

**GREY SAUBLE CONSERVATION AUTHORITY  
MINUTES**

**Full Authority Board of Directors  
Wednesday, October 25, 2023, at 1:15 p.m.**

---

The Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) Board of Directors' meeting was held in a hybrid format of in-person at the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Administrative Office and virtually via the meeting application, WebEx.

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Sue Carleton called the meeting to order at 1:16 p.m., welcomed all those present in person and virtually, and made a land acknowledgement declaration.

Directors Present In-Person: Chair Sue Carleton, Vice Chair Scott Greig, Tobin Day, Nadia Dubyk, Tony Bell, Scott Mackey, Robert Uhrig, Scott Mackey, Jennifer Shaw

Directors Present Virtually: Alex Maxwell, Jon Farmer (1:40)

Regrets: Jay Kirkland,

Staff Present: CAO, Tim Lanthier; Administrative Assistant, Valerie Coleman; Manager of Information Services, Gloria Dangerfield; Manager of Financial and Human Resources Services, Alison Armstrong; Manager of Conservation Lands, Rebecca Anthony; Operations Manager, Morgan Barrie; Manager of Environmental Planning, MacLean Plewes; Water Resources Coordinator, John Bittorf; Forestry Coordinator, Mike Fry; DWSP Project Manager, Carl Seider; Communications & Education Specialist, Vicki Rowsell

**2. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest**

The Directors were reminded to disclose any pecuniary interest that may arise during the course of the meeting. No disclosures of pecuniary interest were expressed at the time.

**3. Call for Additional Agenda Items**

Nothing at this time.

**4. Adoption of Agenda**

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-095**

**Moved By:** **Tony Bell**  
**Seconded By:** **Scott Mackey**

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors approve the agenda of October 25, 2023.**

**Carried**

---

**5. Approval of Minutes**

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-096**

**Moved By:** Scott Greig  
**Seconded By:** Robert Uhrig

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors approve the Full Authority minutes of September 27, 2023.**

**Carried**

---

**6. Business Out of Minutes**

Nothing at this time.

**7. Consent Agenda**

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-097**

**Moved By:** Scott Greig  
**Seconded By:** Jennifer Shaw

**THAT in consideration of the Consent Agenda Items listed on the October 25, 2023, agenda, the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors receives the following items: (i) Environmental Planning – Section 28 Permits and Planning – September 2023; (ii) Administration – Receipts & Expenses – September 2023; (iii) Correspondence – Donation to GSCA Forestry Department; (iv) Minutes – GSCF Board – September 21, 2023; IFAA Committee September 5, 2023; (v) Recent Media Articles**

**Carried**

---

**8. Business Items**

**i. Board Orientation – Forestry Department**

Forestry Coordinator, Mike Fry, provided a Forestry Department orientation presentation to the Board of Directors.

A Member asked about the Forestry Services that GSCA provides and if these are revenue generating and if there is capacity to increase those revenues. Mr. Fry responded that those services are revenue generating and that there may be room for additional revenue generation, however, staff strive to ensure that they are not undercutting private forestry services businesses.

Mr. Fry introduced the Forestry Department's staffing compliment, their roles, and job category.

Mr. Fry gave an overview of GSCA's total land area by cover type. It was noted that upland deciduous cover comprises the largest area by percentage.

Mr. Fry outlined GSCA's forest management designations by percentage. It was noted that 5% of GSCA lands have been designated as "No Forest Management", these had been selected by members of the public and cannot be changed without consultation.

A Member asked if there is a standard buffer zone around protected species. Mr. Fry explained that it depends on the situation and that, in most cases, GSCA staff would defer to the best practices established by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.

Mr. Fry gave a brief history of forest management within the GSCA watershed. It was noted that the current makeup of species is very different than it had been historically.

A Member asked what the forest cover would have been compared to present day. Mr. Fry replied that he did not have a specific number, however; noted that it would have been significantly higher than present day.

Mr. Fry gave a high-level overview of GSCA's forest management program, how it originated, and some of the changes that have come with time. The programs goals were reviewed, and it was noted that revenue generation is a secondary goal.

Mr. Fry detailed the steps that staff take in the management of forestry stands. The first step is to take an inventory of the stand, this information is saved for future reference. Next the prescription is completed using the information gathered from the inventory, this determines what and how much can be safely harvested. In step three staff physically mark trees for harvest. Lastly, staff put the harvest out to tender. It was noted that changes in harvest techniques and equipment may require changes in how trees are selected for harvest to accommodate and reduce damage in areas that should not be impacted.

