

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Mill of Kintail Gatehouse

July 20, 2011

1:00 p.m.

AGENDA

ROLL CALL

ITEMS FOR DECISION

1. Minutes – Board of Directors Meeting – May 18, 2011
2. Minutes – Office Building Committee Meeting – June 9, 2011
3. Minutes – Policy and Priorities Advisory Committee Meeting – June 28, 2011
4. Business Arising from the Minutes
5. Ontario Regulation 153/06 Permits (Staff Report #2636/11)
6. New Administration Office – Draft Budget and Financing Plan (Staff Report #2637/11)

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

7. Watershed Conditions Update
8. Draft Mill of Kintail Master Plan – Presentation (Craig Cunningham)
9. Conservation Ontario Response to *Climate Ready: Ontario's Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan* (Staff Report #2638/11)
10. Other Business

ADJOURNMENT

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Mill of Kintail Gatehouse

MINUTES

May 18, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:

M. Burnham, Chair;
P. Sweetnam, Vice-Chair;
D. Abbott;
D. Black;
G. Code;
W. Millar;
A. Gillis.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

E. El-Chantiry;
A. Jones;
R. Kidd;
G. McEvoy;
A. Snider;
B. Sutcliffe;
L. Watkins.

INVITED MEMBER PRESENT:

L. Antonakos;
E. Preston.

STAFF PRESENT:

P. Lehman, P. Eng., General Manager;
J. Sargeant, Secretary-Treasurer;
C. Craig, Project Manager;
M. Craig, Manager, Planning & Regulatory Services;
G. Mountenay, Water Management Supervisor;
E. Kohlsmith, Septic Inspector;
P. Hammersley, Environmental Technician.

GUEST PRESENT:

E. Fytche, Mississippi Valley Field Naturalists.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Minutes – April 20, 2011

B05/18/11-1

MOVED BY: W. Millar

SECONDED BY: G. Code

Resolved, That the Minutes for the Board of Directors meeting held April 20, 2011 be received and approved as printed.

“CARRIED”

2. Minutes – Office Building Committee Meeting – May 2, 2011

B05/18/11-2

MOVED BY: D. Black

SECONDED BY: G. Code

Resolved, That the Minutes for the Office Building Committee meeting held May 2, 2011 be received.

“CARRIED”

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

With regard to the Office Building Committee tour of new building structures, Mr. Sweetnam suggested that the Committee visit the fire station on Iber Road in Ottawa. He noted that the fire station is close to the police station which the committee also discussed visiting.

Mr. Gillis expressed concern with the suggestion of 1% for the capital reserve allowance. He suggested that it should be in the 5% range. Mr. Lehman noted that the figure was a suggestion and has not been finalized. Mr. Gillis also expressed concern with the committee only picking two or three companies for detailed request for proposals. It was pointed out that the Committee is not limited to two or three companies. If more than two or three proposals are outstanding then all will be considered.

B05/18/11-3

MOVED BY: D. Black

SECONDED BY: G. Code

Resolved, That the Office Building Committee proceed with a Design-Build project delivery system for the new office project.

“CARRIED”

4. Ontario Regulation 153/06 Permits

B05/18/11-4

MOVED BY: A. Gillis
SECONDED BY: D. Abbott

Resolved, That the Board of Directors approve Permit Nos. W11/11, W10/110, W11/21, W11/18, W11/16, W11/22.

“CARRIED”

5. Software Acquisition

Staff Report #2631/11 regarding the purchase of WISKI-SODA software was reviewed and discussed. Mr. Lehman noted that the 2011 Budget included an allocation of \$10,000 to enter into an agreement with Kisters to purchase and operate the WISKI-SODA data software. At that time, the costs were based on a partnership with several eastern Conservation Authorities (CA's) entering into an agreement with Kisters and sharing the costs of the overall project, originally estimated at \$80,000. To date, only 2 CA's including MVC and Quinte Conservation have committed to enter into the agreement in 2011. As a result, MVC and Quinte staff re-negotiated a price with Kisters to deploy the software through Quinte Conservation which will host the data collection server. MVC's cost to undertake the project jointly with Quinte Conservation in 2011 will be \$16,700 with an additional \$3,400 in each of 2012 and 2013.

Mr. Lehman advised that staff at both MVC and Quinte Conservation are of the opinion that the use of the software will provide important benefits to the Water Management Program at considerably lower cost than purchasing the software individually. He recommended that MVC proceed with the acquisition in 2011 at a cost of \$16,700.

In response to a question, Mr. Lehman noted that staff must access the gauges 365 days per year at an annual cost of \$15,000.

Mr. Mountenay advised that there are other modules available which can be purchased in future years which will, for example, update the web automatically along with other functions. He noted that the present purchase is for the barebones software which will allow the gauges to be accessed on weekends without staff having to be at the office. He noted that staff will still have to look at the data and make decisions on log operations as required. He also noted that the software will provide residents of the watershed with hourly data as opposed to daily data.

Mr. Sweetnam stressed that fisheries should not be a priority for MVC. He stated that the responsibility for fish is not a mandated responsibility for MVC and software should not be purchased to allow that to happen. He stressed that any decision to take on responsibility for fish must be discussed at a Board level.

Mr. Mountenay agreed to provide a demonstration of the software when it is received and set up. In response to a question, Mr. Mountenay confirmed that MVC will receive the

water quality module with the purchase. He noted that he will be attending a workshop on June 8 to review the software which will allow information to be shared between all conservation authorities.

Mr. El-Chantiry suggested that staff report to the Board of Directors or the Finance Committee about the cost savings as a result of the purchase.

B05/18/11-5

MOVED BY: P. Sweetnam

SECONDED BY: W. Millar

Resolved, That staff be authorized to allocate \$16,700 in 2011 towards the purchase of the WISKI-SODA data acquisition software.

“CARRIED”

6. Appointment of Regulations Officer

Staff Report #2632/11 regarding the appointment of a Regulations Officer was reviewed. It was noted that over the past several years, enforcement of Ontario Regulation 153/06 to investigate potential violations and initiate prosecution has been assigned to the Regulations Officer (David Arbour) and more recently included the Manager, Planning and Regulatory Services (Matt Craig). Due to workload demands and availability of staff, Mr. Lehman recommended that alternate enforcement staff be designated in accordance with Section 10 of the Regulation wherein the authority may appoint officers to enforce the Regulation.

The Regulations Officer is responsible for investigations and enforcement of the Conservation Authority Regulations under both Section 28 (DEVELOPMENT, INTERFERENCE WITH WETLANDS AND ALTERATIONS TO SHORELINES AND WATERCOURSES REGULATION – ONT. REG. 153/06) and Section 29 (CONSERVATION AREA REGULATION – ONT. REG. 120/90), of the *Conservation Authorities Act*.

Mr. Lehman advised that Andy Moore has been an Environmental Technician with MVC since 2008 and recently completed Level 1- Compliance Training for Provincial Offences Officers. He recommended that Andy Moore be appointed as a Regulations Officer to enforce Ontario Regulation 153/06 and Ontario Regulation 120/90.

Mr. Lehman advised about positive comments received from the residents of Dalhousie Lake regarding Mr. Moore’s demeanor when handling a shoreline situation recently.

B05/18/11-6

MOVED BY: P. Sweetnam

SECONDED BY: G. Code

Resolved, That Wayne Andrew Moore be appointed as a Regulations Officer to enforce Ontario Regulation 153/06 and Ontario Regulation 120/90.

“CARRIED”

7. Appointment to Regulations Committee

B05/18/11-7

MOVED BY: E. El-Chantiry

SECONDED BY: D. Black

Resolved, That the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority hereby appoints Duncan Abbott to the Regulations Committee.

“CARRIED”

8. Appointment to New Office Building Committee

Mr. Burnham advised that Robert Sutcliff has requested that he be allowed to attend the Office Building Committee meetings at the request of Lanark Highlands. Mr. Burnham suggested that Mr. Sutcliff should be appointed to the committee if he is going to attend the meetings.

