

March 19, 2019

**NOTICE OF
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING *AMENDED***

DATE: TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 2019

TIME: 9:30 A.M – 11:20 A.M

LOCATION: WATERSHED CONSERVATION CENTRE
BOARDROOM

AGENDA:	TIME
1. Approval of Agenda	9:30am
2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest	
3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting: Thursday February 21, 2019	
4. Business Arising from the Minutes	9:35am
(a) Responses to St. Marys and Perth South's Delegation at the 2019 AGM (45 minutes)	
i) UTRCA Budget and Municipal Appointments Background Presentation (T.Annett/T.Hollingsworth/I.Wilcox)	
ii) Five Year Levy and Spending Data Report to Finance & Audit Committee (S.Levin/T.Hollingsworth/C.Saracino)(Doc: FIN #860) (Report attached)	
iii) Letter from St. Marys, March 12, 2019 (Letter attached)	
5. Business for Approval	
6. Closed Session – In Camera	10:20am
* Item 6(a) moved to Business for Information	
7. Business for Information	10:25am
* MTO Land Purchase	

(Verbal)(5 minutes)

- (a) Administration and Enforcement - Section 28
(T. Annett) (Doc: ENVP #7434)
(Report attached)(5 minutes)
 - (b) Dingman Screening Area Update
(T.Annett)(Doc: ENVP #7440)
(Report attached)(10 minutes)
 - (c) 2018 Health & Safety Summary
(C.Ramsey)(Doc: #121279)
(Report attached)(5 minutes)
 - (d) Fanshawe Pioneer Village Update
(I.Wilcox)(Verbal)(5 minutes)
 - (e) Human Resources Training Information
(Verbal)(I.Wilcox)(5 minutes)
 - (f) Water & Information Management Presentation
(C.Tasker)(20 minutes)
8. Other Business (Including Chair and General Manager's Comments) 11:15am
9. Adjournment 11:20am



for

Ian Wilcox, General Manager

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

T.Annett	G.Inglis	C.Ramsey	M.Snowsell	M.Viglianti
B.Glasman	D.Charles	C.Saracino	P.Switzer	S.Viglianti
C.Harrington	B.Mackie	A.Shivas	C.Tasker	I.Wilcox
T.Hollingsworth	S.Musclow	J.Skrypnyk	B.Verscheure	K.Winfield
J.Howley				

MINUTES
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING
TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 2019

Members Present:	M.Blosh	H.McDermid
	A.Dale	B.Petrie
	D.Edmiston	J.Reffle
	A.Hopkins	M.Ryan
	T.Jackson	J.Salter
	S.Levin	M.Schadenberg
	P.Mitchell	A.Westman
	A.Murray	

Regrets:

D.Shepherd

Solicitor:

G.Inglis

Staff:	T.Annett	A.Shivas
	D.Charles	M.Snowsell
	C.Harrington	C.Tasker
	T.Hollingsworth	B.Verscheure
	C.Ramsey	K.Winfield

1. Approval of Agenda

S.Levin welcomed Mayor Al Strathdee of St. Marys and Mayor Bob Wilhelm of Perth South.

B.Petrie moved – seconded by A.Murray:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors move item 6a) MTO Land Purchase from Closed Session to the first item in ‘Business for Information’.”

CARRIED.

M.Blosh moved – seconded by A.Hopkins:-

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

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. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
February 21, 2019

There was a suggestion to change the total for the ‘Number of Members’ column in the Weighted Vote Summary table to reflect the number of Municipalities, not the number of Members in 2020.

M.Blosh moved – seconded by A.Murray:-

“RESOLVED that the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the Board of Directors’ minutes dated February 21, 2019 as posted on the Members’ web-site.”

CARRIED.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

(a) Responses to St. Marys and Perth South’s Delegation at the 2019 AGM
(Report attached)

i) UTRCA Budget and Municipal Appointments Background Presentation
(Report attached)

ii) Five Year Levy and Spending Data Report to Finance & Audit Committee
(Report attached)

iii) Letter from St. Marys, March 12, 2019
(Report attached)

I.Wilcox introduced his presentation and noted the presentation and letter from MPP Pettapiece will be included in the minutes. Staff and the Chair are drafting a response to the letter dated March 12, 2019 from the Town of St. Marys. Staff and the Chair are also drafting a response letter to MPP Pettapiece, which highlights and corrects inaccuracies contained in the original letter, and requests a public correction of those errors.

I.Wilcox noted that there is a history attached to the representation piece and staff will report back in April or May on this concern. If any changes are made to representation, all Members who have shared representation would be given the option to appoint separate members. There was a discussion around increased membership.

There was discussion around the 2019 and 2020 Municipal transfer payments.

Some members commented that although the budget was presented to the Board members in advance of the Annual General Meeting, new members were unaware of the overall financial status of the organization.

T.Jackson brought a point of order to the attention of the Board. He noted the amended budget motion he put forward at the Annual General Meeting was not voted on using the weighted vote, which he felt it should have been. He added that in order to follow proper process he believed the second budget motion, which was voted on using the weighted vote, should be rescinded and expunged from the minutes. Following a discussion, the Board asked G.Inglis to provide a legal opinion on this point of order.

T.Jackson moved – seconded by H.McDermid:-

“RESOLVED that the Board of Directors rescind and expunge the second budget motion.

DEFERRED.

B.Petrie moved – seconded by A.Hopkins:-

“RESOLVED that the Board of Directors defer any further decision until a legal opinion is obtained”

CARRIED.

There was a suggestion to create a cutoff date for Municipal feedback prior to the Annual General Meeting. Staff will look into inviting Municipalities to speak to Budget concerns at the January meeting and will work to improve communications with Municipalities earlier in the Budget process.

The Board asked staff to provide information regarding the capital deficit and the Investment Policy for April’s discussion.

5. Business for Approval

There was no business for approval.

6. Closed Session – In Camera

*Moved to Business for Information

7. Business for Information

*MTO Land Purchase

A.Shivas updated the Board on the successful purchase of land previously owned by the Ministry of Transportation adjacent to the UTRCA owned Lowthian Flats.

- (a) Administration and Enforcement – Section 28
(Report attached)

A typo in the date of Permit 209-19 was found, staff will correct the error.

T.Jackson moved – seconded by A.Murray:-

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

CARRIED.

- (b) Dingman Screening Area Update
(Report attached)

T.Annett spoke to the report and confirmed that the industry now has a better understanding of the process and is more comfortable than they were at the time of the delegation.

J.Salter moved – seconded by M.Blosh:-

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

CARRIED.

- (c) 2018 Health and Safety Summary
(Report attached)

C.Ramsey gave a history of Health and Safety at the UTRCA and an overview of the Occupational Health and Safety Act. In 2019 the focus will be on preventing strains in the workplace. Staff clarified that all UTRCA staff members and volunteers are required to participate in Health and Safety training.

A.Murray moved – seconded by D.Edmiston:-

“RESOLVED that the recommendation be amended to recommend receipt of the report, not approval.

CARRIED.

J.Reffle moved – seconded by B.Petrie:-

“RESOLVED that the Board of Directors receive the report as amended.”

CARRIED.

(d) Fanshawe Pioneer Village Update
(Report attached)

I.Wilcox gave the background and history of the relationship between UTRCA and the Fanshawe Pioneer Village. In the past, the Executive Director has been an employee of the UTRCA, and as a result the General Manager and the Vice-Chair sat on the Board of Directors. I.Wilcox announced that Dawn Miskelly has been hired as the new Executive Director of the Fanshawe Pioneer Village and that position is no longer an employee of the UTRCA. A report will be brought to the Board later this year on suggested governance changes regarding UTRCA representation on the Fanshawe Pioneer Village Board of Directors. Staff will talk to D.Miskelly regarding the possible continuation of quarterly reporting to the Board.

(e) HR Update

M.Viglianti will be sending information to the Board regarding the workplace anti-harassment training that all staff members are required to receive.

(f) Water & Information Management Presentation

C.Tasker gave an orientation presentation on the Water & Information Management Unit at the UTRCA. The presentation will be posted on the Member's website.

8. Other Business

I.Wilcox reminded the Board that there is a thirty day Levy appeal window for Municipalities to appeal the apportionment of the Levy, which begins the day they receive the Levy notice in the mail.

