

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Mill of Kintail Gatehouse

**MINUTES**

October 17, 2012

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

M. Burnham, Chair;  
J. Karau, Vice-Chair;  
D. Abbott;  
G. Code;  
E. El-Chantiry;  
A. Gillis;  
A. Jones;  
P. Sweetnam.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

D. Black;  
R. Kidd;  
G. Martin;  
G. McEvoy;  
W. Millar;  
A. Snider;  
B. Sutcliffe.

**INVITED MEMBERS PRESENT:**

L. Antonakos;  
E. Preston.

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Services;

P. Lehman, P. Eng., General Manager;  
J. Sargeant, Secretary-Treasurer;  
C. Craig, Project Manager;  
M. Craig, Manager, Planning & Regulatory  
  
R. Fergusson, Operations Supervisor;  
S. McFarlane, Community Relations Coordinator;  
G. Mountenay, Water Management Supervisor.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m.

**BUSINESS:**

1. Minutes – Board of Directors – September 5, 2012

**B10/17/12-1**

**MOVED BY: D. Abbott**

**SECONDED BY: A. Jones**

**Resolved, That the Minutes of the Mississippi Valley Board of Director's Meeting held September 5, 2012 be received and approved as printed.**

**“CARRIED”**

2. Minutes – Office Building Committee – September 11, 2012

**B10/17/12-2**

**MOVED BY: A. Jones**

**SECONDED BY: P. Sweetnam**

**Resolved, That the Minutes of the Mississippi Valley Office Building Committee Meeting held September 11, 2012 be received.**

**“CARRIED”**

3. Minutes – Office Building Committee – October 4, 2012

Mr. Lehman advised that pressure is still being put on Enbridge to have gas to the new office site during the fall. However, he pointed out that the difference in cost to use propane would be approximately \$10,000-\$12,000. For that reason, the municipalities were not approached for assistance with putting pressure on the company to move the Authority project up the list. A number of members commented on the problems many communities are facing with Enbridge.

It was noted that Ontario Hydro has started the process to have hydro to the site as soon as possible.

**B10/17/12-3**

**MOVED BY: A. Jones**

**SECONDED BY: P. Sweetnam**

**Resolved, That the Minutes of the Mississippi Valley Office Building Committee Meeting held October 4, 2012 be received.**

**“CARRIED”**

4. Ontario Regulation 153/06 Permits

Mr. Abbott commented on a permit approved for a resident in Mississippi Mills. He indicated that Council is aware of the concerns of the resident. Mr. Craig advised that the Authority has a copy of the landowners report.

**B10/17/12-4**

**MOVED BY: G. Code**

**SECONDED BY: P. Sweetnam**

**Resolved, That the Board of Directors approve Permit Nos. W12/001, W12/67, W12/68, W12/70, W12/84, W12/89, W12/96, W12/99, W12/100, W12/101, W12/102, W12/103, W12/104, W12/105, W12/108, W12/112, W12/113, W12/114, W12/117, W12/120.**

**“CARRIED”**

5. New Office Project – Highway 7 Turning Lanes

Mr. Lehman commented on Staff Report #2698/12 regarding turning lanes to the new

office site off Highway 7. It was noted that the Traffic Impact Statement (March 2012) prepared by McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineers which was accepted by the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) indicated that an auxiliary left turn lane into the new office site appeared to be unwarranted at the present time. As such the project has proceeded on that basis at an estimated cost of \$75,000 to construct the entrance to the office.

Recently the Town of Carleton Place and the property owner who also has a right of access off of Hwy 7 have indicated that they would be willing to participate in a three-way cost sharing agreement to proceed with construction of left-turn and right-turn lanes. The estimated cost to construct the entrance to include these lanes is:

Entrance Permit	\$750
Entrance	\$75,000
Right Turn Slip Lane	\$250,000
Left Turn Taper	\$100,000
Design/Engineering Fees	<u>\$42,500</u>
Total	<u>\$468,250</u>

Based on a three-way cost share, each party would need to contribute \$156,000. As the New Office project has allocated \$75,000 towards construction of the entrance, MVC would be responsible for an additional cost of \$81,000.

