage & Ecotourism.”

Fanshawe CA Assistant Superintendent Damian Schofield joined the delegates at the London Convention Centre for the bus ride out to Fanshawe. He provided an overview of the UTRCA, the watershed and flood management, before focusing on Fanshawe CA as a camping and day use destination for tourism opportunities.

The first stop was the Fanshawe Pioneer Village, where the delegates were met by Executive Director Sheila Johnson. Sheila gave a tour of the village focusing on the history of Middlesex County and some of the significant buildings on site. Sheila also shared with the delegates how the village has gone from facing



AMO delegates at the Fanshawe Pioneer Village.

significant financial challenges to an operation that is popular, stable and financially successful in just five years.

After the village tour, the conference delegates were driven to Fanshawe Dam. Community Education Specialist Joanna John led a tour of the structure, explaining the history of flooding in the Thames watershed and the role of Fanshawe Dam in controlling floods in the City of London.

The highlight of this stop was a descent down 139 stairs to the inspection tunnel deep in the dam. Fortunately, all the delegates who went down into the tunnel were able to make the long climb back up!

During the ride back to the London Convention Centre, Damian answered many questions from the delegates who wanted to learn more about our Conservation Area, the attractions on site and our organization as a whole.

*Contact: Damian Schofield, Assistant Superintendent, Fanshawe Conservation Area*

## Memorial Forest Dedication Services

Three annual services are coming up to honour loved ones who have passed on. Memorial trees have been planted through five programs in London, St. Marys, Woodstock, Thames Centre and Zorra Township. Of those five, three hold a yearly dedication ceremony. This year’s ceremonies are as follows:

- London - the George Furtney Memorial Forest ceremony is on Sunday, September 25 at 2:00 pm at Fanshawe CA’s Watson Porter Pavilion. Staff member Karen Pugh will represent the UTRCA.
- St. Marys - the St. Marys and Area Memorial Forest ceremony is on Sunday, September 25 at 3:30 pm at Wildwood CA. Staff member Jennifer Howley will represent the UTRCA.
- Woodstock - the City of Woodstock Memorial Forest ceremony is on Sunday, October 2 at 2:00 pm at Pittock CA. Councillor Jim Northcott will represent the UTRCA.

A commemorative tree will be planted at each service, followed by refreshments. Nearly 11,000 memorial trees have been planted throughout our watershed since 1992.

*Contact: Karen Pugh, Resources Specialist*

## Fun Times at Fanshawe

We’ve had another successful summer camping season at Fanshawe Conservation Area. The Camper Garage Sale kicked things off in June, followed by July’s Canada Day celebrations. There were activities for everyone, with games, a bike parade, BBQ and more.

The next July event was Family Fishing Day, which we hosted in collaboration with the Thames River Anglers Association and the Fanshawe Camper’s Association. There were prizes for the largest fish (59 cm carp) and the most colourful fish (a small sunfish). This event was open to day use visitors and campers alike.



The Family Fishing Derby (above) and Fanshawe Fun Fair were popular summer events.



The rest of July flew by with Christmas in July and Fanshawe's Got Talent. August was also busy with new and old events that were well received. The Bike Rodeo and Community Campfire were hits that we'll build on for next year. Camper Halloween was a spooky sensation with the addition of a haunted house in the Recreation Centre and Halloween movie night. This event is always popular.

To wrap up the summer, Labour Day weekend was packed with events for all ages. The Royal Astronomical Society helped us host a star gazing night. Members brought out many different telescopes through which we viewed distant galaxies and constellations such as the Big Dipper and the Summer Triangle. We had a special treat when we saw the International Space Station zoom by.

Our fifth annual Fanshawe Fun Fair featured games, prizes, inflatables, music and much more. Children enjoyed this last chance at fun before heading back to school.

The Camper's Association Corn Roast was the final event. Despite the rain, campers came out to enjoy fresh corn and other treats.

Fanshawe Recreation Centre staff would like to thank the Camper's Association and other volunteers for all their hard work in making our events successful. Thanks also to the campers who supported us by attending the events throughout the summer.

*Contact: Ashley Tenner and Nicole Slivinski, Events and Programs Staff, Fanshawe Conservation Area*

## CA Aquatics Group Summer Meeting

Several Conservation Authorities (CAs) participated in a Conservation Authorities Aquatics Group (CAAG) meeting, hosted by South Nation Conservation Authority (SNC) in August.

CA staff involved with fisheries/aquatics reviews under the Fisheries Act and Conservation Authorities Act, as well as in aquatic monitoring programs, attended in person or via teleconference.

The two-day meeting provided valuable opportunities to learn and to share experiences with other CA staff. CAAG was established to provide advice and recommendations to individual CAs and to Conservation Ontario on matters related to CA aquatic ecosystem programs (e.g. regulations, monitoring, research and natural heritage based on aquatic ecosystems). Given the varying expertise, experience and resources of each CA, CAAG membership and topics reflect this diversity.

SNC were great hosts, arranging reservations for accommodations and a guided tour of sites in their watershed. The group was taken to Jessup Falls Conservation Area, the Alfred Bog Bogwalk, the Lemieux Landslide and the Larose Forest. We also toured SNC's new office building (renovated school) and treated to a BBQ lunch featuring local perch and cheese curds.

CAAG would like to have a similar meeting in the western region to enable more CAs to participate. The UTRCA may host a meeting next fall or the following spring in the new building.

*Contact: Cathy Reeves, Aquatic Biology Technician*

## Upcoming Events

- September 17-18: Doors Open Middlesex, Dorchester Mill Pond
- September 25: Furtney Memorial Forest Dedication, Fanshawe CA
- September 25: St. Marys & Area Memorial Forest Dedication, Wildwood CA
- October 2: City of Woodstock Memorial Forest Dedication, Pittock CA
- October 15: Vulture Bait Trail Run, Fanshawe CA
- October 16: Fanshawe, Pittock and Wildwood CAs close for the season

*Contact: Steve Sauder, Marketing Specialist*

## On the Agenda

The following items will be presented at the UTRCA Board of Directors meeting on September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2011. Board meeting minutes are posted at [www.thamesriver.on.ca](http://www.thamesriver.on.ca); click on "Downloads."