I.Wilcox informed the Board that this year's St. Marys Land Owner Workshop was very successful and had the largest attendance on record for this event. T.Jackson suggested the Board visit the farm of Mr. Breen, one of the landowners featured at the workshop.

S.Levin reminded members to direct any questions they may have for staff through I.Wilcox or the Acting General Manager.

S.Levin informed the Board that the backcountry camping experience at Wildwood was one of three finalists for the Southwest Ontario Tourism Corporation's 2018 Innovation Award.

It was suggested that the Health and Safety report be removed from the Administrative By-Law's list of Annual Meeting agenda items.

A Members tour of the Watershed was suggested.

D.Edmiston suggested organizing a large draw to raise money to take the burden off the levy.

9. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:38 am on a motion A.Hopkins.



Ian Wilcox
General Manager
Att.



Context:

1. **Perth South/ St. Marys Delegation** at AGM
2. **St. Marys Mayor's Letter** to the Board, Municipalities, MPPs, MP and the Premier
3. **St. Marys Media Releases** to London Free Press, St. Marys Independent
4. **Perth Wellington MPP Letter** to Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and Perth Municipal Mayors

- Criticism of Board's 2019 Budget approval.
- Accused of ignoring municipal financial challenges.
- Concern regarding budget growth and perceived inability to influence Board decisions.
- Criticisms shared with the media, other municipalities, MPPs, MPs, Minister of ECP, and the Premier- not necessarily with the UTRCA.



Office of the Mayor
Al Strathdee
astrathdee@town.stmarys.on.ca
(519) 284-2340 Ext. 246

March 12, 2019
Mr. Sandy Levin, Chair, Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA)
1424 Clarke Rd. London, Ont., N5V 5B9

Dear Mr. Levin,

At the February 21st inaugural meeting of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority Board of Directors, director Tony Jackson made a motion to remove the \$288,000 increase in municipal levy. This motion was defeated without adequate consideration. I am writing to you to formally request that the UTRCA board of director's reconsider Mr. Jackson's motion. There are a number of issues that I feel the Board should consider:

- 1) **Due Process.** Passing the budget at the inaugural meeting of the 2019 UTRCA Board did not allow for due process. Many board members, especially those attending their first meeting, were not adequately informed of the UTRCA financial situation. There was no detailed examination of assets and reserves. From the minutes of previous board minutes, we know this includes millions of dollars in reserves and land holdings that were not discussed at the meeting.

Both new and incumbent members of the board could not have made an informed decision about the municipal levy increase without being given detailed financial information and time to consider its impact on member municipalities. Therefore, I ask the board to reconsider the increase in municipal levy whilst taking an appropriate amount of time to look at UTRCA's comprehensive financial situation.

- 2) **Accountability.** My concerns remain centred around the overly aggressive growth of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority relative to its peers. We are concerned with our ability to pay the continuous increases which are above average. UTRCA's reliance on precarious Provincial and Federal grants is also of concern. The new environmental targets and strategic plan fails to re-evaluate core services and lacks sufficient metrics of accountability. These shortcomings leave municipalities vulnerable to recurrent increases in levies without sufficient checks and balances.
- 3) **Fairness.** The discussion at the February 21st UTRCA annual general meeting regarding municipal levies was disheartening. The municipal levy system is overly complex and grossly unfair. Municipal levies are not collected on a per capita basis. This leaves smaller municipalities bearing the burden of disproportionately high fees. I would encourage the UTRCA on behalf of its rural member municipalities to work with the Province of Ontario to find a workable solution to this obvious inequity.

The weighted voting system is problematic for smaller municipalities. The representatives of the City of London and one other Board member have the ability to control all of the financial decisions. Smaller member municipalities are not adequately represented.

TOWN OF ST. MARYS
P.O. Box 998, St. Marys, ON. N4X 1B6



Response Plan:

1. Delegation Response to Board:

- Key messages included later in this presentation.
- Content of St. Marys and MPP response letters will speak to delegation's concerns.
- Note that the Board heard delegation, debated and voted on budget approval at the AGM. Procedurally the matter has been addressed.

2. St. Marys Mayor's Letter:

- Chair to draft a response letter, as requested.
- Response letter to be cc'd to circulation list used by St. Marys, including media, as well as UTRCA Board.
- Chair to request delegation status at a St. Marys Council meeting to speak to the response and answer questions.

3. Perth Wellington MPP Letter to Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks:

- Chair to draft a response letter noting inaccuracies and requesting a public correction.
- Response letter to be cc'd to MPP's circulation list, as well as UTRCA Board.



Key Messages:

1. Timing:

- All municipalities received the draft budget Nov. 8, 2018 (> three month review/ comment period).
- Formal feedback from Perth South and St. Marys came Feb. 19th, two days before the AGM and was supported by a delegation at the AGM.
- Press releases and letters to other municipalities and the Province were written after the AGM.

2. Inaccurate Financial Data:

- Budget amounts (operating vs. total), per capita levy, percent increases, impact on municipal budgets, forecast budgets,....

Examples:

- Perth South claim of levy = 13% of municipal budget, but in fact appears to be 1.6% calculated from Perth South's on-line draft budget.
- Levy increase since 2015= 28%, not 50% as claimed.
- Claim of 2020 UTRCA budget of \$24M???
- Claim of \$8M increase in budget- has actually declined over past three years
- Accusation UTRCA is more expensive than neighbouring CAs- 8th lowest of 36 CAs. Lowest in Perth.



Key Messages:

3. Due Process:

"Many Board Members were not adequately informed of the UTRCA financial situation"

- Half of the Board was involved in every stage of budget development.
- New members received the budget as soon as appointed, were encouraged to review, and speak with outgoing board members, call with questions.
- January Orientation Meeting included budget review.
- All information regarding reserves and land holdings is available.
- Suggests new members made an uninformed decision...

4. Accountability:

- Argument criticizes growth more than accountability.
- The suggestion that Targets Plan does not have sufficient metrics is based on assumptions rather than fact.
- Board has been clear about the need for reporting metrics.



Key Messages:

5. Fairness:

"The municipal levy system is overly complex and grossly unfair."

- Levy apportionment system is not complicated. Same premise but far simpler than municipal taxation.
- Apportionment calculation is a provincial requirement.
- Some may not like use of assessment (CVA) but it is a means of allocating levy based on a standardized measure of ability to pay. It is proportional, equitable and in all but exceptional cases, fair. (And smaller municipalities do not bear a higher proportion of the levy burden.)
- Criticism of weighted voting depends on perspective. Fundamentally, those who pay more have more say. London could argue it should have even more say.
- Weighted voting is a provincial requirement.



Key Messages:

6. Representation

"As a separated municipality and in accordance with provincial legislation, St. Marys should be granted a director on the UTRCA Board..."

- Complicated issue and history that will be addressed through a separate Board report in April or May.
- Will note:
 - Current Board make-up is in accordance with provincial legislation.
 - A new dedicated member for St. Marys would not change the weighted budget vote outcome in any way.
 - Other shared municipalities would have to be offered the same dedicated positions.
 - Board costs would increase by \$6K at a minimum (per diem, travel) resulting from additional members.
 - Influence of any one member/ municipality on all other issues would decrease.



Notes:

- There will be no reductions to provincial transfer payments (OMPF) for municipalities in 2019 (Expected cuts were the delegation's main justification for requesting a reduced levy).
- Perth municipalities recently received \$3M in additional transfer payment funding for 2019 (\$672K for St. Marys and \$338K for Perth South).
- UTRCA 2019 Budget projects a levy reduction for St. Mary's (-\$7,700, -3.9%)
- Floodwall funding pursued by UTRCA saved the St. Marys \$585,000 (equivalent of three years of levy). Cost avoidance.
- UTRCA levy reduces St. Marys tax rate by 0.07% for 2019.

Staff Opinion:

- Criticism is in many cases unfair, unfounded, uniformed and based on assumptions, misinterpretation and/or incorrect data.
- Tactic of late input and broad public distribution of criticisms escalates the issue and is not conducive to a cooperative locally derived solution.
- Happy to meet with any municipality or individual to address questions and concerns, and have always extended those invitations.



Randy Pettapiece, MPP
Perth-Wellington

March 4, 2019

Hon. Rod Phillips, MPP
Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks
c/o Macdonald Block Mailing Facility
77 Wellesley St W PO Box 200
Toronto ON M7A 1N3

RE: Upper Thames River Conservation Authority

Dear Minister Phillips:

I am writing you today on behalf of a number of municipalities in Perth-Wellington concerning the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA).