Mr. Gillis pointed out that Mississippi Mills should also be represented at the Office Building Committee meetings.

There was a discussion about the makeup and size of the committee at the present time.

B05/18/11-8

MOVED BY: G. Code

SECONDED BY: P. Sweetnam

Resolved, That Robert Sutcliffe be appointed to the New Office Building Committee.

“CARRIED”

9. Septic System Program Proposals

Staff Report #2635/11 containing a proposal submitted to the Township's of North Frontenac and Central Frontenac to deliver the Township's septic inspection and re-inspection programs was reviewed and discussed.

Mr. Lehman advised that staff will be attending upcoming council meetings to answer questions about the program. He introduced Eric Kohlsmith and Peter Hammersley that both work for the Mississippi-Rideau septic system office doing the septic program in Tay Valley Township and the re-inspection program in North Frontenac, Central Frontenac, Drummond/North Elmsley and Rideau Lakes. He noted that MVC, in partnership with the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority, has been delivering the Tay Valley Township Septic approval and re-inspection program since 2004 through the Mississippi-Rideau Septic System Office.

Mr. Kohlsmith provided a presentation on the septic inspection and re-inspection programs. It was noted that the value of the conservation authorities delivering the programs is in providing an

integrated approach to the protection of surface and groundwater resources. Malfunctioning septic systems are recognized by the source water protection initiative as a potential threat to private water supplies. Promoting good design, construction and maintenance of private septic systems will be an important part of protecting drinking water sources and protection of the aquatic environment.

Recently, the Ontario Building Code (OBC) was amended to establish and govern mandatory septic re-inspections in certain areas. The amendments to the Building Code also govern discretionary on-site sewage system maintenance inspection programs that can be established by local approval authorities; i.e. at the discretion of a local municipality, it may establish a mandatory inspection program over all or a designated portion of its jurisdiction. However, if such a program is to be implemented, it must be done by the "Principal Authority" having jurisdiction over Part 8 of the OBC (Septic Systems). Currently the KFL&A Health Unit is the Township's of North Frontenac and Central Frontenac "Principle Authority" for Part 8 (Septic System Approvals) of the Building Code.

The KFL&A Health Unit has advised municipalities in which the Health Unit has been the "Principle Authority", that utilizing the Conservation Authorities to provide "Third Party Inspection" services (discretionary septic re-inspection programs) is not permitted under the legislation, and also have recommended that the current voluntary programs be deferred.

A legal interpretation of the Building Code received by staff would not exclude the Conservation Authorities from providing this "Third Party Inspection" service to member municipalities.

It was noted that the staff report and proposal was provided for information. If North Frontenac decides to have the Conservation Authority provide its septic approval program then the contract will be brought back to the Board of Directors for acceptance.

Mr. Sweetnam pointed out that the septic inspection program must pay for itself in each Township. He noted that the City of Ottawa should not subsidize septic inspections/re-inspections in outlying municipalities.

Mr. Burnham suggested that municipalities interested in having the Conservation Authority take over their septic inspections/re-inspections should contact Mr. Lehman or Mr. Kohlsmith.

B05/18/11-9

MOVED BY: W. Millar

SECONDED BY: D. Black

Resolved, That the proposals for delivery of Septic System Programs to the Townships of North Frontenac and Central Frontenac be received.

"CARRIED"

10. Watershed Conditions Update

Mr. Mountenay provided an update on water levels across the system as a result of excessive rain. He noted that the upper lakes are at normal levels at the present time. Mississippi Lake is approximately 8” above the normal level for the present time. Dalhousie Lake is approximately 1 foot higher than the normal level. Mr. Mountenay commented on the numerous complaints about erosion and ice damage.

11. Up-coming Meetings

- a. Board of Directors Tour – changed from June 15 to June 22, 2011 – all day tour to leave from the Lanark Office;
- b. Policy & Priorities Advisory Committee – June 28 – 10:00 a.m. – Mill of Kintail Gatehouse;
- c. Finance & Administration Advisory Committee – June 23 – 10:00 a.m. – Mill of Kintail Gatehouse.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

B05/18/11-10

MOVED BY: D. Black
SECONDED BY: D. Abbott
Resolved, That the meeting be adjourned.

“CARRIED”

“J. Sargeant, Recording Secretary

M. Burnham, Chairman”

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

OFFICE BUILDING COMMITTEE

Mill of Kintail Gatehouse

MINUTES

June 9, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:

M. Burnham, Chair;
P. Sweetnam, Vice-Chair;
D. Black;
G. Code;
A. Jones;
B. Sutcliffe.

STAFF PRESENT:

P. Lehman, P. Eng., General Manager;
J. Sargeant, Secretary-Treasurer;
C. Craig, Project Manager.

BUSINESS:

Mr. Burnham called the meeting to order at 9:50 a.m.

1. Minutes – Office Building Committee Meeting – May 2, 2011

OBC06/09/11-1

MOVED BY: A. Jones

SECONDED BY: D. Black

Resolved, That the Minutes for the Office Building Committee meeting held May 2, 2011 be received and approved as printed.

“CARRIED”

2. Draft – Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications Plan

Mr. Craig commented on the draft Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications as circulated with the agenda. He noted that the estimated time frames as outlined are important if the Authority wishes to proceed with construction in 2012.

Mr. Sweetnam expressed confusion over the fee to deliver the services and the respondent expenses. Mr. Craig agreed to revise the Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications document to clarify the confusion outlined by Mr. Sweetnam.

There was a discussion regarding the inclusion of the 4.2 million dollar budget figure in the Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications document. Mr. Craig advised that he will revise the document to indicate that the budget figure has not been finalized.

There was a discussion regarding distribution of the Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications. Mr. Lehman noted that project has already been posted in the Daily Commercial News giving notice to potential contractors that the project is on the horizon. It was agreed that notice be included in the Daily Commercial News and with the Ontario Home Builders Association. It was agreed that the distribution should be wide. Mr. Craig noted that he will be circulating the Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications to companies that have already inquired.

Mr. Craig pointed out that if distribution of the Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications can be handled in a timely manner then the dates presented in the document are reasonable. If distribution is difficult, then the dates could be moved back if required. He noted that the estimated time frames are flexible.

Mr. Craig advised that he would make the minor amendments to the document. The final copy of the Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications for circulation to contractors is attached to the minutes.

OBC06/09/11-2

MOVED BY: A. Jones

SECONDED BY: G. Code

Resolved, That the Request for Expressions of Interest and Qualifications for the Mississippi Valley Conservation new administrative office facility in Roy Brown Park be approved.

“CARRIED”

3. Response from MPAC Regarding Taxation on Building

Mr. Lehman commented on the response from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation regarding municipal taxation of conservation authority projects. He noted that the response indicates that property purchased by the conservation authority would be liable for taxation under a residential property class, however, the building, if deemed to be “works” of the Authority, would not be assessed. He noted that the conclusion of MPAC is that the final determination will be made once the building is constructed.

Mr. Sweetnam cautioned that any lease with a potential tenant should ensure that they are responsible for a portion of the property taxes if assessed.

4. Project Budget and Financing

Mr. Lehman circulated a capital cost estimate for the building project. He noted that the Town of Carleton Place has confirmed that they can finance the project over a 15, 20 or 25 year term. It was noted that the City of Ottawa financed the Rideau Valley Conservation

Authority new office project over a 20 year term. It was agreed that the Authority should go with a 20 year term unless expenditures and levy requirements dictate that a 25 year term would be easier for watershed municipalities to handle.

Mr. Lehman noted that, based on the formula used by the City of Ottawa for the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority new office project, the capital reserve allowance would be \$40,500.00 per year. He noted that the total annual cost of \$398,038.00 as presented includes \$40,000.00 for a capital reserve allowance.