- Core Services Review
- Draft 2012 Budget
- Administration and Enforcement - Section 28
- Amendments to Ontario Regulation 157/06 – UTRCA's Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation
- Dams - Concrete Inspections and Repair Strategy, Consultant Contract Award
- London Dykes Stability Review, Consultant Contract Award
- Quarterly Financial Summary
- Watershed Conservation Centre Update

*Contact: Susan Shivas, Executive Assistant*

**To:** UTRCA Board of Directors  
**From:** Ian Wilcox, General Manager  
**Date:** September 14, 2011  
**Subject:** Core Services Review

**Agenda #:**

**Filename:** ::ODMA\GRPWISE\UT\_MAIN.UT  
RCA\_PO.File\_Centre\_Library:957  
49.1

---

## Background

The UTRCA Board of Directors requested that staff conduct a 'Core Services Review' during 2011. This request came during deliberations for approval of the UTRCA's 2011 Budget. The intent of the request was to ensure that municipalities receive good value for their municipal levy contribution and that municipal funds were being allocated to appropriate programs and services.

## Background

A single definition of 'core services' is difficult. Programs and services have evolved during the 60+ year history of the UTRCA. Our original *Upper Thames Valley Conservation Report* from 1952 established flood control, reforestation, erosion control and recreation priorities for the Authority. Subsequent reports including the *Thames River Basin Study* in the 1970s, the Clean Up Rural Beaches Research in the 1980s, and our current efforts regarding Source Water Protection authorized under the *Clean Water Act* have all led to adjustments to what we could call core services.

Strategic Planning has also been introduced as our formal process to review core services. Strategic Plans for the UTRCA have been completed in 1995, 2004 and 2010. It is our intent to engage in Strategic Plan updates every five years. The most recent copy of the UTRCA's Strategic Plan was provided to the Board at the August meeting. A further update regarding our Strategic Plan is being prepared for the October Board of Directors' Meeting.

## Current Core Services Review

The following review identifies and ranks 'core services' from the limited perspective of municipal funding. That is not to suggest that programs that rank lower in terms of municipal funding support are unimportant. In some cases these may be legislated responsibilities. In several instances, funding is able to be generated from other sources allowing municipalities to benefit from programs they don't have to pay for. This does not necessarily make the program less of a priority for the Authority. However, from a municipal investment perspective, the following review does clearly identify and rank funding allocations among Authority programs.

As further context, municipal levy is distributed to each mission centre based on a formula that considers overhead costs (service centre costs), whether the program benefits the individual or the watershed as a whole, and the mission centre's ability to generate other sources of revenue.

## **Context**

The mandate of a Conservation Authority is incredibly broad. The Conservation Authorities Act defines the business of an Authority as follows:

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

Conservation Ontario has narrowed the business of a Conservation Authority to the following four functions:

1. To protect life and property from flooding and erosion,
2. To protect and enhance water quality,
3. To manage and protect natural areas and,
4. To provide outdoor recreation opportunities.

Even within this narrowed scope, there is great latitude for individual Conservation Authorities to develop and implement unique 'core' programs. This ability to customize programs locally is a great strength of Conservation Authorities as it allows them to develop programs that meet local needs.

With this latitude also comes the need for periodic review to ensure funding is being directed toward the highest priority programs. Municipalities provide key baseline funding to the UTRCA and our member municipalities want to ensure their investment is allocated appropriately. For that reason, the following report identifies the 'core services' of the UTRCA based on the allocation of municipal levy funding.

The attached table lists and ranks all UTRCA mission centres according to their levy allocation. These values are drawn from 2010's actual expenditures. Staff recognize this review is limited in that it only considers the financial perspective of our municipal partners. Staff are comfortable that the current allocation of municipal funding is appropriate, recognizing minor adjustments are being considered as part of the 2012 draft budget.

## **Analysis**

1. Flood Control: This mission centre includes flood forecasting and warning systems as well as operation and maintenance of our watershed wide system of dams and dykes, all to protect people and their property from flooding. This includes infrastructure valued at more than \$150 million in replacement cost. Climate change has created an immediate need to review this program to ensure it continues to provide the necessary protection for the future. This is our most critical program with the greatest implications for watershed residents and highest infrastructure costs so it is reasonable that the bulk of our municipal levy is allocated to its operations. Please note that this mission centre has its own special 'Dam and Flood Control Levy' and 'Flood Control Capital Levy' and these levies are apportioned based on the benefits received by each municipality.

2. Watershed Planning and Research: This Mission Centre is charged with developing our action plans for the future as well as adding to our understanding of the watershed through research. Coordination with other mission centres around these issues keeps the UTRCA's programs and services relevant and evolving to address future watershed management challenges. Alternate sources of funding also support this work (foundations, government grants) however this funding is variable. Levy support for this mission centre ensures we are aware of and adapting to new and evolving watershed management issues.

3. Environmental Planning: The UTRCA assists member municipalities in meeting their obligations under the Planning Act to make decisions that are consistent with Provincial Policy related to natural hazards, natural heritage and drinking water protection. The UTRCA also administers the permitting process related to Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act which requires proponents to obtain permits for certain activities in natural hazard areas such as floodplains, slope erosion areas and wetlands. Funding for these planning support and permitting activities is derived from permit fees, inquiry fees and application and peer review fees that are charged to development proponents. The cost of administering the program is supported by municipal levy to reflect that there is a watershed wide benefit to the program for the purpose of protecting life and property and protecting natural heritage.

4. Forestry: The UTRCA supports continued subsidization of tree planting efforts in the watershed. Voluntary planting on private land is extremely sensitive to cost and this municipal levy subsidy strikes an acceptable balance between incentives for planting and fees paid by individual landowners.

5. Community Partnerships: The Community Partnerships Mission Centre includes traditional environmental education programs with school groups as well as coordinating roles for the establishment and operation of our various 'Friends of..' groups. Three quarters of the revenue needed for this mission centre is derived from school group fees and alternate funding sources. Municipal levy supports one quarter of the cost of the program to serve as 'seed' funding to allow us to leverage money from other sources.