There is a growing concern amongst municipal and business leaders that the UTRCA is abusing its position. The board of directors recently passed a \$288,000 levy increase for the coming fiscal year. Over the past three years, the budget of the UTRCA has increased by \$8 million and now has an operating budget of \$20 million. According to the Conservation Authority's Environmental Targets: Strategic Plan (2016), the operating budget is going to rise to \$24 million by 2020.

In my riding of Perth-Wellington, the rural municipalities do not know where they are going to find the money for these levy increases. In the Township of Perth South, the UTRCA levy was \$47,840 in 2018, representing 13 percent of its entire operating budget. Since 2015, there has been a 50 percent increase in the annual levy for municipalities. These levy increases are unsustainable.

There are 17 municipalities represented on the board of directors. The City of London has a weighted 50 percent voting share under the current governance model. As a result, the rural municipalities are at a disadvantage. Their voices are diminished even though the levees make up a larger component of their yearly budgets.

The rural municipalities in my riding practice good fiscal management and live within their means. This becomes increasingly difficult when the UTRCA decides to keep increasing the municipal levy. Perth South and the other rural municipalities in my riding will not be able to finance vital infrastructure projects, if these levy increases remain unchecked.

...2/



Randy Pettapiece, MPP
Perth-Wellington

-2-

The UTRCA's Environmental Targets: Strategic Plan also assumes they will be able to leverage provincial grants, which do not currently exist. As you are aware, our province inherited a \$15 billion deficit from the former government and our caucus is focused on balancing the budget. When this provincial funding does not materialize they will need to increase the municipal levees further.

All parties involved are not asking to compromise the base budget or stop delivering essential services. They only want the UTRCA to practice fiscal restraint and live within their means, as municipalities are required to do.

I would appreciate a meeting either with yourself or your staff in the near future to discuss this issue further.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward your response.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Randy Pettapiece".

Randy Pettapiece, MPP
Perth-Wellington

- c. Al Strathdee, Mayor of the Town of St. Marys
- c. Bob Wilhelm, Mayor of the Township of Perth South
- c. Rhonda Ehgoetz, Mayor of the Township of Perth East
- c. Walter McKenzie, Mayor of the Municipality of West Perth and Warden of Perth County

MEMO

To: Finance and Audit Committee

From: Christine Saracino

Date: 11 Mar 2018

Agenda #: 7

Subject: 5 Year Levy and Spending Data

Filename: FIN # 860

For Information:

This report attempts to clarify levy and budget history for the organization.

Levy is normally about a third of our annual funding. It may or may not keep pace with the growth of our total spending needs. It is even more important to remember that the levy is directed in two ways:

1. Approximately 75% of all levy is destined to support annual operating activities including Targets objectives which are integrated fully in what is accomplished by each unit each year. 89% of operating levy is apportioned using CVA.
2. Approximately 25% of levy is for capital spending, 90% of which supports repair or reconstruction of flood control structures. These activities are funded by the structure's benefitting municipality through levy, however some of these projects have been eligible for 50% funding through WECL. These large dollar value-projects are typically planned well in advance through discussions with the benefitting municipality. The remaining capital spending is apportioned using CVA.

Combining capital and operating levy for year to year comparisons will always lead to misleading conclusions as the nature of the spending, the timing, the apportionment and wide fluctuations year by year vary between the two types of spending. This report therefore **focuses primarily on operating levy and operating costs.**

The data presented on the following page identifies that the simple change in total operating levy between 2014 and 2019 is 29%. As examples, Perth South's corresponding change is 54% while St Marys change is 9%. While Perth South's change in levy is larger than the total levy change, St Marys is quite the opposite.

Instead, by using a 5 year average rate of change to encompasses all the years between 2014 and 2019 we see that the average annual change in total operating levy is 5.32%. Perth South's corresponding change is 9.13%; St Marys is 1.98%. When the change in CVA is greater than the total levy change, we can infer that land values in those municipalities are increasing at a faster rate than our operating levy. This is the case because the operating levy apportioned to each municipality is the result of two things:

1. Total operating levy, and
2. CVA (Cumulative Value Assessment) of the lands in each municipality in the watershed which share our services. If the CVA changes, the levy apportionment changes.

We can see the extent that changes in CVA have influenced increases, or decreases, to each municipality. Using two extreme examples, Perth South has experienced one of the larger increases in land value (CVA) while St Marys has experienced the largest decrease in CVA when looking at both the simple and the 5 year average. This directly causes the 9.13% average increase in levy to Perth South and the 1.98% average increase to St Marys. *UTRCA's only choice is in setting total operating levy. We do not choose the apportionment whether it is CVA or by specific beneficiary.*

	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Budget		Simple
OPERATING LEVY \$	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	5 Yr Avg	5 yr change
Oxford County	734,083	646,200	660,418	739,569	800,261	857,240	3.51%	17%
London City	2,725,858	2,785,492	2,825,185	3,139,176	3,367,155	3,592,082	5.73%	32%
Lucan/Biddulph	9,297	10,172	10,382	12,021	16,324	14,920	10.89%	60%
Thames Centre	107,738	114,896	117,074	132,361	144,108	156,185	7.77%	45%
Middlesex Centre	74,681	79,911	81,611	92,924	100,710	107,410	7.60%	44%
Stratford	303,770	329,855	335,079	370,929	396,208	392,599	5.35%	29%
Perth East	44,205	46,949	47,889	54,060	60,924	66,996	8.75%	52%
West Perth	80,067	83,548	84,633	90,909	98,464	101,134	4.82%	26%
St. Marys	81,283	85,290	87,011	94,454	98,499	88,756	1.98%	9%
Perth South	34,820	37,026	37,083	41,994	47,840	53,577	9.13%	54%
South Huron/Usborne	6,727	7,075	7,027	7,970	8,698	9,396	7.01%	40%
Zorra Township	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	8,500	-8.67%	-43%
SW Oxford	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,610	5,610	0.40%	2%
Total Operating Levy	4,223,029	4,246,914	4,313,892	4,796,867	5,159,801	5,454,405		29%
Year to year increase		0.6%	1.6%	11.2%	7.6%	5.7%	5.32%	
CVA								
Oxford County	16.2461	16.1943	16.3094	16.3189	16.373	16.551	0.37%	2%
London City	65.5078	65.3638	65.2186	65.1945	65.045	64.698	-0.25%	-1%
Lucan/Biddulph	0.2833	0.2894	0.2906	0.2963	0.309	0.318	2.35%	12%
Thames Centre	3.1308	3.1266	3.1371	3.1404	3.157	3.217	0.55%	3%
Middlesex Centre	2.2758	2.2735	2.2844	2.2912	2.287	2.287	0.10%	0%
Stratford	7.1169	7.3466	7.3542	7.3625	7.322	7.285	0.48%	2%
Perth East	1.2709	1.2646	1.2705	1.2712	1.326	1.373	1.58%	8%
West Perth	1.3248	1.3165	1.3159	1.3139	1.365	1.419	1.40%	7%
St. Marys	1.5775	1.5700	1.5844	1.597	1.532	1.509	-0.87%	-4%
Perth South	1.0611	1.0534	1.038	1.0356	1.087	1.143	1.54%	8%
South Huron/Usborne	0.205	0.2013	0.1967	0.1966	0.198	0.200	-0.48%	-2%
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		

Perth South now carries .819% (1.143 [2019] -1.0611 [2014]) more of our total operating levy than they did 5 years ago; St Marys carries .0685% less (1.509 [2019] – 1.5775 [2014]) over the same period.

A second concern was expressed with the growth of our budget. In the past, not all spending was budgeted so it will be most useful to reference actual spending rather than planned spending. Our operating spending appears below and is sources from our audited financial statements over the same 5 year period. We see that the simple increase in actual spending is 27% and the 5 year average annual spending increase is 5.26%. These figures closely correspond to the increase in levy mentioned earlier of 29% and 5.32%. In summary, *operating levy is almost exactly keeping pace with overall operating costs.*

While you might expect to see an increase in spending in 2017 when the Targets initiatives commenced, total revenues fell by over 14%. Recall that levy is only a third of all revenues. As a result, total expenditures also fell because when revenue falls, spending does too.