It was noted that in 2008 an amount of \$464,000.00 was recommended to the Board of Directors for an annual levy on the new office project. The amount was reduced by the Board of Directors to \$300,000.00 at that time. The annual cost of \$398,038.00 as presented is a more accurate estimate of the annual levy requirement at the present time. Final budget and financing figures will be developed once final construction costs are determined. He pointed out that a report on the projected cost estimate will be taken to the Board of Directors.

There was a discussion regarding water and sewer for the property. Mr. Lehman commented on discussions with the Town of Carleton Place regarding the future installation of water and sewer. He noted that water and sewer may not be installed for at least ten years. The Agreement of Purchase and Sale between the Conservation Authority and the Town of Carleton Place will address the future installation and cost of water and sewer so the Conservation Authority will know the costs going into the project.

In response to a question regarding revenue from any prospective tenant, Mr. Lehman explained that no amount has been included in the projected budget because the decision has not been made by the Board whether to proceed with a smaller office to accommodate current staff with expansion later or build a larger office and lease out a portion to a tenant until the conservation authority needs the space. Mr. Lehman noted that a decision will have to be made on size prior to going to construction.

It was suggested that two budgets be provided to the Board of Directors, one based on a 20 year term and one based on a 25 year term.

5. Tour – June 13, 2011

Mr. Craig outlined the visits for the tour on June 13, 2011 as follows:

Meet at Tay Valley Township office – 9:00 a.m. – take MVC vehicles
Lanark Mutual Insurance Building
Rideau Valley Conservation Authority Office – have a box lunch
Drummond/North Elmsley Office
Return to Tay Valley Township office – 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Craig noted that the Ottawa police declined a visit to their facility due to security reasons

and the Iber Road Fire Hall declined a tour since the building is not officially completed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

OBC06/09/11-3

MOVED BY: G. Code
SECONDED BY: R. Sutcliffe
Resolved, That the meeting be adjourned.

“CARRIED”

“J. Sargeant, Recording Secretary

M. Burnham Chairman”

June 9, 2011

Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications

Project: Mississippi Valley Conservation (MVC) Building a New Administrative Office Facility in Roy Brown Park

Introduction

Mississippi Valley Conservation (MVC) is seeking a design-builder to design and construct a new administrative office. MVC intends to use the design-build method of project delivery in which one entity – the design-build team – works under a single contract with MVC to provide design and construction services. A Construction Project Management approach will also be considered provided the Respondent can pull together a design team and provide details regarding construction administration.

The Responses to this Request for Expressions of Interest and Qualifications will be used to identify a Shortlist of up to three (3) qualified Respondent teams which will be invited to respond to a Request for Proposals.

Background

Mississippi Valley Conservation (MVC) has outgrown its administrative headquarters on Highway 511 near Lanark. In 2007, the Board of Directors agreed that a new Administrative Office was required to accommodate the growing needs of the Conservation Authority.

A Space Needs Study was conducted in 2007, which included interviews, data collection and on-site reviews. It concluded that a more than doubling of the current office space was required. The study also found serious problems with the current working environment including; building code violations, accessibility code violations, lack of privacy and inadequate meeting space. The existing office building consists of 3 trailers merged together that date back to the early 1970's.

During 2008, the MVC undertook further reviews of staff projections and operational considerations regarding a new office location. In early 2009, Tiree Consultants were hired to undertake a Site Analysis Study, including a review of site servicing feasibility, of the current MVC office site on Highway 511 and the Mill of Kintail site. The Board reviewed the outcomes of the Site Analysis Study, but there was no clear consensus on a preferred location. Consequently, the Board agreed to expand the search to include other potential sites. Member municipalities were contacted to see if they had any additional sites to recommend. The outcome of this site selection process is that Roy Brown Park emerged as the preferred site for the new MVC office.

The Roy Brown Park site was purchased by the Town of Carleton Place and designated as a park in 2004. The 30-acre parcel is in the Township of Beckwith. It is currently zoned Rural and Flood

Plain.

Mississippi Valley Conservation is a watershed based environmental organization established in 1968 under the *Conservation Authorities Act of Ontario*. The MVC represents a grouping of municipalities in the Mississippi River watershed. MVC is funded primarily through municipal levies and self generated revenues and is governed by the 11 member municipalities of the watershed.

The organization's Vision is "a healthy watershed where the needs of our communities are achieved in balance with the needs of the environment". The MVC Mission statement says, "Mississippi Valley Conservation will provide leadership in managing the water resources of our watershed in partnership with our member municipalities, resource agencies and watershed communities".

The MVC has a strong track record of partnering with municipal, provincial and federal governments as well as community-based groups to deliver local, practical solutions to a range of natural resource problems. Important tools to help MVC's objectives, in both the short and long term, include providing motivation and influencing the individual and collective actions of watershed residents. MVC realizes that it must remain relevant to watershed residents to ensure that they feel "connected" to the watershed and understand the impact of their actions on the long-term health of their environment.

MVC was looking for a site that compliments their environmental protection and public education mandates. Roy Brown Park is an ideal location due to frontage on the Mississippi River, which MVC works to protect, and frontage on Highway 7, which will provide easy access and good visibility.

Progress to Date

The MVC Board of Directors has formed an Office Building Committee to oversee the project. The MVC is in discussions with the Town of Carleton Place to acquire a portion of the Roy Brown Park site.

Studies and work completed to date include:

- Building Condition Report and Space Needs Study
- Preliminary Concept Plan for the Roy Brown Park Site
- Site Servicing Feasibility Study
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- Traffic Impact Statement
- Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation

A copy of the Preliminary Concept Plan is attached to this document. The functional requirements will be further specified in the Request for Proposals. Documents referred to above may be obtained free of charge, weekdays, between 8:00 am and 4:00 pm, at:

Mississippi Valley Conservation

4175 Highway 511
RR#2 Lanark, Ontario
K0G 1K0

Copies can also be viewed and downloaded from the MVC website at www.mvc.on.ca.
Click on the New Office Project link on the MVC homepage.

Current thinking is that the new MVC headquarters will occupy a five acre parcel in the southeast portion of Roy Brown Park. Access to and egress from the site is proposed from a shared entrance off Highway 7. The size of the office building will be approximately 14,000 sq. ft. with parking for approximately 60 vehicles. The office building is initially expected to house 35 employees with a projected growth over 10 years to approximately 50 employees. The size of the workshop/garage facility will be approximately 4,000 sq. ft. with a fenced compound for secure parking of MVC vehicles and equipment. The MVC would like to build a sustainable building using a process that is environmentally responsible and resource-efficient throughout the building's life-cycle. The building is to be designed and constructed to the GreenHouse Certified Construction standard. The estimated construction budget is 4.2 million dollars. The size of the buildings and the construction budget has not been finalized. These items will be subject to review during the design stage.

Contact Person

The contact person for this project is as follows:

Cliff Craig, MVC Project Manager
Cell: 613-894-1052
Home: 613-836-6928
Email: cliffcraig@rogers.com

Closing Date

Expressions of Interest and Qualifications must be received before **3:00 pm on July 8, 2011**.
Expressions of Interest and Qualifications can be delivered to the above address or they can be delivered electronically to info@mvc.on.ca

Qualifications Review Committee

Review of Responses will be by the Office Building Committee and their recommendations must be approved by the MVC Board of Directors.

Estimated Time-Frames

Please note the following key dates in our selection process:

Expressions of Interest and Qualifications Due ...	July 8, 2011	3:00 pm
--	--------------	---------

Issue Request for Proposals (short-listed firms only) ...	August 5, 2011	
Detailed Proposal Due ...	September 2, 2011	3:00 pm
Approval of Successful Respondent by MVC Board of Directors ...	September 21, 2011	

The timing and the sequence of events resulting from the Request for Expression of Interest and Qualifications may vary and shall ultimately be determined by the MVC Board of Directors.