A Member asked how much control staff have over the methods that contractors use. Mr. Fry responded that it is on a case-by-case basis.

#### **Member Jon Farmer joined the meeting at 1:40 pm.**

A Member asked if the tenders are presented to the board and if price is the only factor used to determine the successful bidder. Mr. Fry responded that staff have the experience and history to determine good versus sub-standard contractors. Additionally, it was noted that there is room for control in refusing a bid based on previous work. Mr. Fry explained that once bids are opened and reviewed by a committee that includes a member of the board, staff recommendations are brought to the Board for approval.

A Member asked if the traditional or historical uses of a forest are recorded and saved. Mr. Fry responded that staff take every effort to work with user groups and achieve as much balance as possible while still fulfilling the mandate of the forest management program.

A Member asked about the danger of forest fires caused by the debris left behind in the harvesting process. Mr. Fry responded that forest fire is generally low risk in hardwood forests of southern Ontario, and that the tops and branches left behind provide habitat for small species and do break down over time, providing nutrients to the soil.

Mr. Fry gave an overview of the department's revenue generation over the years.

A Member asked about the revenue generated and the volume of material being removed. Mr. Fry responded that the price by volume has increased a small amount but that the greatest difference would be accounted for by the type of material being harvested, for example firewood versus saw logs.

It was noted that due to the nature of the program, there are highs and lows in revenue from year to year.

A Member asked about what is done with surplus revenues during the peak periods. Mr. Fry responded that those surplus revenues go into the Forestry Reserve.

Mr. Fry reviewed some of the services that staff provide on a fee for service basis. Tree planting is one of the main services that staff provide and have planted 2.6 million trees since 2005. Staff also write Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program plans for clients for a fee.

A Member asked if staff discuss/educate landowners on the tax savings opportunities associating with renting agricultural land. Mr. Fry responded that staff have discussions with landowners to determine the best path forward, however; it remains in the hands of the landowner which path they take moving forward.

A Member asked about the species of trees being planted. Mr. Fry responded that the plan is developed for the long-term health of the forest, however; it was noted that large scale hardwood seedling planting is at risk of deer predation, so often a mix of coniferous and deciduous seedlings are a better option.

A Member asked about Carolinian tree species. Mr. Fry responded that staff are exploring these, however; staff strive to ensure that there is long term forest health.

Mr. Fry outlined the department's annual tree sales. The department conducts a pre-order bulk sale and a one-day tree sale for individual sales. The one-day sale is very popular with the public and Mr. Fry noted that it would be an excellent opportunity to highlight the programs and services GSCA provides.

Mr. Fry highlighted the internal and external committees that department staff sit on or are involved with.

## **ii. Administration**

### **a. Draft 2024 Budget**

The motion was put on the floor specifying a 3% COLA increase.

CAO, Tim Lanthier spoke to the three versions of the budget presented with 5%, 4%, and 3% COLA increases respectively, as requested by the Board.

Mr. Lanthier reviewed the changes that staff made from the initial draft 2024 budget that was presented to the Board in September. It was noted that the initial levy increase of 7.07% was reduced to 6.21% with the same 5% COLA increase. Mr. Lanthier noted that the proposed levy increase with a 4% COLA would include a 5.09% levy increase (which would be lower than the 2023 increase) and with a 3% COLA would include a 4.19%. It was noted that, in all other respects, the three budgets are generally identical.

Mr. Lanthier stressed that the main driver of the proposed increase in the 2024 budget is salary, including COLA, merit-increases, and increases to OMERS, EI, and CPP contributions. Mr. Lanthier added that as a service provider, staff are the primary cost to the organization and stressed that it is important to compensate them fairly.

It was noted that a significant portion of GSCA's total salary expenses is not funded through levy but through self-generated revenue or funding provided through other agencies. Mr. Lanthier detailed the impact of each COLA percentage increase.

A Member asked if spreading the COLA increase over multiple years would be an option. Mr. Lanthier responded that, as the Board analyzes and approves the budget annually, a multi-year phasing may not be the best fit.

A Member offered support of the GSCA staff and encouraged rewarding their skills, knowledge and experience appropriately and asked when the last salary review was completed. Mr. Lanthier responded that it was completed in 2021 and implemented in 2022. At the time of the review, it was geared to place GSCA at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of its comparators. It was noted that since then, inflation

has increased significantly and that GSCA is being outcompeted by neighbouring CAs and member municipalities. The Member asked to clarify that the goal of the most recent salary review was to set wages at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile and which of the three COLA options would maintain that status. Mr. Lanthier responded that it was, however; without having all the information required on hand, he would be unable to answer accurately.