6. Lands and Facilities: This mission centre is still relatively new. This mission centre manages the physical assets of the UTRCA including more than 6,000 ha of public land as well as UTRCA owned facilities (excluding flood control structures). This part of our business was impacted greatly by past budget cuts and an increase in land management capacity has been identified as a priority in the UTRCA's Strategic Plan and as part of the 2012 Draft Budget.

7. Environmental Monitoring: Environmental monitoring is one component of the Planning and Research mission centre. It was separated from that mission centre for the purpose of this discussion and to more clearly describe how municipal funds are being used. Environmental monitoring includes water quality sampling through the Provincial Water Quality Monitoring Network, the Provincial Groundwater Monitoring Network, and our own benthic invertebrate and fish sampling programs. These monitoring networks are funded through municipal levy as the cornerstone of our environmental information which is the basis for watershed management decision making by all other mission centres. Environmental monitoring data is communicated through our watershed report cards and data is used for internal decisions as well as by external partners. More than 1/3 of the funding for these critical monitoring networks is found through alternate sources.

8. Soil Conservation: The Soil Conservation Mission Centre provides technical advice, design services and grants to landowners working to reduce erosion and/or improve water quality conditions on their property. This mission centre also implements new and leading edge technologies and techniques as demonstration sites or as part of university based research to improve watershed health. Municipal funding for this work is matched by alternate sources of revenue, greatly increasing the value of the program.

9.-11. Conservation Areas, ESA's and Source Water Protection: These three mission centres do not currently receive municipal funding. Conservation Areas funding was discussed in detail at the June Board of Directors' meeting and the Board is aware there will be consideration for new levy in support of the Coordinator's wage in recognition of their work supporting broader Authority

business. The Environmentally Significant Areas Mission Centre is a fee for service effort based on an annual agreement and 100% funding from the City of London. Source Water Protection is a mandated responsibility under the Provincial *Clean Water Act* but costs are currently covered 100% by the Province. This commitment extends to the end of 2012 when plans are to be completed. Responsibility for implementation costs for the post 2012 period are yet to be determined.

While no municipal levy is directed towards these three mission centres, that does not diminish the importance of the work involved. All three programs are key areas of effort for the UTRCA with direct municipal benefits.

Opportunities for the UTRCA to develop and implement new environmental programs are nearly endless. The challenge for Staff and the Board is to focus on a limited number of priority programs. It is the belief of staff that the programs listed in this report and the associated municipal funding allocations effectively address our current watershed management needs and represent good value for our municipal partners.

Prepared by:

Ian Wilcox

UTRCA Core Services Review  
2010 Actuals

Mission Centre	Mission Centre Total Budget	Municipal Levy	% of Municipal Levy	Municipal Levy as % of Mission Budget
1 Flood Control	\$2,719,283	\$1,040,097	32.7	38.2
2 Watershed Planning and Research*	\$544,256	\$349,891	11.0	64.3
3 Environmental Planning	\$575,873	\$342,899	10.8	59.5
4 Forestry	\$670,968	\$321,795	10.1	48.0
5 Community Partnerships	\$1,189,487	\$309,749	9.7	26.0
6 Lands and Facilities	\$603,161	\$308,638	9.7	51.2
7 Environmental Monitoring*	\$410,587	\$263,953	8.3	64.3
8 Soil Conservation	\$480,016	\$241,174	7.6	50.2
9 Conservation Areas	\$3,586,071	\$0	0.0	0.0
10 ESA's	\$607,704	\$0	0.0	0.0
11 Source Water	\$2,160,248	\$0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$13,547,654</b>	<b>\$3,178,196</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Note:** \* - The Planning and Research Mission Centre has been subdivided into 'Watershed Planning and Research' and 'Environmental Monitoring' to better explain program activities.

**Note:** 'Municipal Levy' is the combined General and Flood Control Levies but does not include special projects or the flood control capital levy

Mission Centre	% of Municipal Levy
Flood Control	32.7
Watershed Planning and Research*	11.0
Environmental Planning	10.8
Forestry	10.1
Community Partnerships	9.7
Lands and Facilities	9.7
Environmental Monitoring*	8.3
Soil Conservation	7.6
Conservation Areas	0.0
ESA's	0.0
Source Water	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**To:** UTRCA Board of Directors

**From:** Ian Wilcox, General Manager

**Date:** September 6, 2011

**Agenda #:**

**Subject:** Draft 2012 Budget- For Approval

**Filename:** ::ODMA\GRPWISE\UT\_MAIN.UT  
RCA\_PO.File\_Centre\_Library:955  
54.1

---

**Recommendation:**

**That the Board of Directors approve the Draft 2012 Budget and authorize its circulation to member municipalities for comment.**

**Introduction**

A first draft of the UTRCA's 2012 Draft Budget has been developed and the key summary tables are attached for your review and approval. If approved at the September Board of Directors Meeting, a full budget package will be developed (descriptive text added) and it will be circulated to member municipalities for comment. Included are individual mission centre budget summaries as well as a final 'Municipal Funding Summary' page. The draft budget totals \$12,235,851 which is \$598,000 less than 2011, largely due to a reduction in the Source Water Protection budget. Overall the draft budget includes revenue from the following sources:

Direct Revenue (permit fees, campground revenue, land lease, etc)	= 48%	
Contract Revenue (Competitive proposals for special projects)	= 19%	
Municipal Levy (Drafted at 6.7%)		= 30%
MNR Transfer Payment (Restricted to Flood Control only)	= 3%	

A copy of the '2012 Budget Concepts Memo' that was provided as part of the June Board of Directors agenda has been reprinted and is attached as further context.

**Highlights:**

**Municipal Levy**

While municipal funding represents only 30% of the UTRCA's total budget, it is a key funding source in that it is stable and allows us to leverage funds from other sources (direct revenue and contracts). Municipal funding is also the most politically charged element of the budget and is subject to the most scrutiny and debate. The purpose of approval of this first draft of the budget is largely to set a draft levy amount and circulate it to municipalities for comment. The draft municipal levy increase averages 6.7% (see table below). Justification for this increase is included in the attached reprint of the '2012 Budget Concepts Memo' provided at our June meeting.