Response Contents

Please limit your Expressions of Interest and Qualifications to a maximum of seven (7) pages, plus resumes of the individuals on the design-build team and highlights of related projects. The following information must be included as a minimum:

- Name, address and brief history/overview of your firm including your ability to implement the project on an integrated design-build basis plus financial capability to undertake this project (insurance & bonding).
- Related experience during the last five years (similar in scope and scale to this project and green building experience). List no more than three of the most relevant projects your firm has completed. Provide a narrative, building size, project delivery method, project team members, and a reference for each project listed. Also provide the initial and final contract values, and the initial and actual dates of substantial completion for each project.
- Identify your project team members (both in-house resources and outside sources), their proposed roles, and relevant experience. Provide a detailed resume for each project team member.
- Indicate the proposed process for the design and construction of the project. Provide an outline of all deliverables for this project, and a detailed statement of the scope of services you intend to provide.
- Indicate your proposed fee structure for the design and construction supervision services outlined within your response.

Selection criteria will be based on the above.

Respondent Expenses

Respondents are solely responsible for their own expenses in preparing a Response and for subsequent negotiations with MVC, if any.

The MVC may withdraw this request for Expressions of Interest and Qualifications at any time. Moreover, the MVC need not accept any submission, and in its sole discretion may deal with the project in any other way. No contractual obligations will arise between MVC and any Respondent until and unless the MVC and a Respondent enter into a formal, written contract for the Respondent to perform the required work.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY
POLICY AND PRIORITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mill of Kintail Gatehouse

MINUTES

June 28, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:

D. Abbott, Chair;
D. Black, Vice-Chair;
W. Millar;
A. Snider;
M. Burnham, ex-officio;
P. Sweetnam, ex-officio;

MEMBERS ABSENT:

R. Kidd;
L. Watkins.

STAFF PRESENT:

P. Lehman, General Manager;
J. Sargeant, Secretary-Treasurer;
C. Cunningham, Environmental Planner;
G. Mountenay, Water Management Supervisor.

VISITORS PRESENT:

J. Fowler, The Millstone;
M. O'Malley, Appleton, Reach 18;
D. O'Malley, Appleton;
R. Campbell, Enerdu Power Systems Ltd.;
J. Cohen, Soloway Wright LLP;
B. Touzel, WESA/OEL-Hydrosys
K. Bennett, WESA/OEL-Hydrosys

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

BUSINESS:

1. Minutes – Policy & Priorities Advisory Committee Meeting – November 10, 2010

Mr. Sweetnam pointed out that Olivia MacAngus was referred to as Ms and Mrs in the minutes. He noted that she should be referred to as Ms.

PPAC06/28/11-1

MOVED BY: P. Sweetnam

SECONDED BY: W. Millar

Resolved, That the Minutes of the Policy and Priorities Advisory Committee meeting held November 10, 2010 be received and approved as printed.

“CARRIED”

2. Election of Chair

Duncan Abbott agreed to fill the position of Chair.

PPAC06/28/11-2

MOVED BY: P. Sweetnam

SECONDED BY: W. Millar

Resolved, That nominations for Chair be closed.

“CARRIED”

3. Election of Vice-Chair

Mr. Burnham nominated Doug Black to the position of Vice-Chair.

PPAC06/28/11-3

MOVED BY: P. Sweetnam

SECONDED BY: A. Snider

Resolved, That nominations for Vice-Chair be closed.

“CARRIED”

4. Delegation – Mr. Mike O’Malley

Mr. O’Malley, a resident of Appleton provided a power point presentation on the destruction he has witnessed of the Appleton wetland during the last few years. He referred to the area of concern as Reach 18 on the Mississippi River which includes a Provincially Significant Wetland and he noted that the area is also an ANSI (Area of Natural and Scientific Interest). He commented on historical water levels in the area compared to water levels at the present time. He noted that the higher water levels are the result of flash boards installed by Enerdu Power Systems Ltd. to assist with hydro generation. Mr. O’Malley showed photos of the increased water levels and of the degradation of the water with algae bloom in the past few years. He pointed out that the elevated water levels are causing root drowning and a rare species of swamp maple is at risk.

He stated that the short term solution would be to lower the water level. The long term solution would be to re-establish historic wetland water levels or come up with a compromise; amend the water levels compliance range; restrict hold and release of water for run of the river use only.

Mr. O’Malley requested help from the Conservation Authority to make the Ministry of Natural Resources see that there is a problem with the water levels in the Appleton wetland. He requested support from the Conservation Authority to come up with a compromise.

Mr. Campbell, an employee of Enerdu Power Systems Ltd. noted that Enerdu is in the renewable energy business that benefits from the river. Mr. Campbell commented on a number of slides presented by Mr. O’Malley. He noted that a cement weir was put in

place many years ago and the flashboards are mounted to the weir every year when the water levels allow them to be installed. He noted that there is no such thing as non-failing flashboards. He also pointed out that Mike Stockton was a direct competitor with Enerdu and both businesses are trying to maximize their revenues through hydro generation. Mr. Campbell noted that the flashboards have been used for many years and any claim that they are affecting the water levels now are unfounded.

Mr. Campbell noted that a process was established in January to ensure that it is not water levels causing the problems on the river. Both the Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Natural Resources have begun collecting data on water levels.

Mr. Campbell shared Mr. O'Malley's concern for the health of the river. He noted that hydro producers use water that passes through the system. Mr. Campbell noted that the flashboards are the same height now as they were historically. They are put in during the spring and they stay there until the ice takes them out then they are rebuilt and put in again in the spring when the water level allows. He pointed out that generation of hydro electricity in Almonte is not affecting the wetland or the algae bloom upstream because nothing has changed since the flashboards were historically installed for the first time.

Mr. Mountenay advised that a staff gauge has been installed in Appleton to begin collecting water level data. He noted that there is not enough data yet to verify what is being said by Mr. O'Malley or Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Lehman noted that the Conservation Authority is committed to doing some analysis of what is happening with the wetland. He pointed out that the flashboards are regulated by the water management plan.

5. Presentation – Carleton Place Dam Hydro-Electric Development

Mr. Lehman advised that WESA Group Inc./Ottawa Engineering was retained to review a proposal submitted by Eco-Joule to install hydropower facilities at the Lanark and Carleton Place dam sites. He introduced Bill Touzel and Kearon Bennett from Ottawa Engineering Hydrosystem to comment on the viability of hydro generation at Carleton Place and Lanark Dams.

Mr. Bennett pointed out that Mr. Lehman requested that Ottawa Engineering take a fresh look at Carleton Place and Lanark Dams from the point of view of hydro power potential and provide some perspective on whether either site would be an attractive investment opportunity for the Conservation Authority or a hydro developer.

Mr. Bennett noted that because Carleton Place is a low head dam then the development option would be VLH (very low head) technology. He noted that VLH is the preferred option based on environmental footprint and economics. However, he noted that the problem at Carleton Place is that development cannot proceed until modifications are made to the Hydro One grid. He commented on a bottleneck at Hawthorne T.S. which services the entire region from Arnprior to past Cumberland to Smiths Falls. He noted that theoretically Hydro One cannot accept anything in that area because of a lack of

short circuit capacity.

Mr. Bennett commented on VLH technology. He also questioned whether MVC or the municipality would want to pass on control of the dam to a private developer for the long term that is required in the hydro generation business.

Mr. Bennett commented on the Carleton Place Preliminary RETScreen Results as presented. He noted that Retscreen is a fairly well accepted and established model for assessing energy projects. Mr. Bennett summarized the annual revenues that could be generated over 20 years. He noted that the project would not generate a lot of money for the Conservation Authority.

With regard to Lanark Dam, Mr. Bennett pointed out that the dam is too small for hydro generation. He presented the Preliminary RETScreen results. He pointed out that a project in Lanark would be a lot of effort for a poor return.