Mr. Lehman noted that construction of the turning lanes would probably not proceed until the spring of 2013, however, if it were to proceed an amendment to the Development Permit Agreement with the Town of Carleton Place would need to be initiated along with engineering design. While it is expected that the additional costs of \$81,000 could be absorbed within the existing contingency budget, the additional cost would not exceed the project upset limit of \$6,500,000. He recommended that the Building Committee be authorized to proceed with the construction of turning lanes subject to an acceptable agreement between the three parties and project costs not exceeding the project upset limit.

In response to a question, Mr. Craig explained that the cost estimates could change. Once the other two parties agree to contribute then final design and tendering can proceed to finalize costs.

It was the general consensus that the Conservation Authority contribute 1/3 of the total cost for turning lanes if the Town of Carleton Place and the other property owner wish to proceed at the present time and share equally in the cost. If the lanes do not proceed then the Authority would not contribute to a future project for lane construction.

Mr. Burnham confirmed that the Board of Directors will be advised on final costs once they are available.

**MOVED BY: A. Jones**

**SECONDED BY: G. Code**

**Resolved, That the Building Committee be authorized to proceed with the construction of turning lanes subject to an acceptable agreement between the three parties and project costs not exceeding the current project upset limit.**

**“CARRIED”**

6. Carp River, Poole Creek and Feedmill Creek Restoration Plan & Proposed Fee Schedule

Staff Report # 2699/12 was reviewed and discussed. It was noted that the Carp River Restoration Plan has received planning approval from the municipality and the MVCA is anticipating receiving applications for commencement of the work in the next few months. The project will be completed in three phases within a maximum six year time frame. The Carp River Restoration Plan (CRRP) affects lands located approximately 3.5 km north of Hazeldean Road. The project involves significant redesign to the Carp River Floodplain and enhancement to habitat and flow along the Carp River. MVCA staff has been involved with the project since its inception in 2002 including consultation on design, model verification and impacts to the terrestrial and aquatic habitat. The project will require continued detailed engineering and biological review.

It was noted that the proposed work will be subject to Ont. Reg 153/06 and will require MVCA permission. MVCA's review will assess potential impacts related to flooding, erosion and pollution. Also MVCA is responsible for assessing impacts to fish habitat as per the agreement with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Prior to any approval, it must be clearly demonstrated that all impacts have been addressed.

Mr. Craig noted that MVCA has not been involved in a project of this scale or size and the current fee schedule does not reflect the type of technical analysis, review and monitoring that is required. MVCA is responsible for ensuring that all work proceeds as approved. This will involve frequent site meetings and review of monitoring plans along with weekly liaison with project managers. Staff will be required to provide technical direction and feedback in a short time frame. If dedicated staff are not readily available, it could result in delays for the project. The current fee schedule accounts for major shoreline alteration over 1000 metres or new bridge construction. There is no category that addresses major restoration of river corridors.

The CRRP is a highly visible project which has attracted community attention for several years. MVCA has an extensive responsibility in regard to ensuring that works respect approved conditions. The current fee schedule (Schedule B) does not reflect the required staff commitment to ensure that MVCA interests are addressed and the project moves forward in a timely manner. MVCA anticipates dedicating 20% of one staff member (0.2 FTE) equivalent to \$26,000.00. The amount is based on the cost for senior technical staff, including travel and expenses, and is consistent for staff costs within the three Conservation Authorities that are located within the City of Ottawa. Permitting fees are included in the cost as well as reporting, consultation and agency coordination. It was also noted that MVCA is monitoring downstream impacts and has been working with the

Friends of the Carp River to identify potential areas downstream for improvements.

Given the extent of the CRRP and numerous landowners involved, Mr. Craig noted that it would be more efficient and less cumbersome to directly invoice the Kanata West Owners on an annual basis over the life of the project. Annual expenses can be recorded and adjusted as necessary in subsequent years. He recommended that the current fee schedule, Schedule B - Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses – 2012 be amended to include a Special Project Fee category applicable to the Carp River, Poole Creek, Feedmill Creek Restoration Project in the amount of \$26,000 per year. He also recommended that staff be authorized to notify the project proponents and negotiate implementation details.