## Draft Municipal Levy Increases

Municipality	% Increase	\$ Increase	Total Request
St. Marys	4.4	\$3,355	\$78,793
West Perth	5.5	\$3,818	\$73,839
Stratford	6.3	\$17,477	\$296,435
London	6.5	\$155,768	\$2,538,167
Perth South	6.7	\$1,855	\$29,553
South Huron	6.9	\$390	\$6,011
Oxford County	7.3	\$39,648	\$582,690
Perth East	7.8	\$2,878	\$39,979
Middlesex Centre	7.9	\$4,977	\$67,877
Lucan/ Biddulph	8.4	\$633	\$8,186
Thames Centre	10.9	\$9,694	\$98,959
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Avg 6.7%</b>	<b>\$240,493</b>	<b>\$3,820,489</b>

## Contract Revenue

Contract revenue, sometimes referred to as ‘soft’ revenue, is a key component of the budget and represents 19% of our revenue (> \$2 million). Staff develop numerous project proposals during the course of the year and compete with other non-profit organizations for funding from foundations and other levels of government. As an example, staff were recently successful in securing \$120,000 over two years from the Royal Bank of Canada as a contract to support our Clean Water and Communities for Nature Programs. Matching money came in part from funding already provided by municipalities for the Clean Water Program. In this way, we have leveraged municipal funding into a larger amount, through contracts, to enhance our conservation efforts.

These contracts typically provide up to 50% of the revenue needed to deliver a project and require matching funding. In these cases municipal levy is often identified as the matching funding for these proposals allowing us to, at a minimum, double the value of our municipal investment in terms of total program capacity. While the development and administration of contract funding is time consuming and at times very cumbersome, we believe it adds tremendous value to our municipal levy investment.

While staff have been very successful in securing contract revenue for many years, it comes with a great deal of uncertainty at budget time. Contracts are usually short term (one to two years) making retaining staff a challenge. Work planning is difficult as programs are typically announced with very little lead time, and increasing competition from other not-for-profit organizations for the same funds creates challenges. The attached Contract Revenue Status List (see Table 1) summarizes our recent efforts to secure contracts. Please note that our draft budget includes approximately \$250,000 in ‘soft’ contract revenue meaning we hope we are successful in securing funding but this funding is not yet confirmed.

## Conservation Areas Funding

The forecast for Conservation Areas funding included in this draft budget is not yet complete. Park operations, more than any other mission centre, requires year end actual costs to allow us to finalize the next year’s budget. With the park season still in operation, year end numbers are not available. You can expect this portion to be updated again before final approval of the budget in February.

**Other Considerations:****London Budget Target**

The City of London has provided direction to each of its Boards and Commission regarding a desired budget target. These targets were developed by City staff with no input from agencies. Targets were developed from the perspective of City finances only; no consideration was given to the needs or plans of individual agencies. The UTRCA was assigned a municipal levy increase target of 1.5%.

**Perth South letter**

A letter from the Municipality of Perth South was circulated to the Board at the August meeting. That letter referred to concerns with increasing the municipal levy for the purpose of funding Conservation Areas and requested that surplus land be sold as an alternative. While this does not speak to our 2012 budget directly, it does provide context regarding Perth South's financial wishes.

**Budget Schedule/ Next Steps:**

**September 2011 Board Meeting:** Draft Budget Approval for circulation to member municipalities for comment.

**October 2011- January 2012:** Municipal Council Presentations (with assistance from Board Members).

**January 2012 Board Meeting:** Board Review of municipal comments and final budget adjustments.

**February 2012:** Annual General Meeting- Final Budget Approval.

Staff recognize the proposed levy increase may not be supported by member municipalities. If the Board of Directors is not supportive of the full 6.7% levy increase, staff would request that an appropriate percentage increase be approved by the Board and staff will make the necessary program adjustments to meet the target.

Prepared and Recommended by:

Ian Wilcox

**Table 1: Contract Revenue Status List****Fall 2010/ 2011 Funding Proposals**

<b>Submitted To</b>	<b>For/ By</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Received</b>
Ministry of the Environment- Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program	Early Response project and delivery funds Brad G, Teresa H, Linda S	\$1.1 million	\$531,299
Department of Fisheries and Oceans	Development of Outreach Tools and Activities Teresa H, Mia K	\$25,000	\$25,000
Ministry of Natural Resources	Rondeau Bay Habitat and Sediment Reduction Teresa H, Mia K	\$30,000	\$30,000
London Hydro	Tree Power (for 2012) Steve S, Karen P, John E	\$10,000	\$10,000
Environment Canada – Habitat Stewardship Program for Species at Risk	Five Activity areas in application (if crossed out, removed given reduced funding): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clean Water Project</li> <li>- SAR Reptiles Stewardship and Education</li> <li>- Medway Creek Riparian Tree Planting Project</li> <li><del>- SAR Subwatershed Monitoring</del></li> <li><del>- Medway Creek – Habitat Requirement Assessment</del></li> </ul> Chris H, Scott G, John S, Brad G, Cathy R, Julie W	\$224, 544	\$65,000
Species at Risk Stewardship Fund	SAR Reptile Stewardship Project  Scott G / Chris H	\$63,683	\$42,477
Species at Risk Stewardship Fund	At Risk Freshwater Mussel Larval Host Survey John S/ Chris H	\$38,248	\$15,299
Environment Canada	Lake Erie Public Involvement Teresa H	\$75,000	\$75,000
City of London Sparks, Neighbourhood fund	Friends of Stoney Creek 20 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary Open House Christina B	\$3240	\$3240
TD Friends of the Environment Foundation- London	Dorchester Naturalization Project- Christina B	\$5800	\$5800
Ministry of the Environment	Community based watershed implementation Teresa H	\$40,000	\$40,000
TD Friends of the Environment Foundation – Woodstock/Ingersoll	Stubbe Wetland Naturalization Brad H	\$4800	\$4800
Habitat Stewardship Program	Medway Enhancement Project Julie W	\$12,000	\$5000
TD Friends of the Environment Foundation - London	Oxbow Rehab Project Julie W	\$2050	\$2050