A Member added that members would be able to estimate roughly what increase would be needed to maintain the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile standing based on what increase was afforded their own municipal staff in 2023 and will be put forward for 2024. It was noted that inflation is no longer staying steady at 2%.

A Member expressed that they felt a 3% COLA increase to be the financially prudent decision considering the 2021 salary review having been fully implemented in 2022. Additionally, the Member cautioned the Board about reduced planning applications and the resulting slow down of growth within their municipalities.

A Member asked about the Engineering Services department and funding being drawn from reserves. Mr. Lanthier responded that to limit the levy increase, part of the salary of the Manager of Engineering Services position would be funded through sales and services and reserves.

A Member asked about the 2021 salary review and if a COLA increase was included. Mr. Lanthier responded that the annual COLA increase is at the discretion of the Board. The Member asked a follow up question about the COLA increases from 2022 and 2023. Mr. Lanthier and Ms. Armstrong responded that the COLA increase in 2022 was 1.6% and 2023 was 2%.

A Member expressed support for GSCA staff, however; is concerned with rising interest rates and increases from the counties, and the resulting impact on municipalities. The Member suggested taking the average of the eight member municipalities COLA increases and applying that rate for GSCA staff.

A Member commented that while Board Members must be mindful of what is going on in their respective municipalities, they are also responsible to ensure that GSCA staff can continue to afford to continue to work at GSCA. The Member added that the cost of losing staff to other agencies would be significant and would be a much more difficult number to quantify.

Mr. Lanthier stated that staff had collected the averages of member municipalities for the previous three years and the average COLA increase was 6.93%. GSCA's three-year average was 5.56%.

A Member expressed their belief in fair market pay for staff and with the past three years of COLA increase taken into account, made a motion to amend the motion from a 3% to 4% increase. This motion was seconded.

A Member commented that the agency will experience turn over regardless of increases in pay and that there will be a cumulative impact long term.

A Member commented that the agency is nothing without its staff and believes in fair market pay. Additionally, the Member asked for clarification on who GSCA's comparators were for staff. Mr. Lanthier responded that both counties, neighbouring municipalities, neighbouring CAs, and CAs with similar demographics were used as comparators.

A Member commented that GSCA should be looking for areas to limit expenses and areas to increase revenues. Mr. Lanthier replied that a significant percentage of GSCA's salaries are funded by self-generated revenue and not through levy.

A Member asked to have the amendment motion be a recorded vote.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-099**

**Moved By:** Nadia Dubyk  
**Seconded By:** Jennifer Shaw

**THAT the GSCA Board of Directors amend Motion FA-23-098 to reflect a 4% COLA increase for GSCA Staff for the 2024 budget year.**

**Carried**

---

<b>Director</b>	<b>Yay</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Alex Maxwell		X	
Jon Farmer	X		
Robert Uhrig		X	
Tobin Day	X		
Jay Kirkland			X
Tony Bell	X		
Nadia Dubyk	X		
Jennifer Shaw	X		
Scott Mackey		X	
Sue Carleton	X		
Scott Greig		X	

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-098**

**Moved By:** Scott Mackey  
**Seconded By:** Scott Greig

**WHEREAS GSCA Staff have prepared the 2024 Draft Budget for the Board of Directors' consideration,**

**AND WHEREAS the Conservation Authorities Act requires that this Draft Budget be circulated to participating municipalities for a minimum 30-day commenting period,**

**THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors receive the 2024 Draft Budget,**

**AND THAT the GSCA Board of Directors generally accept a 4% COLA increase for GSCA Staff for the 2024 budget year,**

**AND THAT Staff be directed to distribute the 2024 Draft Budget and Budget Companion reflecting a 4% COLA increase to participating municipalities for the minimum 30-day review period.**

**AND THAT Staff bring a report before the Board of Directors at the December 2023 meeting of the Board for final review and approval of the 2024 Budget.**

**Carried, as amended**

---

Mr. Lanthier outlined the budget process moving forward and explained the weighted voting process.

**b. Cultural Mindfulness Training**

Member Jennifer Shaw spoke about discussions held at the GSCA and Indigenous Relationships Committee meetings around cultural mindfulness training and participation.