**B10/17/12-6**

**MOVED BY: E. El-Chantiry**

**SECONDED BY: G. Code**

**Resolved, That Staff Report #2699/12 regarding the proposed fee for Carp River, Poole Creek, Feedmill Creek Restoration Plan be received; and further, Resolved, That the Board of Directors endorse the proposed amendment to the Schedule B - Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses fees and that staff update the Councillor for the area on an ongoing basis through the process.**

**“CARRIED”**

7. Logo Co-Branding

Mr. Lehman commented on Staff Report #2700/12 regarding the costs associated with co-branding with Conservation Ontario. It was noted that costs would be incurred for graphic design, directional and interpretive signs and printed publications and stationary. However, it was noted that current print materials would be used until the supply is exhausted. Stationary such as letterhead, envelopes and cheques must be changed as a result of the move to the new office regardless of a logo design change.

Mr. Lehman noted that senior staff have determined that introducing two options of the logo for interchangeable use would result in confusion to stakeholders even if it is predetermined which usage is warranted in any given situation. He noted that it would be difficult to establish a consistent view of the Conservation Authority and its roles and responsibilities. The pros and cons of using the word Authority as opposed to not using it was discussed.

It was the general consensus that the logo include the full legal name being Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority as recommended.

**B10/17/12-7**

**MOVED BY: A. Jones**

**SECONDED BY: A. Gillis**

**Resolved, That the MVC Board of Directors co-brand with Conservation Ontario using the stylized “C” graphic and text “Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority” and maintain one option only as the official logo.**

**“CARRIED”**

8. Watershed Conditions Report

Mr. Mountenay advised that regardless of substantial rainfall since the last Board of Directors meeting, most of the watershed is still suffering drought conditions.

9. Watershed Management Futures for Ontario – CO Whitepaper

Mr. Burnham commented on Staff Report #2701/12 regarding the whitepaper “Watershed Management Futures for Ontario Report”. He noted that the whitepaper provides an opportunity for the Board of Directors to go through the whitepaper as a first step to a strategic planning exercise. He noted that Mr. Karau will facilitate and chair the discussion. He also noted that due to time constraints, the discussion may continue at another meeting. Mr. Lehman gave a presentation on the programs currently offered at the Conservation Authority. He noted that the discussion will address questions such as:

- Is there a fundamental or predominant role expected of MVCA by member municipalities?
- Which are the priority programs required to fulfill this role and what support functions are required?
- What is the expected level of service and how should this be defined?

There was a discussion on the questions posed. The following points were made by members:

- Municipalities look to the Conservation Authority for expertise on environmental issues;
- Water level maintenance and control is important in the watershed;
- Technical expertise at the Conservation Authority is an important asset for municipalities;
- There is increasingly more demand for the Conservation Authority to take over MNR responsibilities;
- Expertise with regard to provincially significant wetlands is valuable to municipalities and the watershed;
- Planning assistance provided by MVCA staff is valuable to municipalities;
- The Authorities role in source water protection is very important to development in communities;
- The Conservation Authority provides a balanced public awareness of environmental needs in the watershed;
- The Conservation Authority must be careful not to take additional downloading from the Province without assurance that municipalities can pay for it;

- Generally the municipalities and the public are pleased with the mandate conservation authorities have and the service they provide;
- It is important that the Authority not undertake source water protection without significant contributions from the Province – it is not fair to add additional costs to local municipalities for the commitment the Province has made to source water protection. Source water and forestry is not the mandate of Conservation Authorities and should not be taken on without a commitment of full funding;
- The Authority should have a limited role in education since that mandate should be the responsibility of school boards and the Ministry of Education;
- It is unlikely that there will be significant new money from the Province so municipalities will have to decide if a program is important and if so, be willing to pay for it;
- Conservation Authorities are local and unlike MNR, they take a common sense approach.

It was agreed that the discussion be continued at a future meeting with a presentation to local municipalities to be considered.

10. Next Meeting – December 5, 2012

It was noted that the next meeting of the Board of Directors will be the Annual Christmas Luncheon on December 5, 2012. Mr. Sweetnam suggested that the Board consider having lunch at Cabotto's Restaurant in Stittsville. He agreed to host the Board meeting at his office in Stittsville prior to lunch if arrangements can be made to have the lunch at Cabotto's. Mr. Sweetnam suggested that a quick presentation on the Biennial Tour be provided at the next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

**B10/17/12-8**

**MOVED BY: G. Code**

**SECONDED BY: J. Karau**

**Resolved, That the Mississippi Valley Conservation Board of Directors meeting be adjourned.**

**“CARRIED”**

**“J. Sargeant, Secretary-Treasurer  
Chairman”**

**M. Burnham,**