<b>Submitted To</b>	<b>For/ By</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Received</b>
EcoAction	Beachville Thames Corridor Restoration Brad H	\$34,253	\$33,766
EcoAction	Oxbow Watershed Enhancement Project Julie W	\$18,300	\$18,000
CFWIP	Oxbow Creek Enhancement Project Julie W	\$4000	\$2000
TD Friends of the Environment Foundation – London	Sifton Bog Wetlands Education Program - Joanna	\$3600	Submitted
Ministry of the Environment – Showcasing Water Innovation Fund.	Thames River Clear Water Revival – Addressing Water Management Issues in a Changing Climate Chris H, Teresa, Brad G, Mark S, Mark H	\$403,562	Submitted
TD Friends of the Environment Fund (London Chapter)	SAR Reptile Outreach and Education Program Scott G / Chris H	~\$15,000	Application submitted then retracted (need to address shortfall in Wage funding given HSP shortfall)
Ministry of the Environment - Showcasing Water Innovation Fund	Cedar Creek Watershed Strategy for City of Woodstock Brad H	\$158,820	Submitted
TD Friends of the Environment Foundation – Woodstock	Hall's Creek/Cedar Creek Subwatersheds Report Card Education Program Joanna J	\$2650	Submitted
TD Friends of the Environment Foundation - London	Medway Creek/Stoney Creek Subwatersheds Report Card Education Program Joanna J	\$2650	Submitted
Sobey's	Thames River Corridor 2012 (Communities for Nature) Steve, Karen P	\$20,000	Submitted
Earth Day Canada Petro Canada Foundation	Earth Day London & Community Forestry London Steve, Karen P	\$22,000	Submitted
TD Friends of the Environment Foundation - London	Medway Enhancement Project Julie W	\$7100	Submitted
3M	Wildflower Meadow and Stormwater Pond Steve, Karen P		TBD
CEM Specialties	Steve, Karen P		TBD
Sun Valley Foods	Steve, Karen P		TBD
Festival Hydro/Woodstock Hydro	Tree Power Steve, Karen P, John E		TBD
Royal Bank of Canada	Community Precipitation Monitoring Steve, Julie	\$4500	TBD
TD Friends of the Environment Foundation – Stratford	Trout Creek Stream Bank Stabilization Vanni	\$2500	TBD

<b>Submitted To</b>	<b>For/ By</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Received</b>
Royal Bank of Canada Blue Water Project – Leadership Grant	St. Marys confluence of the Thames/Trout Creek issues – Town of St. Marys, Rotary Vanni		TBD
Royal Bank of Canada Blue Water Project – Community Grant	Avon Watershed Program for students Vanni	In partnership with CBEAC, OCWA, City of Stratford	TBD
EcoAction	Trout Creek Community Forestry Proposal Vanni	\$13,765	Unsuccessful
The Keg	Accessible Trail and Boardwalk, Fanshawe CA Teresa H	\$25,000	Unsuccessful
Trillium Foundation (Mar/11)	Cedar Creek Watershed Strategy Brad H	\$73,600	Unsuccessful
Ontario Power Generation	River Safety Programs – Woodstock Joanna J	\$4500	Unsuccessful
Trillium Foundation (Jul/11)	Cedar Creek Watershed Strategy Brad H	\$43,500	Unsuccessful
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$2,493,665</b>	<b>\$908,731</b>

**To:** UTRCA Board of Directors  
**From:** Ian Wilcox, General Manager  
**Date:** June 13, 2011  
**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:

*Original signed by  
Ian Wilcox*

Ian Wilcox, General Manager  
Att.

---

**To:** Chair and Members of the UTRCA Board of Directors  
**From:** Jeff Brick, Coordinator – Hydrology & Regulatory Services  
**Date:** August 9, 2011 **Agenda # 10 (c)**  
**Subject:** Administration and Enforcement – Sect. 28 Status Report - Filename: Document#  
Development, Interference of Wetlands and Alteration to **95526**  
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 August 9 to September 9 inclusive.

**Application #57/11**

**Spriet Associates London Limited**

**Lot 20 & 21, Concession 11 – Municipality of Middlesex Centre**

- proposed Wonderland Road bridge replacement.
- plans prepared by Spriet Associates London Limited.
- staff approved and permit issued August 26, 2011

**Application #62/11**

**London Hydro Inc.**

**Veteran's Memorial Parkway at South Thames River – City of London**

- approval requested for a hydro pole line extension
- staff approved and permit issued August 12, 2011

**Application #80/11**

**Dillon Consulting Limited**

**Jane Street/Dorchester Road – County of Middlesex**

- proposed construction of a new bridge over the Thames River associated with the extension of Jane Street and Dorchester Road in the Community of Dorchester.
- plans prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited.
- staff approved and permit issued August 18, 2011

**Application #82/11**

**City of Woodstock Community Services Department**

**Burgess Park – City of Woodstock**

- proposed picnic table/park bench pad.
- permit issued for concrete pad adjacent the Burgess Trail.
- staff approved and permit issued September 8, 2011

**Application #87/11**

**James and Patricia Brownscombe**

**47 McKeand Street – Town of Ingersoll**

- proposed pole barn/garage.
- plans prepared by Pow Peterman Consulting Engineers with floodproofing to the Regulatory Flood elevation.
- staff approved and permit issued August 18, 2011

**Application #89/11**

**Patrick Malloy**

**639 Talbot Street – City of London**

- approval requested for proposed duplex to triplex conversion, with minor exterior work required
- staff approved and permit issued August 12, 2011

**Application #91/11**

**John Leahy**

**61 Gunn Street – City of London**

- approval requested for proposed construction of a residential dwelling
- lot grading certificate received August 15, 2011 confirming building location outside flood and erosion hazard
- staff approved and permit issued August 16, 2011

**Application #92/11**

**City of London**

**Uplands North SWM Facility – City of London**

- approval requested for proposed construction of Uplands North SWM Facility #B2
- detailed drawings submitted by AECOM
- staff approved and permit issued September 2, 2011