Mr. Bennett outlined the options available to the Conservation Authority:

Carleton Place Dam:

1. Do nothing at this point;
2. Tender Carleton Place to preselected, qualified developers;
3. MVCA pursue development of Carleton Place through a joint venture with the municipality.

Lanark:

1. Same as above but the project would have very marginal financial characteristics.

Mr. Lehman agreed to circulate the presentation provided by Ottawa Engineering to the members for review. Mr. Bennett and Mr. Touzel agreed to attend another meeting to answer questions once members have had a chance to review and discuss the presentation.

6. Draft Mill of Kintail Master Plan

Mr. Lehman advised that the intent of the Mill of Kintail Master Plan as presented is to take the document out for public review.

Mr. Burnham suggested that staff proceed with a public review while it is also reviewed by MVC board members.

MOVED BY: P. Sweetnam

SECONDED BY: W. Millar

Resolved, That the Draft – Mill of Kintail Master Plan be received and recommended for public review.

“CARRIED”

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

PPAC11/06/28-5

MOVED BY: M. Burnham

SECONDED BY: W. Millar

Resolved, That the Policy and Priorities Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

“CARRIED”

“J. Sargeant, Secretary-Treasurer

D. Abbott, Chair;

Staff Report # 2636/11

July 20, 2011

Memorandum

**To: The Chair and Members of the Board of Directors
Mississippi Valley Conservation**

**From: Matt Craig
Manager, Planning and Regulatory Services**

**Re: Ontario Regulation 153/06 Permits
Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and
Watercourses**

Attached to this report is a summary of the permits up to July 13, 2011.

Recommended Resolution:

Resolved, That the Board of Directors approve Permit Nos. W10/71, W11/38, W11/52, W11/53, W11/23, W11/35, W11/15, W11/25, W11/26, W11/27, W11/28, W11/29, W11/30, W11/33, W11/31, W11/32, W11/10, W11/19, W11/20, W11/39.

Mississippi Valley Conservation

Section 28 Permits Issued Up To: 13/07/2011

CAFileNo: W10/71 **DATE ISSUED:** 16/05/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 16/05/2012
MUNICIPALITY: BECKWITH **WATERBODY:** MISSISSIPPI LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 123 LAKESIDE DRIVE **LOT:** 8 **CON:** 10 **WARD:** BECKWITH
PROPOSAL: Construct shoreline erosion protection with encroachment into lake to preserve tree.

CAFileNo: W11/38 **DATE ISSUED:** 28/06/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 28/06/2013
MUNICIPALITY: BECKWITH **WATERBODY:** MISSISSIPPI LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 241 AVENUE 1, PETRIE ROAD **LOT:** 5 **CON:** 9 **WARD:** BECKWITH
PROPOSAL: Replace damaged wooden retaining wall and replace with 2:1 'rip rap' protection.

CAFileNo: W11/52 **DATE ISSUED:** 11/07/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 31/08/2011
MUNICIPALITY: BECKWITH **WATERBODY:** MISSISSIPPI LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 337 NINTH LINE **LOT:** 2 **CON:** 7 **WARD:** BECKWITH
PROPOSAL: Import clean fill and place in the flood plain for the purpose of seeding lawn and creating a flower garden

CAFileNo: W11/53 **DATE ISSUED:** 12/07/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 12/07/2013
MUNICIPALITY: BECKWITH **WATERBODY:** MISSISSIPPI LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 157 LAKESIDE **LOT:** 18 **CON:** 10 **WARD:** BECKWITH
PROPOSAL: Raise floor of cottage 2 feet above flood plain elevation. No expansion to existing structure proposed.

CAFileNo: W11/23 **DATE ISSUED:** 16/05/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 12/05/2012
MUNICIPALITY: CENTRAL FRONTENAC **WATERBODY:** SILVER LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 103 HOYLE LANE E **LOT:** 19 **CON:** 7 **WARD:** CENTRAL FRONTENAC
PROPOSAL: Repair/Alter Retaining Wall

CAFileNo: W11/35 **DATE ISSUED:** 03/06/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 03/06/2012
MUNICIPALITY: DRUMMOND/NORTH ELM **WATERBODY:** MISSISSIPPI LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 128 CRAIGS SHORE **LOT:** 5 **CON:** 9 **WARD:** DRUMMOND/NORTH ELMSLEY
PROPOSAL: Shoreline RipRap Approx 55ft, plus placing of topsoil in low spots for lawn.

CAFileNo: W11/15 **DATE ISSUED:** 26/05/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 26/05/2013
MUNICIPALITY: LANARK HIGHLANDS **WATERBODY:** UNNAMED CREEK
CIVIC ADDRESS: 704 HWY 511 **LOT:** 3 **CON:** 3 **WARD:** DARLING
PROPOSAL: Install a 30" concrete culvert to allow flow of seasonal stream.

CAFileNo: W11/25 **DATE ISSUED:** 26/05/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 26/05/2013
MUNICIPALITY: LANARK HIGHLANDS **WATERBODY:** DALHOUSIE LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 531 PURDONS BAY RD **LOT:** 12 **CON:** 9 **WARD:** DALHOUSIE
PROPOSAL: Repair the original retaining wall and replace the fill and sod that was lost during an exceptional high water, high wind spring storm on Thursday April 28th and to protect the trees and return the shoreline to the state it was in prior to the storm on that date

CAFileNo: W11/26 **DATE ISSUED:** 26/05/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 26/05/2013
MUNICIPALITY: LANARK HIGHLANDS **WATERBODY:** DALHOUSIE LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 535 PURDONS BAY RD **LOT:** 12 **CON:** 9 **WARD:** DALHOUSIE
PROPOSAL: Repair the original retaining wall and replace the fill and sod that was lost during an exceptional high water, high wind spring storm on Thursday April 28 and to protect the trees and return the shoreline to the state it was prior to the storm on that date.

CAFileNo: W11/27 **DATE ISSUED:** 26/05/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 26/05/2013
MUNICIPALITY: LANARK HIGHLANDS **WATERBODY:** DALHOUSIE LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 557 PURDONS BAY RD **LOT:** 12 **CON:** 9 **WARD:** DALHOUSIE
PROPOSAL: Repair the original retaining wall and replace the fill and sod that was lost during an exceptional high water, high wind spring storm on Thursday April 28th and to protect the trees and return the shoreline to the state it was in prior to the storm on that date

CAFileNo: W11/28 **DATE ISSUED:** 26/05/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 26/05/2013
MUNICIPALITY: LANARK HIGHLANDS **WATERBODY:** DALHOUSIE LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 505 STEWART LANE **LOT:** 12 **CON:** 9 **WARD:** DALHOUSIE
PROPOSAL: Repair the original retaining wall and replace the fill and sod that was lost during an exceptional high water, high wind spring storm on Thursday April 28, 2011 and to protect the trees and return the shoreline to the state it was in prior to the storm on that date

CAFileNo: W11/29 **DATE ISSUED:** 26/05/2011 **EXPIRY DATE:** 26/05/2013
MUNICIPALITY: LANARK HIGHLANDS **WATERBODY:** DALHOUSIE LAKE
CIVIC ADDRESS: 537 PURDONS BAY RD **LOT:** 12 **CON:** 9 **WARD:** DALHOUSIE
PROPOSAL: Repair the original retaining wall and replace the fill and sod that was lost during an exceptional high water, high wind spring storm on Thursday April 28, 2011 and to protect the trees and return the shoreline to the state it was in prior to the storm on that date.

Staff Report # 2637/11

June 29, 2011

Memorandum**To:** The Chair and Members of the Board of Directors
Mississippi Valley Conservation**From:** Paul Lehman, P.Eng.
General Manager**Re: New Administration Office – Draft Budget and Financing Plan**

At the direction of the Office Building Committee, staff have prepared the following project budget for consideration by the Board of Directors. The budget is separated into soft costs, construction costs and operating expenses.