It was noted that GSCA hosted a cultural mindfulness training session that was mandatory for staff to attend and for which Board Members were invited to attend, however; there was little uptake from Members.

Member Shaw relayed that the committee has proposed that another baseline training session be scheduled, and that Board Members be requested and to attend.

A Member commented that including on-going training in addition to the baseline training is an important part of the motion.

A Member asked to clarify what commitment is being required of Board Members through the motion and if training provided by Member’s municipalities would be accounted for. Member Shaw responded that the committee recognized that not all Member Municipalities have been conducting the same level of training. The committee is asking Members to commit to participate at the same level that staff are being required to attend.

A Member expressed support for the motion and training indicated and added that isolated training opportunities are not enough and that as Members it is about demonstrating the leadership.

There was general discussion around the benefits of additional training, a variety of teaching styles and training formats, and showing commitment to further knowledge and understanding.

Concern was raised with regard to the expense versus value of providing training for Board Members and being aware of duplication of content.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-100**

**Moved By:** Jennifer Shaw  
**Seconded By:** Tobin Day

**WHEREAS, the legislated mandate of the GSCA is to provide programs and services designed to further the conservation, restoration, development and management of natural resources other than gas, oil, coal and minerals and the mission is to promote and undertake sustainable management of renewable natural resources and to provide responsible leadership to enhance biodiversity and environmental awareness, in partnership with stakeholders;**

**AND WHERAS, Indigenous people have been the traditional caretakers and stewards of these lands and waters since time immemorial and share a great interest in their preservation and conservation;**

**AND WHERAS Grey Sauble Conservation Authority is committed to advancing reconciliation as demonstrated by the formation of the Indigenous & GSCA Relationships Committee and acknowledgement of the people on whose lands we operate;**

**AND WHERAS, the purpose of the Indigenous & GSCA Relationships Committee is to take an active role in self education, and to develop real, non-goal-oriented relationships between GSCA, its Board and Staff, and the Indigenous communities whose traditional territory coincides with the GSCA watershed area;**

**AND WHERAS, the GSCA Board of Directors strives to lead by example and recognizes how this contributes to a positive workplace culture;**

---

---

**THAT, the GSCA Board of Directors supports baseline and ongoing skills-based training and/or education related to intercultural competency, conflict resolution, human rights, and anti-racism for all board members and staff.**

---

**Carried**

**iii. Water Management**

Nothing at this time.

**iv. Environmental Planning**

**a. Provincial Offences Officer Appointment**

Manager of Environmental Planning, MacLean Plewes spoke to GSCA's responsibility to enforce Section 28 regulations and the need to have staff trained and appointed as Provincial Offences Officers for GSCA.

**Member Jon Farmer left the meeting at 3:23 pm.**

A Member expressed congratulations to Chris Scholz on his successful completion of the training.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-101**

**Moved By:** Scott Mackey  
**Seconded By:** Tony Bell

**WHEREAS Grey Sauble Conservation Authority must monitor compliance with the Conservation Authorities Act and, where appropriate, enforce the provisions of that Act, AND WHEREAS certain staff have completed the appropriate Provincial Offences Officer training, THAT the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Board of Directors designate Chris Scholz, Intermediate Planner, as a Provincial Offences Officer under the Conservation Authorities Act and Ontario Regulation 151/06.**

**Carried**

---

**v. Operations**

Nothing at this time.

**vi. Conservation Lands**

**a. Agricultural Lease Tenders**

Manager of Conservation Lands, Rebecca Anthony, spoke to the recent agricultural lease tender process and results.

It was noted that all seven tendered agricultural properties saw increased tender bids ranging from a \$5,250 to a \$36,300 increase.

A Member asked what the average bid per acre was. Ms. Anthony responded that it was roughly \$200 per acre.

A Member asked what the properties will be used for. Ms. Anthony responded that the seven tendered properties will be used for cash crops. Additionally, GSCA has other agricultural properties used for hay and/or pasture that are not tendered.



A Member asked if GSCA pays the full tax rate. Ms. Anthony responded that GSCA receives the Farm Tax incentive, Conservation Lands Tax Incentive, and the Managed Forest Tax Incentive. It was noted that these programs help to reduce the total taxes owed by GSCA.