**Application #93/11**

**John and Louise Broeders**

**Part Lot 6, Concession 12 – Municipality of Middlesex Centre**

- proposed construction of farm driveway.
- plans prepared and elevation survey provided by FKS Land Surveyors.
- staff approved and permit issued August 29, 2011

**Application #94/11**

**Roger and Kate Kropf**

**102 Culloden Road – Town of Ingersoll**

- proposed solar array (multiple solar panel installations).
- plans prepared by M C Engineering show the solar array structures will be located within the area of interference of a wetland but a sufficient distance from the wetland proper.
- staff approved and permit issued September 1, 2011

**Application #95/11**

## **Sun-Canadian Pipe Line**

### **Lot 6, Concession 9 – Township of Zorra**

- proposed replacement of existing concrete cable mat.
- plans prepared by Sun-Canadian Pipeline Company Limited prepared in accordance with DFO measures to mitigate impacts to fish and fish habitat.
- staff approved and permit issued September 6, 2011

## **Application #97/11**

### **Sivaraman Kandath**

### **60 Wilson Avenue – City of London**

- approval requested for proposed construction of a porch
- staff approved and permit issued September 1, 2011

## **Application #99/11**

### **Brussels-Walton Trailblazers Snowmobile Club**

### **Lot 23, Concession 12 – Township of West Perth**

- proposed clear-span snowmobile bridge.
- plans prepared include a pre-fabricated Eagle Bridge, to be placed clear-span in accordance with DFO measures to mitigate impacts to fish and fish habitat.
- staff approved and permit issued September 6, 2011

## **Application #102/11**

### **Tjeerd de Wit**

### **Lot 31, Concession 4 – Township of Perth East**

- proposed installation of (2) new culverts.
- plans prepared in accordance with culvert sizing by Dietrich Engineering Limited.
- staff approved and permit issued September 8, 2011

## **Status Report – Unauthorized Filling & Dam Installation**

### **Lot 1, Concession 4**

### **Township of West Perth**

En route from another site visit (August 17, 2011) UTRCA staff noticed recent construction activity adjacent Black Creek in an area designated as flood plain. UTRCA staff attended a follow-up site visit to the property (August 24, 2011) to attempt to talk to the landowner. A dam consisting of rock and other fill material had been placed across the creek without prior UTRCA approval. A waterwheel has been suspended over the creek in a space in the dam suggesting the landowner is attempting to use the structure for hydroelectric power. DFO, MNR and Transport Canada staff have been notified of possible violations to their regulations. UTRCA staff are coordinating a response with the other agencies and will continue to update the Board on the status of this file.

## **Status Report – Unauthorized Fill Placement**

### **952 Southdale Road West – City of London**

The UTRCA was contacted on August 24 regarding dumping of fill and cutting of some vegetation on the subject property, which is within an area of interference adjacent to a wetland. No prior written approval had been issued for the filling activity. On August 25, after confirming the extent of the site disturbance, a Notice of Violation was sent to the property owner. Filling activity has ceased and Conservation Authority staff are working with the owner to determine the extent of work proposed (consistent with UTRCA policies) and steps required to restore the site and prevent the discharge of sediment into the wetland. Progress will be reported to the Board.

Recommended by:

---

Jeff Brick, Coordinator  
Hydrology & Regulatory Services

Prepared by:

---

Karen Winfield  
Land Use Regulations Officer

---

Mark Snowsell  
Land Use Regulations Officer

**To: Chair and Members of the UTRCA Board of Directors**

**From: Ian Wilcox, General Manager**

**Date: September 14, 2011**

**Agenda # 10 (e)**

**Subject: Amendments To Ontario Regulation 157/06 - UTRCA's  
"Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration  
Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation"**

**Filename: Document#  
95742**

---

**Recommendation:**

**That the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority Board supports staff in their continued efforts to amend Ontario Regulation 157/06, consistent with Ministry of Natural Resources procedural guidelines, revised July 2011.**

**Background:**

Last month, staff reported on progress to amend Ontario Regulation 157/06. A flowchart prepared by the Ministry of Natural Resources was provided to Board members, outlining steps in the process to amend our Section 28 regulation. Some of the key steps in the process include:

1. Consultation with MNR staff to ensure content and wording is consistent with procedures prepared by the Province to amend the regulation.
2. A draft amendment to Ontario Regulation 157/06 is forwarded to MNR for review (MNR review scheduled to occur in mid-October).
3. MNR informs Conservation Authorities of conformity of submission and once all CA submissions are satisfactory, MNR posts the intent of the 36 proposed regulations on the "Regulatory Registry for 45 days.
4. MNR considers comments received and makes recommendations.
5. MNR sends proposed regulations to Legislative Counsel for drafting
6. Legislative Counsel drafts are sent to CA Boards for approval.
7. Upon receipt of CA Board-approved proposed regulation amendments, MNR sends the documents forward for Minister Approval.

**Current Status:**

While progress is slower than anticipated by MNR, the process is still on course for completion later this year. Draft wording of an amended UTRCA Section 28 regulation is being forwarded to MNR within one week (the second step noted above). Our regulation is somewhat simplified by virtue of not having any Great Lakes shoreline in the watershed. Board members are reminded that the proposed amendments are largely housekeeping in nature, with the two most pertinent revisions dealing with formal delegation of "positive" permit decisions to CA staff and providing the capacity to extend the length of a permit for projects beyond the 24-month time frame currently allowed. We intend to post notices regarding the amendment in the largest watershed newspapers (in London, Stratford and Woodstock) and likely on our web site as well.

MNR staff and staff from Conservation Ontario have been very helpful in guiding individual CA's through the process. Realistically, however, it appears that our Board will not have a proposed amendment to consider for approval until the November 2001 meeting. Staff will certainly keep members advised of progress.