	Actual 2014	Actual 2015	Actual 2016	Actual 2017	Actual 2018	Budget 2019	5 Yr Avg	Simple 5 yr change
Total Audited Operating Spending	12,380,048	13,665,694 10.4%	16,138,030 18.1%	15,317,871 -5.1%	16,072,203 4.9%	15,744,571 -2.0%	5.26%	27%

As noted earlier capital expenditures vary considerably year to year and therefore should be considered separately. **Levies made for capital projects and capital spending** are presented below. The far right column in the table below identifies the municipalities which are primarily affected by recent capital projects. While capital maintenance levy has remained modest (CVA apportioned, approximately 2.5% of total budgets), where capital repairs occur in a year or over the course of a few years, those municipalities bear the cost as the benefitting municipality of the structure.. The benefitting municipality was determined in the original funding of the structure.

CAPITAL LEVY	Actual 2014	Actual 2015	Actual 2016	Actual 2017	Actual 2018	Budget 2019	5 Yr Avg	Simple 5 yr change
Oxford County	152,560	152,560	152,560	151,967	151,967	153,111	0.07%	0%
London City	651,780	668,202	2,361,598	880,344	1,883,426	1,597,779	58.40%	145%
Lucan/Biddulph	521	521	521	521	521	531	0.38%	2%
Thames Centre	5,314	5,314	5,314	5,314	5,314	5,420	0.40%	2%
Middlesex Centre	3,850	3,850	3,850	3,850	3,850	3,927	0.40%	2%
Stratford	12,325	12,325	12,325	12,325	12,325	37,572	40.97%	205%
Perth East	2,231	2,231	2,231	2,231	2,231	2,276	0.40%	2%
West Perth	2,297	42,297	42,297	24,065	2,297	7,343	365.50%	220%
St. Marys	15,403	8,556	2,579	256,558	100,935	104,631	1935.33%	579%
Perth South	1,826	1,826	1,826	1,829	1,829	1,866	0.44%	2%
South Huron/Usborne	333	333	333	333	333	340	0.42%	2%
Zorra Township						6,500		
Total Capital Levy	848,441	898,016	2,585,434	1,339,337	2,165,028	1,921,296		126%
Year to year increase		5.8%	187.9%	-48.2%	61.6%	-11.3%	39.19%	

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	5 Yr Avg	Simple 5 yr change
UTRCA CAPITALIZED COSTS	915,486	1,446,854	2,315,608	1,939,365	1,903,618	5,196,208	54.59%	468%

With swings of up to \$3 million a year, capital levy in fact fails any summary analysis. It is also highly dependent on the starting year for the analysis. Simple percentage changes are not reflective of the reality and nature of each project for a given municipality. Recall that, at times, some capital spending benefits from leveraged revenues from other sources (ie. WECI and NDMP) while others do not. Additionally, some capital spending does not result in capitalized assets.

Respectfully submitted by:

Christine Saracino, CPA
Supervisor, Finance & Accounting



Office of the Mayor
 Al Strathdee
astrathdee@town.stmarys.on.ca
 (519) 284-2340 Ext. 246

March 12, 2019

Mr. Sandy Levin, Chair, Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA)
 1424 Clarke Rd. London, Ont., N5V 5B9

Dear Mr. Levin,

At the February 21st inaugural meeting of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority Board of Directors, director Tony Jackson made a motion to remove the \$288,000 increase in municipal levy. This motion was defeated without adequate consideration. I am writing to you to formally request that the UTRCA board of director's reconsider Mr. Jackson's motion. There are a number of issues that I feel the Board should consider:

- 1) **Due Process.** Passing the budget at the inaugural meeting of the 2019 UTRCA Board did not allow for due process. Many board members, especially those attending their first meeting, were not adequately informed of the UTRCA financial situation. There was no detailed examination of assets and reserves. From the minutes of previous board minutes, we know this includes millions of dollars in reserves and land holdings that were not discussed at the meeting.

Both new and incumbent members of the board could not have made an informed decision about the municipal levy increase without being given detailed financial information and time to consider its impact on member municipalities. Therefore, I ask the board to reconsider the increase in municipal levy whilst taking an appropriate amount of time to look at UTRCA's comprehensive financial situation.

- 2) **Accountability.** My concerns remain centred around the overly aggressive growth of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority relative to its peers. We are concerned with our ability to pay the continuous increases which are above average. UTRCA's reliance on precarious Provincial and Federal grants is also of concern. The new environmental targets and strategic plan fails to re-evaluate core services and lacks sufficient metrics of accountability. These shortcomings leave municipalities vulnerable to recurrent increases in levies without sufficient checks and balances.
- 3) **Fairness.** The discussion at the February 21st UTRCA annual general meeting regarding municipal levies was disheartening. The municipal levy system is overly complex and grossly unfair. Municipal levies are not collected on a per capita basis. This leaves smaller municipalities bearing the burden of disproportionately high fees. I would encourage the UTRCA on behalf of its rural member municipalities to work with the Province of Ontario to find a workable solution to this obvious inequity.

The weighted voting system is problematic for smaller municipalities. The representatives of the City of London and one other Board member have the ability to control all of the financial decisions. Smaller member municipalities are not adequately represented.

TOWN OF ST. MARYS
 P.O. Box 998, St. Marys, ON. N4X 1B6



Quoting from the Conservation Authorities Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.27:

PART II

Establishment of conservation Authorities, Representatives at meeting

2 (2) The council of each municipality may appoint representatives to attend the meeting in the following numbers:

5. **Where the population is less than 10,000, one representative.** R.S.O. 1990, c. C.27, s. 2 (2); 2001, c. 9, Sched. K, s. 1 (1).

Adhering to this legislation, the Town of St. Marys, with a population of 7,265, would be entitled to one representative; the Township of Perth South, with a population of 3,810, would be entitled to one representative; and, the Municipality of South Huron, with a population of 10,096, would be entitled to two representatives. According to the legislation, this would allocate a total of four board members in our region, where there is currently only one board member.

As a separated municipality and in accordance with Provincial legislation, St. Marys should be granted a director on the UTRCA Board. I urge you to re-examine the appropriate legislation and consider this request.

Quoting from the Conservation Authorities Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.27:

Changes in number of members

14 (2) The total number of members of the authority and the number of members that each participating municipality may appoint shall be adjusted as required to ensure compliance with subsection (1) if the municipalities that are participating municipalities change or the population of a participating municipality changes. 2001, c. 9, Sched. K, s. 1 (6).

As the population of St. Marys has grown considerably in recent years, we feel that is necessary for the board to reconsider the allocation of board members. During the meeting of February 21st, a member of the board stated that "people love to dump on Conservation Authorities". This speaks to the frustration and tension that is currently being felt by rural communities who feel their needs are not being represented at the board level. I believe it is important that this be addressed and the allocation of board members be revisited.

Thank you for considering my request. I urge you to re-consider your decision and review the legislation surrounding the appointment of directors. I look forward to your written response addressing my concerns.

Best Regards,


Al Strathdee

Mayor

Town of St. Marys

cc. UTRCA Directors, Ian Wilcox, Mayor Robert Wilhelm, Mayor Rhonda Ehgotz, Randy Pettapiece MPP, John Nater MP, Mayor Ed Holder, Mayor Dan Mathieson, Doug Ford Premier of Ontario

TOWN OF ST. MARYS

P.O. Box 998, St. Marys, ON. N4X 1B6

Telephone: 519-284-2340 • Fax: 519-284-3881

To: Chair and Members of the UTRCA Board of Directors

From: Tracy Annett, Manager – Environmental Planning and Regulations

Date: March 19, 2018 **Agenda #:** 7 (a)

Subject: Administration and Enforcement – Sect. 28 Status Report – **Filename:** Document
Development, Interference of Wetlands and Alteration to **ENVP 7434**
Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation

The attached table is provided to the Board as 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 made pursuant to Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act). The summary covers the period from November 17, 2018 to March 18, 2019.

We note that the format for these reports has been modified from previous Section 28 Summary Reports. This summary report is generated from our new database that is used for documenting all communications related to planning and regulations applications. This database has been utilized since the beginning of this year, as such, some data fields from the previous year are were not collected. We will continue to refine how we present this information. Any feedback on how the information is presented would be appreciated.