Construction Costs

The Site Analysis Study completed by TIREE in 2009, estimated project construction costs for the office building and workshop of \$230/sf and \$180/sf respectively. Project management and design fees were based on a percentage of construction costs at 12% and 6% respectively. Following discussion with local contractors and municipalities a revised construction cost estimate of \$200/sf for the office building and \$150/sf for the workshop was considered to be more applicable. Table 1 provides a description of the total construction cost of \$5,554,520 including soft costs.

The draft Agreement of Purchase and Sale includes provisions to protect MVC's initial investment in constructing private services by limiting the requirement to connect to municipal services for a minimum of ten years, should they become available sooner. After ten years, if municipal sewer and water become available, MVC's cost will be determined by the current difference in appraised value between serviced and unserviced land. The current difference in appraised value is \$55,000 per acre. The current estimate of the cost to connect to municipal sewer and water (when it becomes available) is therefore 5.2 acres x \$55,000 = \$286,000.

Debt Financing

The Town of Carleton Place has indicated that it would be prepared to finance the construction costs at the rates provided by Infrastructure Ontario which are 4.50%, 4.30% and 4.00% for amortization periods of 25, 20 and 15 yrs respectively. These rates are based on July 2011 and are subject to change. Table 2 provides a description of the financing costs for a 25, 20 and 15 yr amortization period. As you will note the annual financing cost would range from \$282,942 to \$377,350 with corresponding interest charges of \$2,878,025 to \$1,464,725.

Operating Expenses

Projected operating expenses for the new office building were estimated to provide an indication on the overall financial impact. In the 2011 Budget, total operating expenses of \$41,500 have been allocated to taxes, insurance, utilities and maintenance associated with the existing office. It is estimated that these annual expenses will be approximately \$72,000 for the new office facility, primarily reflecting an increased cost for maintenance.

In addition it is recommended that a capital reserve allowance of \$40,500 be included as an annual operating expense to cover any major maintenance item which may occur including the cost of connection to municipal services after ten years should it become available. As this capital reserve allowance is not included in the 2011 Budget, the total projected operating expense would be \$112,500 as compared to \$41,500 allocated in the 2011 Budget.

The total shortfall between current 2011 allocations and projected expenses is provided in Table 2.

Table 3 and 4 provides the current (2011) and projected municipal levy requirements based on debt financing being amortized over 15, 20 and 25 years. Based on the anticipated construction schedule the projected changes in municipal levy would occur in 2013. Please note that apportionment figures used to apportion the total cost on a general benefitting basis are based on 2010 current value assessment data provided by MNR and are subject to change from year to year.

Recommendation

In 2008, an allocation of \$464,000.00 was recommended to the Board of Directors to proceed with final design of the new office project. After consideration by the Board of Directors this amount was reduced to \$300,000 and has been maintained for the past three years. While final budget and financing figures will be developed once final construction costs are determined it is recommended that the Board of Directors approve the draft Budget and Financing Plan based on a 20 year amortization period.

It is further recommended that member municipalities be advised of the projected changes in municipal levy for 2013.

Recommended Resolution

Resolved, that the New Administration Office – Draft Budget and Financing Plan be approved.

Table 1 - Draft Project Expense Budget

<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Soft Costs	
Professional Consulting Fees & Disbursements	\$424,820
Project Management	\$50,000
Permits/Approvals/Other	\$110,000
Furniture & Equipment Allowance	\$420,000
Moving Expenses	\$10,000
Total Soft Costs	\$1,014,820
Costruction Costs	
Property Acquisition	\$135,000
Site Servicing/Siteworks	
- entrance/road/parking	\$200,000
- grading/drainage/landscaping	\$135,000
- water/sewer	\$175,000
- hydro/gas/internet	\$82,000
Office Building Construction	
- assume 14,000 sf @ \$200/sf	\$2,800,000
Garage/Workshop Construction	
- assume 4,000 sf @ \$150/sf	\$600,000
Sub-total	\$4,127,000
Construction Contingency (10%)	<u>\$412,700</u>
Total Construction Cost	<u>\$4,539,700</u>
Grand Total	\$5,554,520

Table 2 - Draft Project Financing Budget

Item	25 yr Amort. Amount	20 yr Amort. Amount	15 yr Amort. Amount
Total Construction Cost	\$5,554,520	\$5,554,520	\$5,554,520
Less			
Sale Revenue	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$255,000
Admin Office Reserve (2012)	\$1,104,000	\$1,104,000	\$1,104,000
Debt Financed	\$4,195,520	\$4,195,520	\$4,195,520
Interest Rate (July 2011)	4.50%	4.30%	4.00%
Amortization Period	25	20	15
Total Interest on Debt	\$2,878,025	\$2,143,881	\$1,464,725
Annual Financing Cost	\$282,942	\$316,970	\$377,350
Operating Expenses			
Taxes	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Grounds maintenance	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000
Interior maintenance	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Heat/Hydro	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Telephone	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Insurance	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Capital Reserve Allowance	\$40,500	\$40,500	\$40,500
Annual Operating Expense	\$112,500	\$112,500	\$112,500
Total Annual Cost	\$395,442	\$429,470	\$489,850
2011 Capital Levy	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
2011 Operating Expense	\$41,500	\$41,500	\$41,500
Projected 2013 Shortfall	\$53,942	\$87,970	\$148,350

Table 3 – Projected Municipal Levy (Current and 15 Yr Amortization)

Capital And Operating Expenditure - Current				
Municipality	% in Watershed	Modified Current Value Assessment In Watershed	Apportionment	Levy
North Frontenac Tp	71	490,026,284	1.039%	\$3,549
Central Frontenac Tp	32	231,340,105	0.491%	\$1,676
Tay Valley Tp	35	366,072,382	0.776%	\$2,652
Beckwith Tp	36	264,729,232	0.562%	\$1,918
Carleton Place T	100	1,109,425,187	2.353%	\$8,036
Drummond/North Elmsley Tp	30	252,283,779	0.535%	\$1,827
Lanark Highlands Tp	91	580,039,046	1.230%	\$4,201
Mississippi Mills T	89	1,179,781,525	2.502%	\$8,546
Addington Highlands Tp	21	84,885,065	0.180%	\$615
Ottawa C	29	42,570,006,059	90.293%	\$308,349
Greater Madawaska Tp	3	18,107,839	0.038%	\$131
Total		47,146,696,502	100.000%	\$341,500

Capital and Operating Expenditure - Projected (15 yr amortization)				
Municipality	% in Watershed	Modified Current Value Assessment In Watershed	Apportionment	Levy
North Frontenac Tp	71	490,026,284	1.039%	\$5,091
Central Frontenac Tp	32	231,340,105	0.491%	\$2,404
Tay Valley Tp	35	366,072,382	0.776%	\$3,803
Beckwith Tp	36	264,729,232	0.562%	\$2,751
Carleton Place T	100	1,109,425,187	2.353%	\$11,527
Drummond/North Elmsley Tp	30	252,283,779	0.535%	\$2,621
Lanark Highlands Tp	91	580,039,046	1.230%	\$6,027
Mississippi Mills T	89	1,179,781,525	2.502%	\$12,258
Addington Highlands Tp	21	84,885,065	0.180%	\$882
Ottawa C	29	42,570,006,059	90.293%	\$442,298
Greater Madawaska Tp	3	18,107,839	0.038%	\$188
Total		47,146,696,502	100.000%	\$489,850

Table 4 – Projected Municipal Levy (20 Yr and 25 Yr Amortization)