Recommended by:

Prepared by:

---

Ian Wilcox, General Manager

---

Mark Snowsell  
Land Use Regulations Officer

c.c. Grant Inglis  
Jeff Brick  
Karen Winfield

---

**To:** UTRCA Board of Directors  
**From:** Jeff Brick, Coordinator Hydrology and Regulatory Services  
**Date:** September 12, 2011 **Agenda #**  
**Subject:** Dams-Concrete Inspections and Repair Strategy, **Filename:** ::ODMA\GRPWISE\UT\_MAIN.  
Consultant Contract Award UTRCA\_PO.File\_Centre\_Librar  
y: 95694

---

## Recommendations:

**That the budget for the Dams Concrete Repair Investigation and Plan project be increased from \$100,000 to \$150,000, + HST to accommodate the recommended consultant cost proposal (with provisional items).**

## Purpose of Report

UTRCA purchasing procedures require that when the lowest tender is proposed for acceptance, a report summarizing the tender process is to be provided to the Board of Directors "For Information." In this case, the lowest tender is being proposed for acceptance. This report is however being presented "For Approval" because the overall project budget is changing from the initial estimate.

## Background on the Project

The purpose of the Dams Concrete Inspections and Repair Strategy project is to inventory existing conditions and to develop a strategy, including costs, for future repairs and monitoring for six of the larger dams operated by the Authority. The dams are Fanshawe, Wildwood, Pittock, Springbank, Mitchell, and RT Orr (Stratford). The inspections to be undertaken will include above water, underwater, and interior areas. The intent of the project is also to refine the 20 Year Capital Repair Plan cost estimates for concrete repairs. Currently, concrete and bridge repairs for the six dams is estimated at \$2,600,000 (as identified in the UTRCA 2011, 20 Year Plan).

Concrete repair studies and repair projects have been undertaken in the past and dam safety studies have included limited inspections. This project will be the most comprehensive inspection project to date and will, in some cases, involve closer inspection of some normally inaccessible areas, such as under bridge decks and some confined spaces. The project will include inspection of underwater areas and will include condition survey of trash racks, imbedded steel areas, joints, and include sediment surveys in the forebay and tailrace areas of the dams where of concern. The request for proposals from consultants requested that Provisionary items be included such as inaccessible area inspections and sonar scanning so that costs would be known if the Provisionary items were selected.

The 'Dams Concrete Repair Investigation and Plan' project was on the list of 2011 Proposed Water and Erosion Control Infrastructure (WECI) Projects approved by the Board of Directors in May 2011. The total estimated cost of the project was estimated at \$100,000.

## **RFP Process**

Proposal requests (RFPs) were sent to eight engineering consultants in the London area. Proposals were submitted by two consultant teams led by AECOM and Exp, respectively. Proposals were submitted using a two envelope system, in which cost proposals (Part B) were submitted in separate sealed envelopes from the rest of the main proposal (Part A).

UTRCA staff evaluated 'Part A' of the two submitted proposals prior to opening and evaluating 'Part B' of the submitted proposals. The successful consultant team is selected based upon a combination of factors including: relevant experience, proposed methodologies, proposal quality, schedule, and cost. Hence, the lowest cost would not necessarily be selected.

As a result of the evaluation, UTRCA staff are recommending that the AECOM team be awarded the contract for the 'Dams Concrete Repair Investigation and Plan' project at an estimated cost of \$119,260 + HST, as their work proposal represents the best value for the work required. The Exp cost proposal was approximately 3% higher than the AECOM cost proposal.

As part of the proposal submission, the RFP specified that the submission should include cost proposals for several provisional items. AECOM documented and provided cost proposals for the provisional items as requested. Exp did not submit a cost proposal for provisional items. UTRCA staff reviewed the AECOM provisional items cost proposal (total \$30,200) and find them reasonable for the effort required.

Considering the cost proposal of the recommended team totals approximately \$150,000 with provisional items, it is recommended that the budget for the 'Dams Concrete Repair Investigation and Plan' project be increased to \$150,000 (from \$100,000 previously approved).

UTRCA received WECEI funding for 2011 at an estimated cost of \$100,000. A number of options are available to attain increased funding in 2011 or 2012 to make up the shortfall in funding. As this project is highly ranked for WECEI funding it is expected that funding will be obtained through surplus funding due to other UTRCA WECEI 2011 projects being under budget, Province wide Conservation Authority projects being below budget, or through 2012 WECEI funding as a Part 2 project to cover the funding shortfall. UTRCA has received funding reallocations in recent years based on the balance of UTRCA project costs in any given year.

The distribution of the project costs to the various dams will be determined through consultant input at the outset of the project. It is expected the costs will be distributed based on inspection effort and on the subsequent selection of Provisionary items to each structure as they occur. The larger dams are expected to be allocated the majority of project costs.

If there are any questions on this report, please do not hesitate to contact Mark Shifflett at extension 239 or Jeff Brick at extension 228.

Recommended by:

Jeff Brick, Coordinator  
Hydrology and Regulatory Services

Prepared by:

Rick Goldt, Supervisor  
Water Control Structures

Mark Shifflett, P. Eng,  
Senior Water Resources Engineer

---

**To:** UTRCA Board of Directors  
**From:** Jeff Brick, Coordinator Hydrology and Regulatory Services  
**Date:** September 14, 2011 **Agenda #**  
**Subject:** London Dykes Stability Review, **Filename:** ::ODMA\GRPWISE\UT\_MAIN.UT  
Consultant Contract Award **RCA\_PO.File\_Centre\_Library:**  
95686

---

## **Recommendation:**

**Staff recommend that the team of AECOM/LVM be awarded the contract for the core components of the London Dykes Stability Review at an estimated cost of \$173,301 including Contingencies + HST as their work proposal represents the best value for the work required.**

## **Purpose of Report**

UTRCA purchasing procedures require that in cases where staff are recommending acceptance of a tender that is not the lowest bid, a report is provided to the Board of Directors "For Approval." This report provides background information on the London Dykes Stability Review tendering process and recommends acceptance of a tender that was not the lowest.