Reviewed by:

Tracy Annett, MCIP, RPP, Manager
Environmental Planning and Regulations

Prepared by:

Karen Winfield
Land Use Regulations Officer

Mark Snowsell
Land Use Regulations Officer

Brent Verscheure
Land Use Regulations Officer

Cari Ramsey
Env. Regulations Technician

SECTION 28 STATUS REPORT SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS



DEVELOPMENT, INTERFERENCE WITH WETLANDS AND ALTERATIONS TO SHORELINE AND WATERCOURSES REGULATION ONTARIO REGULATION 157/09

Period of Report: Novmeber 17, 2018 to March 18, 2019

Permit Application	Municipality	Address/Location	Application Type	Project Description	Application Complete	Permit Issued	Regulations Staff
179-17 (Extension-Renewal)	Woodstock	55 Ingersoll Road	Construct/Reconstruct	-proposed construction of new single storey addition onto existing health food store.		12/21/2018	Winfield
184-17 (Extension-Renewal)	Zorra	Part Lot 14, Consession 8	Construct/Reconstruct	-proposed construction of new single storey shop, concrete pad and associated driveway.		11/28/2018	Winfield
83-18	Ingersoll	Victoria Sreet Culvert	Municipal Project	-proposed replacement of the Victoria Street Culvert over Sutherland Creek. Project complicated due to one side of the culvert sharing the same footing as an adjacent privately owned building foundation/retaining wall.		1/30/2019	Winfield
155-18	Thames Centre	Dorchester Mill Pond, Mill Road	Municipal Project	-proposed construction of new municipal (Dorchester) sewage pumping station and installation of two new gravity sewers as well as two sewage forcemains undercrossing the Dorchester Mill Pond. (Substantial amount of dewatering is required for this project as well as high pressure directional drilling for all four lines below the Mill Pond.)		2/26/2019	Winfield
167-18	London	40 Glenview Crescent	Construct/Reconstruct	House addition	02/13/2019	3/1/2019	Snowsell
183-18	London	195 Southcrest Drive	Utilities/Services	New Cable Installation	1/4/2019	2/5/2019	Snowsell

Permit Application	Municipality	Address/Location	Application Type	Project Description	Application Complete	Permit Issued	Regulations Staff
191-18	London	2025 River Road	Enhancement/Restoration Project	Sediment removal in channel	1/11/2019	1/11/2019	Snowsell
195-18	Thames Centre	Beachville Road	Enhancement/Restoration Project	Wetland enhancement and creation	11/2/2018	11/14/2018	Verscheure
196-18	London	2A Grosvenor Street	Municipal Project	Construct two fieldhouse at Gibbons Park	11/2/2018	11/2/2018	Verscheure
197-18	London	20 Oxford Street West	Construct/Reconstruct	Major house renovation within potential SPA	11/10/2018	11/20/2018	Verscheure
199-18	London	23 Kensington Avenue	Construct/Reconstruct	Major house renovation within potential SPA	12/4/2018	12/5/2018	Verscheure
200-18	Woodstock	341 Masters Drive	Construct/Reconstruct	Proposed single family residence and attached garage adjacent Sally Creek.		12/7/2018	Winfield
201-18	West Perth	154 St. George Street	Construct/Reconstruct	-proposed two-storey deck adjacent the North Thames River.		1/25/2019	Winfield
202-18	West Perth	Morello Drain	Drain Maintenance	30 metres of bank repair		1/4/2019	Ramsey
205-18	West Perth	Nicholson Drain	Drain Maintenance	spot cleanout of a class F drain		12/19/2018	Ramsey
206-18	West Perth	Centre Branch of the Northwest Drain	Drain Maintenance	spot cleanout of a class F drain		12/19/2018	Ramsey
207-18	West Perth	Grey Branch of the Northwest Drain	Drain Maintenance	spot cleanout of a class F drain		12/19/2018	Ramsey
208-18	Pert East	Crowley Drain	Drain Maintenance	bottom cleanout of 675 metres of a class C drain		12/19/2018	Ramsey
209-19	Woodstock	333 Masters Drive	Construct/Reconstruct	-proposed single family residence and attached garage adjacent Sally Creek.		12/7/2019	Winfield
210-18	London	1335 Hamilton Road	Minor Works	Demolition of existing house within flood plain	12/10/2018	12/13/2018	Verscheure
211-18	Middlesex Centre	Flood Drain	Drain Maintenance	bottom cleanout of 700metres of a class A drain		12/13/2018	Ramsey
212-18	London	University Drive Bridge	Municipal Project	Major restorative structural work on bridge	1/31/2019	2/1/2019	Verscheure
215-18	West Perth	Branch C of the Russeldale Drain	Drain Maintenance	brushing and bottom cleanout of 850 metres of a class C drain		12/21/2018	Ramsey
216-18	West Perth	Russeldale Drain	Drain Maintenance	Spot cleanout of 1800 metres of a class C drain		3/1/2019	Ramsey
218-18	London	10 Fernley Avenue	Construct/Reconstruct	House addition within potential SPA	12/20/2018	1/14/2019	Verscheure
219-18	London	4-2810 Sheffield Place	Construct/Reconstruct	New house construction		1/15/2019	Snowsell
1-19	London	20 Saunby Street	Minor Works	Deck reconstruction		1/3/2019	Snowsell
2-19	Woodstock	345 Masters Drive	Construct/Reconstruct	-proposed single family residence and attached garage adjacent Sally Creek.	12/20/2018	1/7/2019	Winfield

Permit Application	Municipality	Address/Location	Application Type	Project Description	Application Complete	Permit Issued	Regulations Staff
3-19	Woodstock	161 South Street	Construct/Reconstruct	-proposed house addition and new detached garage adjacent Cedar Creek.	1/21/2019	1/25/2019	Winfield
6-19	Zorra	Perth-Oxford Road	Construct/Reconstruct	-proposed construction of new pipeline valve station associated with upgrades and expansion to the natural gas transmission system for the Union Gas Stratford Reinforcement Project.	2/26/2019	3/8/2019	Winfield
7-19	Middlesex Centre	Martin Road Drain	Drain New	installation of a storm pipe, headwall and geotextile for erosion at outlet		4/1/2019	Ramsey
8-19	London	Pond Mills Subdivision	Utilities/Services	New utility service to future subdivision	1/9/2019	1/30/2019	Verscheure
9-19	London	45 Pond Mills Road	Municipal Project	Replacement of existing storm sewer headwall	1/21/2019	1/25/2019	Verscheure
10-19	Middlesex Centre	23 Millcreek Lane	Construct/Reconstruct	proposed septic system repair adjacent to Dingman Creek	1/15/2019	1/16/2019	Winfield
11-19	City of Woodstock	Lot 29 Masters Drive	Construct/Reconstruct	proposed single family residence and attached garage adjacent to Sally Creek	1/10/2019	1/16/2019	Winfield
13-19	Middlesex Centre	Lot 61 Edgewater Boulevard	Construct/Reconstruct	proposed single family residence and attached garage adjacent to the Thames River	1/16/2019	1/31/2019	Winfield
14-19	London	4838 Colonel Talbot Road	Enhancement/Restoration Project	Dingman Creek debris removal/bank stabilization	1/9/2019	1/21/2019	Snowsell
15-19	City of Woodstock	Lot 7 Masters Drive	Construct/Reconstruct	proposed single family residence and attached garage adjacent to Sally Creek	1/21/2019	1/25/2019	Winfield
16-19	City of Stratford	Multiple locations along Romeo Street and adjacent to Lorne Avenue East	Utilities/Services	proposed high pressure directional drilling installation of fibre optic cable crossing and/or adjacent to multiple watercourse locations to service portions of south Stratford	1/25/2019	1/25/2019	Winfield
17-19	London	220 Rathowen Street	Construct/Reconstruct	House addition within potential SPA	1/24/2019	1/25/2019	Verscheure
18-19	London	187 Rathowen Street	Construct/Reconstruct	House addition within potential SPA	1/24/2019	1/25/2019	Verscheure
21-19	London	6 Moir Street	Construct/Reconstruct	House addition within potential SPA	1/29/2019	1/30/2019	Verscheure
23-19	London	131 Victoria Street	Minor Works	Deck reconstruction	1/28/2019	2/7/2019	Verscheure
27-19	Thames Centre	Switzer Municipal Drain	Drain Maintenance	Municipal drain maintenance	1/31/2019	2/11/2019	Verscheure
28-19	Norwich	Old Stage Road, Lot 20, Concession 4 East	Enhancement/Restoration Project	latest phase of proposed wetland rehabilitation project within the basic footprint of the former Hodge's Pond Dam Reservoir	2/8/2019	2/19/2019	Winfield