A Member asked what other criteria is used to determine the winning bidder or if it is simply highest bid. Ms. Anthony responded that there are controls built into the contract to ensure proper use of the properties and that staff conduct roadside inspections of the properties.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-102**

**Moved By:** Robert Uhrig  
**Seconded By:** Tobin Day

**WHEREAS under Section 21(1)(d) of the Conservation Authorities Act, GSCA has the power to lease for a term of five years or less land acquired by the Authority;**

**AND WHEREAS GSCA Staff tendered seven agricultural leases for GSCA properties and completed the tender opening on October 20, 2023;**

**THAT the Board of Directors accept the Staff recommendation to award the tenders to the highest bidder for each property as presented; AND,**

**THAT the Board of Directors direct Staff to enter into a lease agreement with the highest bidder for each property; AND,**

**THAT, should the chosen tender and lease agreement be rejected by any selected applicant, the Board of Directors authorize Staff to enter into an agreement with the next highest bidder.**

**Carried**

---

### **b. Conservation Lands Operational Reviews**

Manager of Conservation Lands, Rebecca Anthony, spoke to the provided operational review of GSCA properties. Staff have visited twenty properties per year since 2018, assessing their condition, signage, compliance issues, risk management, and SWOT analysis.

These reviews link to several other policies, procedures, and plans within the GSCA.

Staff found that there are significant signs of properties being misused, including encroachments, unauthorized trails, tree/grass cutting, campfires, ATV use, garbage dumping, hunting/fishing issues.

Staff assessed risks on properties like hazard trees, however; it was noted that many risks cannot be mitigated due to the nature of the properties.

Staff will be including additional funds in the operational budget for signage to mitigate some of the compliance and risk issues. Staff are also looking into the installation of gates at strategic locations to restrict ATV access to trails.

Ms. Anthony stressed that communication and education are vital to getting the message out to the community. Staff will be updating the website, attending more community events, and improving signage to address some of the general and site-specific issues.

Ms. Anthony raised concerns with signage being vandalized, stolen, and ignored. Staff may need to explore other enforcement options in the future, either internal or contracted.

A Member commented that gates to restrict ATV access may not be as effective, and asked if the funds to purchase and install gates would be better allocated towards increasing enforcement. Ms. Anthony responded that she agreed and that GSCA is not alone in the issue of ATV trespassing issues. Ms. Anthony added that the gates would also prevent cars and trucks from driving onto the properties, which has also been an issue.

A Member asked if staff could try to forge relationships with the local community groups to help with compliance. Ms. Anthony responded that staff have worked with the OPP in the past to deal with ATV trespassers, however; noted that the OPP continues to be very busy and cannot always dedicate time to deal with these infractions. Staff also work with the Municipality of Grey Highlands and the Town of the Blue Mountains around compliance and keeping an eye on the areas in those regions.

There was general discussion around reaching out to local agencies and clubs around curbing ATV trespassing.

A Member asked if some type of camera on properties could be used towards improving enforcement. Ms. Anthony responded that trail cameras could be looked into, however noted that there would be a cost associated with them and raised the concern around the legalities of enforcement.

A Member raised a concern around trail cameras being stolen or tampered with. Additionally, asked if the public's perception of GSCA properties being "public" versus "private" could be part of the issue and if education signage around this would be helpful. Ms. Anthony agreed that this perception is at play.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-103**

**Moved By: Nadia Dubyk**  
**Seconded By: Tobin Day**

**WHEREAS 20 operational reviews per year were a deliverable of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan;**

**AND WHEREAS under Regulation 686/21, 9(1) 2.i of the Conservation Authorities Act, GSCA is required to undertake programs and services to secure the authority's interests in its lands that include measures for fencing, signage, patrolling and any other measures to prevent unlawful entry on the authority's land and to protect the authority from exposure to liability under the Occupiers' Liability Act;**

**THAT the GSCA Board of Directors accept the Report back on Operational Reviews for GSCA Properties (Report Code 039-2023) as information.**

**Carried**

---

- vii. Forestry**  
Nothing at this time.
- viii. Communications/Public Relations**  
Nothing at this time.
- ix. Education**
  - a. Education Framework**

Manager of Information Services, Gloria Dangerfield and Communications and Education Specialist, Vicki Rowsell spoke to the Draft Education Framework and outlined the purpose and need for the framework document.

Staff sought approval of the document for circulation for comment.

**Member Mackey left the meeting at 3:58 pm.**

It was noted that staff intend for the document to evolve and change with experience, input, and feedback. Staff are looking to get input and feedback from partners and stakeholders.

Ms. Rowsell detailed the three key messages of the framework and the three pillars of GSCA's environmental education program. Additionally, outlined the guiding principles and overall criteria for education program development.