Capital And Operating Expenditure - Projected (20 yr amortization)				
Municipality	% in Watershed	Modified Current Value Assessment In Watershed	Apportionment	Levy
North Frontenac Tp	71	490,026,284	1.039%	\$4,464
Central Frontenac Tp	32	231,340,105	0.491%	\$2,107
Tay Valley Tp	35	366,072,382	0.776%	\$3,335
Beckwith Tp	36	264,729,232	0.562%	\$2,411
Carleton Place T	100	1,109,425,187	2.353%	\$10,106
Drummond/North Elmsley Tp	30	252,283,779	0.535%	\$2,298
Lanark Highlands Tp	91	580,039,046	1.230%	\$5,284
Mississippi Mills T	89	1,179,781,525	2.502%	\$10,747
Addington Highlands Tp	21	84,885,065	0.180%	\$773
Ottawa C	29	42,570,006,059	90.293%	\$387,780
Greater Madawaska Tp	3	18,107,839	0.038%	\$165
Total		47,146,696,502	100.000%	\$429,470

Capital And Operating Expenditure - Projected (25 yr amortization)				
Municipality	% in Watershed	Modified Current Value Assessment In Watershed	Apportionment	Levy
North Frontenac Tp	71	490,026,284	1.039%	\$4,110
Central Frontenac Tp	32	231,340,105	0.491%	\$1,940
Tay Valley Tp	35	366,072,382	0.776%	\$3,070
Beckwith Tp	36	264,729,232	0.562%	\$2,220
Carleton Place T	100	1,109,425,187	2.353%	\$9,305
Drummond/North Elmsley Tp	30	252,283,779	0.535%	\$2,116
Lanark Highlands Tp	91	580,039,046	1.230%	\$4,865
Mississippi Mills T	89	1,179,781,525	2.502%	\$9,895
Addington Highlands Tp	21	84,885,065	0.180%	\$712
Ottawa C	29	42,570,006,059	90.293%	\$357,055
Greater Madawaska Tp	3	18,107,839	0.038%	\$152
Total		47,146,696,502	100.000%	\$395,442

Staff Report # 2638/11

June 29, 2011

Memorandum

To: The Chair and Members of the Board of Directors
Mississippi Valley Conservation

From: Paul Lehman, P.Eng.
General Manager

Re: **Conservation Ontario Response to *Climate Ready: Ontario's Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan***

Attached for your information is the response from Conservation Ontario regarding Ontario's climate change adaptation strategy entitled "*Climate Ready: Ontario's Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan*" which was recently released by the Minister of the Environment. (a copy of the Strategy can be obtained from the MVC web-site www.mvc.on.ca). The Strategy recognizes the significant impact which the changing climate is and will have on our water resources and the important role which conservation authorities (CA's) will be called on to fill in adapting to these changes.

The Conservation Ontario response highlights some of the advances which CA's have already made on this issue and focuses on the opportunities and challenges which the Province of Ontario should consider in advancing Ontario's Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan.

Recommendation

Submitted for information.



Conservation Ontario's Response to *Climate Ready: Ontario's Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan*

(DRAFT)

Introduction

Conservation Ontario is the network of 36 Conservation Authorities, local watershed management agencies that deliver services and programs that protect and manage water and other natural resources in partnership with government, landowners and other organizations. Conservation Authorities promote an integrated watershed approach balancing human, environmental and economic needs. Conservation Authorities are organized on a watershed basis.

As leaders in environmental protection in Ontario, Conservation Authorities applaud the recently released report *Climate Ready: Ontario's Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan*. Conservation Authorities have long recognized the importance of climate change adaptation and are already working to address the increasing impacts of climate change on Ontario's water and land resources.

One of the major implications of climate change made clear by Ontario's Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan is the diverse range of potential impacts of climate change on Ontario's water resources. There are aspects of water management in all of the Strategy's five goals and many of the proposed Actions touch on water management issues. Rising temperatures and changing precipitation patterns in Ontario have already reduced river flows, warmed surface waters and dried out wetlands. These impacts will likely continue, and other threats to environmental and public health are expected to materialize including increased flooding and reduced quantity and quality of drinking water.

Managing impacts on water, water infrastructure and water related natural features as we adapt to a changing climate will be a significant challenge for everyone. Traditionally water and environmental policies and programs have been developed for specific features or activities. However, the complexity and scope of the water and environmental management response required today needs a different approach.

Conservation Authorities support the important principles outlined in the Province's Strategy. It is critical to incorporate climate change adaptation into existing government policies and programs, prioritizing actions that have co-benefits between mitigation and adaptation. As well, given the uncertainty that surrounds climate change impacts, we require the best available science available in order to support good provincial and local decision-making. Enabling ongoing sustainability of Ontario's environment will ensure the health and safety of current and future residents of Ontario.

While there are many areas within the Strategy where Conservation Authorities can support action in local watersheds, the priorities identified by Conservation Ontario include:

- Promote greater collaboration for climate change adaptation through an Integrated Watershed Management approach
- Enhance science and monitoring in order to track local impacts of climate change and support local watershed adaptation strategies;
- Improve ability to protect Ontario from flood hazards through updated mapping and review of flood forecasting systems and flood control infrastructure
- Review of natural hazard technical guidelines in support of CA land use planning responsibilities
- Early review of the Ontario Low Water Response Program
- Build local ecosystem resilience through continued investments and partnerships around biodiversity and the Great Lakes shoreline;
- Closer collaboration between Conservation Ontario and the Province through the proposed Climate Change Directorate.

A Watershed Management Approach to Climate Change Adaptation

Conservation Ontario promotes an Integrated Watershed Management approach as a logical means to organize and coordinate the work of the various Ministries and agencies that will be involved in adapting to our changing climate. There are many inter-relationships between the proposed actions and rather than addressing these individually there is an opportunity to develop a coordinated response that would treat these as an integrated set.

Integrated watershed management is the process of managing human activities and natural resources in an area defined by watershed boundaries. This approach allows us to address multiple issues and objectives; and enables us to plan within a very complex and uncertain environment.

As Ontario's watershed management agencies, Conservation Authorities have been leading the development and implementation of watershed plans for many years. In 2010, Conservation Ontario completed an investigation into the current status of Integrated Watershed Management (IWM) in Ontario today and its potential as a coordinated approach to the management of water and related resources. This project was done in partnership with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO). The final report, *Integrated Watershed Management: Navigating Ontario's Future* provides a number of recommendations to facilitate implementation of a more enhanced approach to integrated watershed planning across Ontario.

In recent years Ontario has developed significant experience in applying IWM to water management issues. The Clean Water Act, which is specific to protecting municipal drinking water sources, is based on a multi-stakeholder watershed approach. Although still in progress it's watershed-based multi-stakeholder decision making process is proving to be very successful. More recently the Lake Simcoe Watershed Plan is also an excellent example of an IWM approach to water management. Climate change adaptation is a logical extension of this experience. Conservation Ontario recommends that the Climate Change Adaptation Directorate adopt an integrated watershed management approach as the process for coordinating the water management response to climate change.

Conservation Authority Role in Climate Change Adaptation

By virtue of their existing responsibilities and experience, Conservation Authorities are an obvious partner to support the implementation of the strategy's water related actions, and are ready to work with the Province to address these challenges.

Conservation Authorities have a long history of working in partnership with provincial ministries and many other diverse stakeholders to manage Ontario's water resources. This includes initiatives such as long standing roles in watershed management, protecting the public from flood hazards and mitigating the impacts of drought. More recently Conservation Authorities have been the province's key partners in the implementation of the Clean Water Act to protect Ontario's sources of drinking water.

There are a number of areas where Conservation Ontario and Conservation Authorities can provide specific support to Ontario's Adaptation Strategy.

Science and Monitoring

Conservation Ontario supports enhanced monitoring and modeling to inform adaptation initiatives and will continue to partner with the province in water and environmental data collection. Enhanced science and information will be the foundation of all climate change adaptation initiatives. The uncertainties around how Ontario's natural systems will respond to a changing climate require an adaptive approach to future programs and initiatives. Robust environmental monitoring as well as local modeling of both the changing climate and the environmental response are critical to an adaptive approach.