Permit Application	Municipality	Address/Location	Application Type	Project Description	Application Complete	Permit Issued	Regulations Staff
29-19	City of Woodstock	Lot 4 Masters Drive	Construct/Reconstruct	proposed single family residence and attached garage adjacent to Sally Creek	2/14/2019	2/19/2019	Winfield
30-19	Thames Centre	Olalondo Road	Enhancement/Restoration Project	Aggregate pit rehabilitation works	2/14/2019	2/14/2019	Snowsell
31-19	City of Stratford	Lake Victoria, William Street at James Street	Enhancement/Restoration Project	proposed stream enhancement project including install of cribwall, installation of proposed fish habitat shoals and riparian vegetation plantings along a reach of the North Shore of Lake Victoria	2/15/2019	2/19/2019	Winfield
32-19	Middlesex Centre	207 Union Avenue	Construct/Reconstruct	New house construction	2/15/2019	2/21/2019	Verscheure
33-19	City of Woodstock	Southside Park, South Street	Construct/Reconstruct	proposed rehabilitation of the Southside Park bridge over Cedar Creek	2/5/2019	2/27/2019	Winfield
42-19	London	61 Scotchmere Crescent	Construct/Reconstruct	House addition	2/27/2019	2/27/2019	Snowsell
43-19	London	7055 Clayton Walk	Minor Works	Pool and cabana construction	2/25/2019	2/27/2019	Snowsell
44-19	London	Eagle Ridge Subdivision	Municipal Project	Road and sanitary sewer crossing	1/25/2019	3/4/2019	Snowsell
45-19	Thames Centre	5390 Cobble Hills Road	Utilities/Services	Pipeline integrity dig to inspect/conduct maintenance	2/25/2019	3/11/2019	Verscheure

To: UTRCA Board of Directors
From: Tracy Annett & Chris Tasker
Date: March 19, 2019
Subject: Dingman Screening Area Update

Agenda #: 7 (b)
Filename: ::ODMA\GRPWISE\UT_MAIN
.UTRCA_PO.ENVP:7440.1

BACKGROUND

The following is provided to update the Board of Directors on the status of the Dingman Screening Area.

REPORTS

A report was provided to the Board on February 22, 2019, a motion was provided to defer the discussion on this topic until the March meeting. Since that time the City Staff, with input from UTRCA staff, provided an update on the Dingman Screening Area to the Planning and Environment Committee. A request was made for UTRCA staff to provide a presentation to the Planning and Environment Committee.

The content of the PEC report is attached for information. The full report, including appendices is available online at: <https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=59902>

As noted in the report, the UTRCA has updated our website to communicate additional information regarding our Flood and Erosion Hazard updates, including a Question and Answer section.

<http://thamesriver.on.ca/planning-permits-maps/flood-erosion-hazard-mapping/>

In a related initiative, the City has provided an update on their activities within the White-Oak Dingman Secondary Plan area. The report to PEC on March 18, 2019 recommended that the project be deferred until sufficient information is made available through Phase 2 of the Dingman Creek Environmental Assessment to delineate developable land area. The report is available online at:

<https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=59885>

CONCLUSION

The Dingman Screening Area represents an area where further review and refinement will continue as the modelling results are peer reviewed by AECOM. Additional modifications of this area may also occur as options for engineered flood mitigation and/or policy solutions are assessed through Phase 2 of the EA and/or when implementation of viable mitigation works are completed. The UTRCA continues to work with City staff of the Dingman Implementation Team to refine the application review process. Subsequent reports will be provided to the Board as Target #3 work progresses.

PREPARED BY:

Tracy Annett, MCIP, RPP, Manager
Environmental Planning and Regulations

Chris Tasker, P.Eng., Manager
Water and Information Management

Attachments:

Report to Planning and Environment Committee March 18, 2019 prepared by Matt Feldberg (report without appendices)

Report to Planning and Environment Committee

To: Chair and Members
Planning & Environment Committee
From: George Kotsifas P. Eng.,
Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services &
Chief Building Official
Subject: Upper Thames River Conservation Authority Dingman Creek
Subwatershed Screening Area Mapping - Update
Meeting on: March 18, 2019

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official the following report **BE RECEIVED** for information.

Executive Summary

Purpose and the Effect of Recommended Action

In a parallel project to the Dingman Creek Environmental Assessment managed by the City, the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA) has engaged in a separate project to update the Regulatory Hazard Lands and flood model for the Dingman Creek subwatershed.

This report provides an update related to the Screening Area for the Dingman Creek Subwatershed identified by UTRCA and presented to Council in November 2018.

Following the November 27, 2018 UTRCA Board meeting, and confirmation of the proposed screening area approach, this report also identifies implications for the City's Growth Management Implementation Strategy (GMIS) and the impacts to planned development within the Screening Area.

Previous Reports Pertinent to this Matter

Planning and Environment Committee, November 12, 2018: "Upper Thames River Conservation Authority Dingman Creek Subwatershed Screening Area Mapping."

Civic Works Committee, October 6, 2015: "Dingman Creek Subwatershed: Stormwater Servicing Strategy Schedule C Municipal Class Environmental Assessment."

Civic Works Committee, February 3, 2013: "Contract Award T13-89 Dingman Creek Stormwater Management Erosion Control Wetland (ES2682)."

Municipal Council, November 20, 2012: "A by-law to amend the Official Plan for the City of London, 1989 relating to lands located in the southwest quadrant of the City, generally bounded by Southdale Road West, White Oak Road, Exeter Road, Wellington Road South, Green Valley Road, and the Urban Growth Boundary."

Analysis

1.0 Context

1.1 Dingman Creek Screening Area

The November 2018 PEC report presented a Screening Area map for the Dingman Creek subwatershed UTRCA provided this map to the City of London as a preliminary update to the Conservation Authority's Regulatory Hazard Lands for the area.

Dingman Creek Subwatershed Screening Area

The Dingman Screening Area represents an area where further review and refinement will continue as options for engineered flood mitigation and/or policy solutions are assessed through Phase 2 of the Dingman EA. Following completion of the advisory services (discussed in Section 2.2.1 of this report) and Phase 2 of the EA study and/or implementation of viable mitigation works, there may be changes to the UTRCA's Regulatory Floodplain limits or adoption of planning policies, which can be incorporated through future amendments to The London Plan and the 1989 Official Plan.

1.2 UTRCA Board Meeting

The UTRCA presented the Screening Area to its Board of Directors on November 27, 2018.

A subsequent Board of Director's report was submitted on February 14th, 2019 which outlined the actions taken since the November meeting. The UTRCA Board report is attached as Appendix E.

Generally, the report highlights the public comment received from local developers, outlines how a screening area is applied under the Planning Act and Conservation Act, and discusses the next steps for implementation agreed on by London Development Institute (LDI), the City and UTRCA.

2.0 Status Update

There are two distinct projects that are currently underway in the Dingman Creek Sub-Watershed. The first, managed by the City, is the Dingman EA which will identify the stormwater servicing strategy for the sub-watershed. The second project, managed by the UTRCA, is the update of the floodplain modelling in the Dingman Creek Sub-Watershed. Although they are linked, they are separate projects with their own scope of work and outcomes.

2.1 Application of Screening Area on Development Applications

Appendix A contains a map reflecting the screening area previously shown in the November 12 2018 report. This area reflects a combination of existing erosion and wetland hazard information (which are part of current Regulation Limit mapping) together with the draft results of the UTRCA's updated flood modelling/mapping exercise.

The City has incorporated this UTRCA screening area into its internal digital mapping system for use by City Planning (CP), Environmental and Engineering Services (EES), Development and Compliance Services (DCS). Using this mapping, the City has been undertaking preliminary assessment of planning, development and building permit applications in order to highlight that consultation and submission requirements should be directed to the UTRCA when in the Screening Area.

Development Services (DS) staff have made some minor tweaks to the subdivision and site plan process to account for the additional reviews for screening area applications. As part of the consultation stage, DS is advising applicants to consult with the UTRCA before proceeding to a complete submission. Ideally, the applicant will have undertaken the necessary technical reviews and applied mitigation measures acceptable to the UTRCA as part of their development application.