Ms. Dangerfield reviewed the existing programming that is offered by GSCA and some potential programming that could be included in the future.

Ms. Dangerfield outlined the staffing resources that would be required moving forward and some of the funding avenues staff will be exploring. The potential for corporate sponsorships is being explored. Ms. Dangerfield went through the proposed Fees for Service chart, stressing that these are preliminary.

Ms. Dangerfield reviewed the budget for 2024 and noted the contribution from the Grey Sauble Conservation Foundation for wage support.

A Member expressed support for the plan and suggested reaching out to some of the teaching college programs for potential teacher candidate volunteers.

A Member expressed support for the plan and especially the corporate sponsorship potential.

A Member asked about the catchment area for the education programming. Ms. Dangerfield responded that some of the programs that GSCA are involved in are organized by the Boards of education and may draw participants from outside of the watershed. Staff intent for the programming offered by GSCA to be available watershed wide, however; noted that there could be an opportunity to capitalize on desire for programming from outside of the watershed.

There was general discussion around corporate sponsorships and how that could look.

A Member expressed concern about what the plan will be if the proposed funding does not materialize, how will success be measured, and whether the demand is strong enough, in light of NVCA eliminating their education programming. Ms. Dangerfield responded that the intent is to diversify funding sources to ensure stable funding and added that the numbers suggest that there is demand for programming in SVCA and that demand was not the impetus behind SVCA from pulling back their education programming.

Mr. Lanthier added that enhancing environmental education programming is one of the pillars of the strategic plan and commended staff on the work that has been done in putting the plan together.

There was general discussion around sustainable funding for the long term.

**Member Nadia Dubyk left the meeting at 4:40 pm**

A Member asked if there is a specific age demographic that is being focused on. Ms. Dangerfield responded that initially programming will be focused on school age participants, however; there is a desire and demand to develop programming for all ages in the future.

A Member asked if there was room or potential to develop online fee for service education course options. Ms. Dangerfield responded that this is something that has been done by other CAs and believes there is potential in that stream. Ms. Dangerfield mentioned the secondary school High Skills Major program and that there may be potential there.

---

**Motion No.:**  
**FA-23-104**

**Moved By:** Tobin Day  
**Seconded By:** Robert Uhrig

**WHEREAS staff have created an Environmental Education Framework that will provide guidance for services, resources and funding for the GSCA Environmental Education program;**

**AND WHEREAS, input from the broader education community will ensure better success in framework implementation, and endorsement by teachers, of the provided services;**

**THAT, the GSCA Board of Directors approve the circulation of the draft Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Environmental Education Framework for feedback from boards of education, teachers, private education providers and other partners groups.**

---

**Carried**

x. **GIS/IT**  
Nothing at this time.

xi. **DWSP**  
Nothing at this time.

9. **New Business**  
Nothing at this time.

10. **CAO's Report**

The CAO, Mr. Lanthier gave a brief report on activities within the GSCA over the last month.

Mr. Lanthier reported that all Category 3 agreements have been signed and will be ready for reporting to the MNRF.

Attended October 4th Grey Bruce Forest Festival and was given a tour of the event by Forestry Coordinator, Mike Fry. Roughly nine hundred grade seven students attended and roughly two hundred fifty high school students volunteered. Mr. Lanthier spoke very highly of the program and encouraged all Members to attend next year.

Mr. Lanthier and Manager of Finance and Human Resources Services, Alison Armstrong have been meeting with the CAOs and finance leads from member municipalities, and with lenders with regards to funding the Administration Center renovations, as per the Board's direction. Meetings have been positive. A report will be brought forward at the November Board of Directors meeting.

Mr. Lanthier let the Board know that staff have been exploring several grants for flood plain modelling updates and coastal resiliency. Staff will bring more information to the Board in the near future.

Mr. Lanthier thanked staff for their hard work in creating three budgets with associated documents for the Board to review.

**11. Chair's Report**

Chair Sue Carleton had nothing to report.

**12. Other Business**

Nothing at this time.

**13. Resolution to Move Into Closed**

Nothing at this time.

**14. Declaration that the Board of Directors has Resumed Open Session**

Nothing at this time.

**15. Resolution Approving the Closed Session Minutes**

Nothing at this time.

**16. Reporting out of Closed Session**

Nothing at this time.

**17. Next Full Authority Meeting**

Wednesday November 22, 2023

**18. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m.



---

Sue Carleton, Chair



---

Valerie Coleman  
Administrative Assistant