## **Background:**

The UTRCA, through agreement with the City of London, is responsible for major maintenance of the London Dyke system. There are seven developed flood plain areas along the Thames River within the City of London protected by approximately 5.1 km of dykes:

- West London Dyke
- Broughdale Dyke
- Ada-Jacqueline Dyke
- Nelson-Clarence Dyke
- Riverview-Evergreen Dyke
- Coves Dyke
- Byron Dyke

The dyke systems date back to the 1800's and the individual dykes have been gradually expanded and heightened in response to various large flood events over the years.

Experience with projects for the London Dykes since 2004 has provided insight into the complexities involved in maintaining the London Dyke system. A Master Repair Plan is currently in the final stages of being completed for the West London Dyke (2.3 km.) portion of the overall system and will provide phasing and capital improvement or replacement costs for future work. Based on work to date with the West London Dykes, we have found that more information is required about the composition and stability of the dykes. This information is needed to assist with planning for future repair or replacements. By planning ahead as we have with West London Dykes, we are prepared to deal with any significant short term changes in the condition of dykes and we are also poised to take advantage of funding opportunities, should they arise, for the works.

The London Dykes Stability Review Project captures a number of initiatives for the broader London Dyke system that are identified in the UTRCA 2011, 20 Year Plan, The project will provide the information needed to scope and phase future works similar to the West London Dyke Master Repair Plan which is currently nearing completion. This project will provide the technical information needed to move into a Master Repair Planning process for the broader dyke system which would include repair options and involve public input. The project has received WECl funding approval for a total project budget of \$450,000.

The 'London Dykes Stability Review' project was on the list of 2011 Proposed Water and Erosion Control Infrastructure (WECl) Projects approved by the Board of Directors in May 2011. The total estimated cost of the project was \$450,000. The project includes several components, including the core stability review components to be undertaken by an engineering consultant, supporting components to be undertaken internally by UTRCA staff (including hydraulic model updating, and vegetation condition surveys), and additional supporting components to be undertaken by a geomorphological consultant. This memo is in regards to the core project components to be undertaken by an engineering consultant. The components to be undertaken by an engineering consultant were estimated to cost \$315,000.

### **The RFP Process**

Proposal requests (RFPs) were sent to eight engineering consultants in the London area. Proposals were submitted by three consultant teams: AECOM/LVM, LVM/Riggs, and Stantec/Exp. Proposals were submitted using a two envelope system, in which cost proposals (Part B) were submitted in separate sealed envelopes from the rest of the main proposal (Part A).

UTRCA staff evaluated 'Part A' of all three submitted proposals prior to opening and evaluating 'Part B' of the submitted proposals. The successful consultant team was to be selected based upon a combination of factors including: relevant experience, proposed methodologies, proposal quality, schedule, and cost. Hence, the lowest cost would not necessarily be selected.

As a result of the evaluation, UTRCA staff are recommending that the AECOM/LVM team be awarded the contract for the core components of the London Dykes Stability Review at an estimated cost of \$173,301 including contingencies + HST, as their work proposal represents the best value for the work required. The Stantec/Exp cost proposal was approximately 10% lower than the AECOM/LVM cost proposal, and the LVM/Riggs cost proposal was approximately 15% higher than the AECOM/LVM cost proposal however, the overall proposal submitted by AECOM/LVM was evaluated as better than either the Stantec/Exp or LVM/Riggs overall proposals.

UTRCA purchasing procedures specify that approval of the Board of Directors is required for any contract or purchase over \$50,000 where the Authority proposes to award a contract or to purchase from other than the lowest bidder.

With the cost proposal of \$ 173,301 from the recommended team for the core components of the London Dykes Stability Review being well below estimates (\$315,000), it is anticipated that the overall cost of the London Dykes Stability Review project will be below the original budget (\$450,000).

#### **Recommended by:**

Jeff Brick, Coordinator  
Hydrology and Regulatory Services

#### **Prepared by:**

Rick Goldt, Supervisor  
Water Control Structures  
Mark Shifflett, P. Eng,  
Senior Water Resources Engineer

**Upper Thames River Conservation Authority**  
**Statement of Operations & Surplus**  
**For The Period Ending August 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	7,816,848.59	1,742,870.27
Provincial transfer - M.N.R. Section 39	351,425.00	351,020.00	0.00
Provincial sources	2,819,365.00	1,476,875.08	2,039,057.62
Federal program funding	173,263.00	173,236.95	124,986.14
Conservation areas	3,193,287.00	2,425,256.85	2,515,213.50
Direct land & asset management	931,080.00	1,040,780.78	722,267.84
Direct fees for service	1,862,798.00	1,610,947.82	1,783,944.09
Donations / sponsorships	151,049.00	148,413.67	194,835.10
Interest income	40,000.00	66,727.29	13,838.13
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>12,953,918.00</b>	<b>19,505,180.03</b>	<b>12,555,208.69</b>
<b>Mission Cost Centre Expenditures</b>			
Community partnerships	1,281,521.00	514,405.20	524,960.35
Flood Control	1,333,844.00	1,027,106.78	1,357,495.66
Environmental planning	592,820.00	378,225.01	377,859.58
Soil conservation	517,824.00	335,124.41	313,561.94
Forestry	730,896.00	532,927.96	488,897.59
Environmental monitoring	251,964.00	198,946.72	250,947.45
Research	715,803.00	445,618.82	404,267.47
Recreation	3,897,774.00	2,530,052.45	2,541,164.96
Environmentally significant areas	514,202.00	383,442.77	403,232.38
Lands & facilities	757,170.00	3,133,152.12	682,420.61
Source water protection-utrca/scrca/ltvca	1,573,000.00	727,736.96	956,603.55
Source Protection -Technical Studies	635,000.00	123,812.05	258,469.74
Source Protection- Early Actions	0.00	3,973.94	30,483.00
Other	0.00	242,496.46	21,572.64
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>12,801,818.00</b>	<b>10,577,021.65</b>	<b>8,611,936.92</b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenue over expenditures	152,100.00	8,928,158.38	3,943,271.77
Net surplus (deficit) in Service Cost Centres	(118,211.00)	16,005.84	13,229.86
Benefits	0.00	(7,854.71)	42,422.26
	(118,211.00)	8,151.13	55,652.12
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>\$8,936,309.51</b>	<b>3,998,923.89</b>