The UTRCA approval will ensure that the lands have appropriate access, minimize risk to public health and safety and not create new or aggravate existing hazards.

2.2 Dingman Creek EA

The Screening Area triggered the phasing of the Dingman Creek Subwatershed: Stormwater Servicing Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Dingman EA). Phase 1, currently underway, will recommend municipal infrastructure for new development within tributaries outside of the area of influence of the updated Dingman Creek hazard lands. The Phase 1 lands map presented in November 2018 has been refined to capture

Dingman Creek Subwatershed Screening Area

the development lands for which stormwater management controls will be recommended (See Appendix B for refined Phase 1 mapping). A public meeting for Phase 1 is targeted by September 2019 with the Notice of Completion to be recommended for posting in fall 2019.

The City regularly updates information related to the Dingman Creek EA:

<https://getinvolved.london.ca/DingmanCreek>

2.2.1 Peer review of UTRCA Floodplain Modelling

In parallel with Phase 1 of the Dingman EA, the City retained a consultant to conduct a peer review, or advisory services, related to the UTRCA's floodplain modelling. The advisory services, will evaluate best practices for floodplain modelling and overarching assumptions made by Ontario Conservation Authorities and floodplain modelling practices conducted in Canada. The review is scoped to assess the draft hydrologic and hydraulic modelling conducted by the UTRCA for the entire Dingman Creek subwatershed and is the first step to confirming the updated Regulatory Floodplain without considering mitigation measures. The outcome of the review will include strengths and weaknesses of the current models, a review of how to consider climate change, and recommend possible improvements to best represent the floodplain within the subwatershed. AECOM has been contracted by the City of London to conduct advisory services.

The kick off meeting for the advisory services was held on January 29, 2019. This meeting included technical representatives from the City, UTRCA, AECOM, the London Development Institute, as well as a technical representative from the landowners involved in the White Oak-Dingman Secondary Plan. The advisory services assignment is scheduled for completion by the end of June 2019.

Once the advisory review is complete, Phase 2 of the Dingman EA will be initiated to evaluate servicing for the remaining lands in the subwatershed (within the Urban Growth Boundary) and will also consider potential mitigation measures to reduce the impact of the updated Regulatory Floodplain. A recommendation for consultant award for Phase 2 of the Dingman EA will be presented to the Civic Works Committee late in 2019 with a targeted completion date by 2021.

2.3 Public and Key Stakeholder Engagement

The City held the Dingman Creek EA External Stakeholder Meeting on December 5, 2018. This group includes members of City Council, City staff, City's EA consultant (Aquafor Beech), UTRCA, EEPAC, TFAC, LDI, Development Community, and LHBA. The meeting presented the information from the PEC report submitted in November 2018, with a focus on the updated phasing strategy of the Dingman EA.

On December 17, 2018, the City and UTRCA also held a meeting with members of LDI, large non-LDI member developers, the local Engineering Consultant chapter, and a handful of agents representing various development proponents. This presentation summarized the November 2018 PEC report and included new information related to the Growth Management Implementation Strategy (GMIS) timing of works. The presentation is included in the UTRCA Board of Director's report in Appendix E.

2.4 Implementation Group

A Dingman Creek Implementation Group has been established including members of CP, DS, Development Finance and EES along with UTRCA staff from the Water and Information Management Division and the Environmental Planning and Regulations Division. The primary objective of this group is to ensure the successful implementation of a revised Regulatory Floodplain within the Dingman Creek subwatershed. This includes looking for opportunities to implement planning policies and manage current development applications that have been submitted within the screening area. This

M. Feldberg
Dingman Creek Subwatershed Screening Area

group is meeting regularly to ensure that continuing progress is being made and to ensure that barriers are removed wherever possible.

The focus is on improved opportunities for communications as well as assessment of the impacts of technical findings. The findings and recommendations of this group will be presented to the UTRCA Board of Directors and Council at key points in the process.

2.5 UTRCA Background Communications

In an effort to improve the understanding and background related to decision making, the UTRCA has provided links to resource documents that can assist land owners and development proponents in understanding the impacts of the screening area on their properties.

UTRCA Strategic Plan:

The Strategic Plan provides background on the UTRCA's mandate and rationale for the updated floodplain mapping.

<http://thamesriver.on.ca/wp-content/uploads//Targets/EnvironmentalTargets-June2016.pdf>

Frequently Asked Questions:

To supplement ongoing communications with all stakeholders, the UTRCA has posted answers to frequently asked questions on its webpage at the following link:

<http://thamesriver.on.ca/planning-permits-maps/flood-erosion-hazard-mapping/>

3.0 Key Issues and Considerations

3.1 GMIS Review

To assess potential implications for development, Staff have reviewed the Screening Area in relation to designated residential lands and the timing of City-led infrastructure in the Southwest GMIS Growth Area.

Based on GMIS timing, the lands identified on Appendix C are anticipated to have external water, wastewater and stormwater services in place by 2026 and be able to develop for residential purposes. The lands identified on Appendix C are colour-coded based on application status, with green representing lands with active applications and brown denoting developable lands with no applications.

Table 1 identifies the estimated unit yields for lands that are to be provided with external servicing to 2026 as shown on Appendix C.

Table 1: Southwest GMIS Growth Area: Estimated Units by Dwelling Type for lands to be provided with External Servicing by 2026

	Active Applications	No Application	Total
LDR (Singles/Semis)	519	2368	2887
MDR (Row/Towns)	767	3762	4529
HDR (Apartments)	320	1717	2037

As shown in Table 1, the lands identified on Appendix C have the ability to provide approximately 2,900 low-density units, 4,500 medium-density units and 2,000 high-density units.

As noted earlier, the UTRCA screening area does not mean development is prohibited. Rather, a screening area provides a means for the City to identify potential natural hazards for development applications that require further review. Within a screening

Dingman Creek Subwatershed Screening Area

area, the City requests applicants to obtain confirmation and approval from the UTRCA before any City approval of a planning, development or building application. The Southwest GMIS Growth Area is already subject to an existing screening area to ‘flag’ such sites.

For the lands to be serviced to 2026, Appendix D identifies the existing regulatory area together with the screening area based on the draft results of the UTRCA’s updated flood modelling/mapping exercise. On Appendix D, lands identified within the regulatory area are shown in pink. Additional lands identified by the screening area are shown in light blue.

Table 2 identifies the estimated unit yields by dwelling type for the additional lands shown in light blue that are further captured within the screening area.

Table 2: Southwest GMIS Growth Area: Estimated Units by Dwelling Type for Lands to 2026 that are Further Captured by the Updated Screening Area

	Active Applications	No Application	Total
LDR (Singles/Semis)	9	170	179
MDR (Row/Towns)	11	238	249
HDR (Apartments)	0	29	29

For residential lands that are to be provided with external servicing to 2026, there will be a minimal impact to development based on the revised screening area. Furthermore as these lands are mostly captured through Phase 1 of the Dingman EA, recommended stormwater management controls for these lands will refine the extents of the screening area and allow development to proceed in accordance with the GMIS over the next seven years.

3.2 Process for Screening Planning and Development Applications

For each individual development application, both the City the UTRCA will assess based on the site specific location. Many of the technical reports required can be used to satisfy Screening Area reviews, Section 28 process and the City’s requirements under the Planning Act, Ontario Building Code and the various design standards. For the Conservation Authority, a precautionary approach is taken to decision making on development applications and is assessed on a case by case basis. The UTRCA examines the broader impacts of the development in the watershed and must assess the cumulative and incremental impact as much as the application under review.

Generally, the UTRCA will assess each application to determine if:

- Safe and/or dry access for proposed development can be provided;
- Appropriate flood-proofing measures have been taken into account;
- When in close proximity to watercourses and channels, what is the status of conveyance capacity function from a maintenance and operations perspective; and,
- Are changes in flood storage characteristics required.

For applications within the Screening Area, consultation with the UTRCA is strongly encouraged ahead of making an application to the City for development. The scope of review, technical details related to floodproofing, along with general expectations for the site can be established early so that proponents can make business decisions related to their proposal.

3.3 Approach to Planning Studies Currently Underway

The screening area approach will also be applied to any Secondary Plan, Master Plan, Municipal Class Environmental Assessments, or other planning study that are currently under review.