Through decades of watershed studies and data collection, enabled through a variety of federal, provincial and municipal partnerships, Conservation Authorities have scientific information and local knowledge that can support climate change adaptation. Conservation Authorities have demonstrated their expertise through their leadership and support of the province's Drinking Water Source Protection Program which is significantly enhancing the watershed knowledge base and is an excellent foundation for adaptation initiatives. Conservation Authorities are also key partners with MOE and MNR in the ongoing collection of the water and environmental monitoring data that will support climate change detection and adaptation. As referenced in the strategy report Conservation Ontario is currently partnering with the province on a research project to assess the adequacy of the PWQMN and PGMN monitoring networks for detecting climate change. Through the Regional Adaptation Collaborative, Conservation Ontario is also a partner in the development of the Climate Modeling Collaborative.

As part of this action it is also important to improve both the coordination of monitoring by the various agencies as well as the enhancement of the tools to manage and access monitoring data. The MOE GIS Portal for Conservation Authorities, developed by the MOE Environmental Monitoring Reporting Branch in partnership with Conservation Ontario, is an example of the latter. Monitoring and modeling tools will be the foundation of watershed adaptation strategies.

Conservation Ontario also supports the development of the Lake Simcoe Adaptation Strategy as a potential model for adaptation planning in other watersheds. Watershed adaptation strategies using watershed scale information and local collaborative decision making will be critical to successful adaptation.

Flood Management

The incidence of significant flood events in Ontario is escalating and adapting to increasing flood hazards will be a major challenge. The province needs to act quickly to ensure that Ontario's flood management system has the capacity to cope with the changes in flood patterns.

As the lead agencies in the province for flood hazards, Conservation Authorities are already working on adapting their programs to account for climate change. For example, the Upper Thames Conservation Authority, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and Grand River Conservation Authority, have partnered with Environment Canada and with Ontario Universities to assess the potential effects of climate change on flooding.

Climate change, together with growing populations, increasing property values and aging urban infrastructure have diminished the capacity of watersheds to cope with storm runoff, exposing growing populations to increased flood risk. Conservation Ontario's report, *Protecting People and Property: A Business Case for Investing in Flood Prevention and Control*, shows that Ontario's flood management programs need to significantly improve in order to continue to protect life and property and to ensure that flood emergencies can be managed effectively now and in the future.

Specific adaptation challenges Conservation Authorities are facing with respect to flooding include:

- Floodplain mapping is the basis of all flood prevention programs. As documented in the Conservation Ontario Report and acknowledged in Ontario's Adaptation Strategy, there is a significant need to update flood risk assessments and floodplain maps. Conservation Ontario urges immediate action by the province to incorporate climate change into floodplain criteria and to extend and update floodplain mapping coverage.
- Conservation Authorities, in partnership with MNR, operate Ontario's flood forecasting and emergency response system. A number of Conservation Authorities are already reviewing and upgrading their systems in response to changing storm conditions. Conservation Ontario recommends that a provincial program review should also be undertaken.
- Conservation Authorities own and operate \$2.7 billion worth of flood control infrastructure including 900 structures which mitigate flood risks to Ontario residents. Some Conservation Authorities, Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority, for example, have already undertaken studies to assess how climate change might change the way they need to operate their reservoirs and water control structures. Identifying the vulnerability of this infrastructure to climate change is a critical first step to the continued effectiveness of these structures.
- Through their role in development review and permitting Conservation Authorities are actively involved in urban stormwater management. For example, in the Greater Toronto area, they are developing low impact development techniques. Conservation Authorities support the action to develop new stormwater management guidance and are ready to assist the province

Land use Planning

Conservation Authorities look forward to collaborating with the Province into the land use planning process. Conservation Authorities have delegated responsibilities to represent

provincial interests regarding natural hazards encompassed by Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement, and will have significant responsibilities for ensuring planning decisions adapt to climate change. These policies are critical to delivery of an effective flood prevention program in Ontario and keeping vulnerable development out of natural hazards within watersheds and along Great Lakes shorelines. The supporting science-based natural hazard technical guidelines should be reviewed and updated to include tools/direction for ensuring that decisions address climate change. Similarly, the associated regulatory tools under the Conservation Authorities Act need to be examined with regard to facilitating adaptation to climate change and require provincial leadership in the science review and policy amendments for consistency.

Low Water Response

Conservation Ontario supports the proposal to review the Ontario Low Water Response Program and urges early action on this review. Conservation Authorities coordinate and support Low Water Response committees and are ready to work with the province on this review. Increasing demand for water coupled with the potential for reduced supplies in summer months create the potential for more significant drought events in the province. Early review the program is necessary to incorporate new science developed through the source protection program and to enhance the support for committee decision making.

Biodiversity

Conservation Ontario and Conservation Authorities can continue to collaborate with the province and others to advance and apply knowledge gained towards implementing conservation, enhancement and restoration of biodiversity to support resilient ecosystems.

Conservation Authorities contribute significantly to the protection of our biodiversity in Ontario. They are major landowners, collectively owning 143,000 hectares, including forests, wetlands, areas of natural & scientific interest, and significant natural habitat. Many Conservation Authorities continue to acquire and manage lands of conservation significance adding to a system of conservation lands for the maintenance of biodiversity.

Conservation Authorities also deliver programs that support afforestation and private land stewardship. For example, in 2009 and 2010 Conservation Authorities led the planting of over three million trees. Conservation Authorities are significant partners with Trees Ontario in the 50 Million Trees Program, accounting for 70% of the trees planted under this initiative. Conservation Authorities also deliver a variety of other private land stewardship programs that support climate change adaptation.

Great Lakes

Conservation Ontario supports including adaptation in Great Lakes Agreements and will continue to actively participate in Provincial and Federal discussions around Great Lakes and climate change. A total of 35 of the 36 Conservation Authorities are located in the Great Lakes Basin. Understanding the relationships between the watersheds managed by Conservation Authorities and the Great Lakes they drain into is fundamental to integrating climate change considerations into Great Lakes agreements. Threats from the watersheds via intense storm events have an impact on the nearshore environment. Watershed-based analyses will be critical in assessing climate change impacts to the nearshore and determining watershed actions to support adaptation.

Additionally, Conservation Authorities are responsible for implementing provincial natural hazard policies and regulations along Great Lakes shorelines and can continue to play a key role in working with the Province in this area. Understanding the risks and vulnerabilities of the Great Lakes shorelines to climate change, for example, with regard to water levels and storm surges, is

a critical first step to review the natural hazards policy framework (including flooding) which currently guides shoreline development decisions.

Collaborating on Adaptation – Working with the Climate Change Directorate

One of the unique characteristics of Conservation Authorities is the partnerships they develop to deliver on-the-ground programs. These initiatives can involve partnerships with provincial ministries, municipalities, federal departments, academic institutions, and nongovernmental organizations. As a result, Conservation Authorities have established a network of contacts that puts them in a good position to support the local delivery of climate change adaptation initiatives

Given this existing network of partners and the wide range of proposed Actions that are linked to Conservation Authority programs, it would be beneficial for Conservation Ontario to sit on the proposed steering committee that will be supporting the Climate Change Adaptation Directorate. Similar to the successful Source Protection model, Conservation Ontario would be able to support implementation of the Province's Adaptation Strategy with the Conservation Authorities.

Summary

Adapting to a changing climate is going to present many challenges and opportunities for Ontario. Ontario's Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan has presented a comprehensive set of actions that can begin the process of adapting to climate change. Within these actions there are a number that deal with issues related to Ontario's water resources. Conservation Authorities urge the province to take an integrated approach to implementing these actions and offer their expertise and support to ensure the Province's success.

The priorities discussed above are of particular important to Conservation Authorities and Conservation Ontario requests an early opportunity to discuss this with the province.