3.3.1 White Oak-Dingman Secondary Plan

An update related to the status of the White Oak-Dingman Secondary Plan is being provided as a separate report to PEC.

3.3.2 Dingman Drive EA

On February 12, 2019, Council awarded AECOM Canada Ltd. the environmental assessment for Dingman Drive from east of Wellington Road to Highway 401, Exeter Road/Wellington Road intersection and Dingman Drive/White Oak Road intersection and design of localized minor roadworks at the Exeter Road/Wellington Road intersection.

The Dingman Drive widening is being considered as a priority project in the 2019 Transportation Development Charges Background Study (DCBS) due to the application London Gateway development located at the southwest corner of Wellington Road and Highway 401. This development is proposed to add a large amount of new retail and is anticipated to be completed in phases in the near term.

Due to the anticipated large traffic volume generated by the development, improvements are required to widen Dingman Drive from 150 m east of Wellington Road to just east of Highway 401 overpass from two to four through lanes. It is anticipated that this project will be implemented in 2021. The development will also have a direct impact on the intersections of Wellington Road & Exeter Road and the intersection of Dingman Drive and White Oak Road.

The Dingman Drive EA will continue in parallel with the Dingman stormwater EA but will need to be coordinated closely with the outputs of the stormwater EA. Following Phase 1 of the Dingman Creek Stormwater EA, there will be an opportunity to assess the potential for flood mitigation measures along Dingman Drive. These measure may include, but not limited to, raising the elevation of Dingman Drive to reduce the frequency of flooding or to provide dry access to new or existing development as well as possibly improve conveyance through increasing culvert sizes.

4.0 Next Steps

Over the course of the next few months, the following activities are anticipated to complete / commence:

1. Complete peer review of UTRCA modelling by summer 2019
2. Complete Phase 1 of Dingman Creek EA by Fall 2019
3. Engage consultant for Phase 2 of Dingman EA in Fall 2019

Further work on establishing the parameters of application review will continue. Through the continued work of the Dingman Implementation Team, guidance on making applications will be provided. DS staff will examine the process for site plan and subdivision review to determine where / when the identification of a Screening Area application can be highlighted. As previously discussed, establishing the expectations related to a development early in the process allows proponents to make business decisions and sets realistic expectations.

Future PEC / CWC reports will examine the outcomes of the steps highlighted above and seek guidance and/or approval from Council.

5.0 Conclusion

The City will continue to work and assist the UTRCA in implementing its floodplain regulation mandate. The City will continue to evaluate stormwater servicing solutions within the Dingman EA for lands identified as Phase 1. A subsequent Phase 2 of the Dingman EA will be presented at the Civic Works Committee to identify potential options to mitigate the increased hazard limits for the balance of the lands within the City boundary.

Separate reports will be brought forward to Council as required regarding planning and development applications and implications on any studies or master plans that are underway.

The updated screening area will have a minimal impact on lands to be provided with GMIS external servicing to 2026.

Acknowledgements:

This report was put together by members of the Dingman Implementation Team including UTRCA staff Stephanie Pratt, Christine Creighton, Mark Shifflett, Mark Snowsell and Tracy Annett. From the City, Maged Elmadhoon and Travis Macbeth added and provided advice on content.

Submitted by:	Kevin Edwards Manager, Development Finance
Submitted by:	Shawna Chambers, P.Eng. Division Manager, Stormwater Engineering
Submitted by:	Matt Feldberg, MPA, CET Manager, Development Services (Subdivisions)
Reviewed by:	Paul Yeoman, RPP, PLE Director, Development Services
Recommended by:	George Kotsifas, P.Eng. Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official

Note: The opinions contained herein are offered by a person or persons qualified to provide expert opinion. Further detail with respect to qualifications can be obtained from Development Services

M. Feldberg
Dingman Creek Subwatershed Screening Area

March 11, 2019
KE\SC

Appendix A – Dingman Subwatershed Screening Area Mapping
Appendix B – Location Map: Dingman Creek EA Proposed Phase 1 Catchment Area
Appendix C – Southwest GMIS Area with UTRCA Screening Area
Appendix D – Southwest GMIS Area - Application Status
Appendix E – February 14, 2019 UTRCA Board of Director's Report

CC: John Fleming, Managing Director, City Planning and City Planner
Kelly Scherr, Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services & City Engineer
Scott Mathers, Director, Water and Wastewater
Peter Kokkoros, Deputy Chief Building Official

Y:\Shared\STORMWATER\Capital Budget\Dingman Creek Subwatershed EA (ES3201_2&ES-SWM-NLP7_8)\Committee Reports\2019-03-18 PEC Report_Dingman UTRCA Update\2019-Mar-18 PEC-UTRCA Draft Floodplain Update.docx

MEMO

To: UTRCA Board of Directors
From: Cari Ramsey, Health and Safety Specialist
Date: March 18, 2019
Subject: 2018 Health and Safety Summary - Revised

Agenda #: 7 (c)

Recommendation:
 That the UTRCA Board of Directors approve the 2018 Health and Safety Summary.

Report Purpose:

This report is to inform the Board of the general Health and Safety issues that were present in 2018. The report will cover a first aid summary, general training across the authority, near misses and lost time accidents.

2018 First Aid Summary

INJURY CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL INJURIES	COUNTED FIRST AID REPORTS
Body, Neck, Shoulder & Back Injuries	25	9
Legs, Ankle, Knee or Foot Injuries	28	10
Face and Head Injuries	1	4
Hand/Finger, Wrist & Arm Injuries	47	17
Eyes	1	2
Ears (noise)	0	0

*36 total reports – 6 injuries affected more than one body part

2017 First Aid Summary

INJURY CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL INJURIES	COUNTED FIRST AID REPORTS
Body, Neck & Back Injuries	6%	2
Legs or Foot Injuries	19%	6
Face and Head Injuries	13%	4
Hand/Finger & Arm Injuries	50%	16
Eyes	6%	2
Ears (noise)	6%	2

*32 total reports

2016 First Aid Summary

INJURY CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL INJURIES	COUNTED FIRST AID REPORTS
Body, Neck & Back Injuries	8%	3
Legs or Foot Injuries	14%	6
Eye, Face and Head Injuries	14%	6
Hand/Finger & Arm Injuries	64%	27

***44 total reports**

2015 First Aid Summary

INJURY CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL INJURIES	COUNTED FIRST AID REPORTS
Body, Neck & Back Injuries	9%	3
Legs or Foot Injuries	18%	6
Eye, Face and Head Injuries	9%	3
Hand/Finger & Arm Injuries	64%	22

***34 total reports**

2014 First Aid Summary

INJURY CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL INJURIES	COUNTED FIRST AID REPORTS
Body, Neck & Back Injuries	13%	5
Legs or Foot Injuries	17%	7
Eye, Face and Head Injuries	8%	3
Hand/Finger & Arm Injuries	62%	25

***40 total reports**

2018 Injury Summary

- Reports are about the same in numbers as 2017
- In 2017 the #1 type of injury was cuts/punctures. #2 is strains which is new.
- In 2017 scrapes and cuts to hands was the most common injury. This has been the case every year since doing first aid summaries.
- In 2017 we had 2 “lost time injuries”
- 1 “near miss” reports in 2017.
- 1 accident investigations was required to be done in 2018

2018 Training

The following items were types of training UTRCA staff obtained in 2018.

- WHMIS on-line (all staff receive WHMIS 2015 training yearly).
 - Health and Safety Orientation (all new staff, volunteers, students receive this training, as well as staff that have been away for more than a 3 month period)
 - Book 7 Training (all staff who drive vehicles take this training yearly), new staff have full training, full time staff receive a yearly refresher
 - Canoe and Kayak (we now have an in-house trainer). 6 staff members received their Level 1 ORCKA certification
 - Miscellaneous – Confined Space Entry, Fall Arrest, Technical Standards, Lock Out/ Tag Out, Transportation of Dangerous Goods, Use of Force, Crane Operation, Joint Health and Safety Committee Certification, Property Entry Training and others.
 - Supervisor training was given to all staff who required it and will continue into 2017
-
- All the same training will be done in 2019, as well as any new training required. Focus will be on lifting, ergonomics and other strain related issues.

Recommended by:

Ian Wilcox
General Manager

Prepared by:

Cari Ramsey
Health and Safety Specialist