

DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION

ACT FOR CLEAN WATER

TRENT
CONSERVATION
COALITION
SOURCE PROTECTION
REGION

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

NOVEMBER 09, 2011–10:00 A.M.

ASPHODEL-NORWOOD COMMUNITY CENTRE, NORWOOD, ON

MINUTES

ATTENDEES

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS	PRESENT	REGRETS	ABSENT	NOTES
Jim Hunt	✓			
Monica Berdin	✓			
Darla Blodgett	✓			
Alanna Boulton	✓			
Dave Burton		✓		
Bill Cornfield		✓		
Edgar Cornish	✓			
Pam Crowe	✓			
Kerry Doughty	✓			Arrived after lunch
Bobbie Drew	✓			
Rob Franklin	✓			
Mike Gibbs	✓			
Dave Golem	✓			
Rosemary Kelleher-Maclennan	✓			Left after lunch
Robert Lake	✓			
Gerald McGregor	✓			
Glenn Milne	✓			
Terry Rees	✓			
Mary Smith	✓			Arrived after lunch
Bev Spencer	✓			
Richard Straka	✓			
Wayne Stiver	✓			
Alix Taylor	✓			
Mae Whetung	✓			
Dave Workman	✓			

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE LIAISONS	PRESENT	REGRETS	ABSENT	NOTES
Tom Cathcart	✓			
Glenda Rodgers	✓			
Clare Mitchell	✓			

COMMITTEE SUPPORT STAFF:

Jennifer Stephens

Marilyn Bucholtz

Myriam Genet

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

CONSERVATION AUTHORITY STAFF:

Crowe Valley SPA: Vicki Woolfrey
 Ganaraska Region SPA: Pam Lancaster
 Kawartha-Haliburton SPA: Mark Majchrowski
 Lower Trent SPA: Kelly Weste
 Otonabee-Peterborough SPA: Meredith Carter, Jennifer Bull
 TCC Regional Staff: Andrew Doiron, Diana Tyner

1. WELCOME

Chair Hunt welcomed the Committee.

2. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 am.

3. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chair Hunt asked for any additions.

It was agreed that Agenda Item 8 (Correspondence) would be moved to the afternoon.

SPC 2011-11-09-01

By consensus, the agenda was approved with the above noted revision.

5. DELEGATIONS

There were no delegations.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING – SEPTEMBER 14, 2011

Chair Hunt asked for any revisions. Bob Lake noted a few clerical errors which will be fixed.

SPC 2011-11-09-02

By consensus, the minutes of September 14, 2011 were approved.

7. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

- I. Terry Rees asked for an update on the Stewardship Meeting that occurred after the September SPC Meeting. Jennifer Stephens indicated an update will be brought forward at the December 2011 Meeting, but advised Terry and others that all projects brought forth in September were approved.

8. REVIEW OF DRAFT POLICIES FOR OPTIONAL SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN CONTENT – (STAFF REPORT 25-11(D)) - A. DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR

There are provisions in the *Clean Water Act* that allow the Source Protection Committee the option of developing policies related to aspects of source protection that may not be specifically addressed by significant threat policies. The Committee had directed staff to develop *draft* wordings for several of these optional components of the Source Protection Plan. Discussion and decisions are noted below:

Policy	Draft Policies for Optional Plan Content Discussion	Decisions
Education and Outreach for non-TOR Systems	No issues	Approved
Transportation Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was concern that it would be difficult for a waterworks to protect itself against some spills that are outside a 2hr time of travel. There may be limited resources at the municipal level to create the appropriate emergency plan. General concerns regarding funding Members emphasized that they are comfortable with municipalities being responsible for implementation of the policy, not the actual clean up if a spill were to occur. Members felt that the onus should be on the municipality to take spill response (on a transportation corridor) into consideration when completing their risk assessments. It will not be just the water treatment plant operators who need to be informed of protocols, but also fire department staff and other first responders. 	<p>Revise the wording.</p> <p>Remove (3): Conduct annual practice exercises and/or emergency response scenarios for the procedures required by (2)(a)</p> <p>Remove (5): Review and update the emergency response plans annually.</p> <p>Confirm what the existing timelines are to update emergency response plans.</p>
Transport Pathways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (3) – Practicality and liability are concerns. Members were concerned that the municipality would be held liable if some transport pathways were not decommissioned. An obvious issue is that neither the municipality, nor the MOE are aware of the locations of all of these transport pathways. A mechanism will need to be created to identify the locations of these pathways. 	<p>Revisit (4) wording to use appropriate text consistent with Reg. 903.</p> <p>Clauses (1) and (2) are satisfactory.</p>
Climate Change Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members inquired why a clause encouraging funding was included in draft policy text and not added in other policies developed by the Committee. 	Remove clause (2) of the draft policy.

SPC 2011-11-09-03

By consensus, accepted the following recommendation:

Recommendation 25-11: Consider the draft policies (as outlined above) for inclusion in the Source Protection Plan.

9. REVIEW OF PROPOSED UPDATES TO DRAFT SECTION 57 (PROHIBITION) AND ROAD SALT POLICIES – (PRESENTATION; STAFF REPORT 26-11(D)) - A. DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR

As a result of additional feedback from the Ministry of the Environment, staff have developed new/updated policies regarding the monitoring of policies that rely on Section 57 prohibition. Further, pre-consultation with municipalities has indicated that there are concerns regarding the applicability of policies related to the application of road salt. New and updated policy wordings for Section 57 monitoring and road salt application were discussed.

Policy	New / Updated Policies: Section 57 Monitoring Application of Road Salt	Decisions
Updated Policy: Section 57 Monitoring		
Proposed Approach 1 – Update to Policy G-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reactive 	<i>Remove the word “random”.</i> <i>Members agreed to adopt both approaches.</i>
Proposed Approach 2 – Inspections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proactive 	
Road Salt Application: Proposed Policy Revisions		
Option 1: Include the entirety of the vulnerable area that includes a portion of a grid cell with a total impervious surface area greater than 8%	N/A	<i>Members agreed that Option 2 is likely the best choice.</i>
Option 2: Only include vulnerable areas with at least the area of one grid cell within the “significantly impervious” area	N/A	<i>Staff were instructed to carry out a mapping exercise and bring back results to the Committee.</i>
Option 3: Include moderate road salt application threats.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPC members continue to support the exclusion of policies addressing moderate threats 	

SPC 2011-11-09-04

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following recommendation:

Recommendation 26-11: Approve the proposed revisions (as outlined above) for inclusion in the Source Protection Plan.

10. REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL LAKE ONTARIO DRAFT POLICIES FOR PRE-CONSULTATION – (HANDOUT, PRESENTATION; STAFF REPORT 27-11(D)) - J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

At its August 16th, 2011 meeting, the TCC SPC approved *draft* policies prepared for pre-consultation to address the potential pipeline rupture threat in the Ganaraska Region SPA. TCC SPR staff met with the two other Source Protection Regions (CTC and Halton-Hamilton) who have identified the pipeline rupture as a local threat. Further to this meeting, it was decided there were some “generic” *draft* policies that would be best adopted by all three Source Protection Committees. These generic *draft* policies are specific to the Ministry of the Environment and recommend the continued support of the Lake Ontario Collaborative.

Policy	Additional Lake Ontario <i>Draft</i> Policies Discussion	Decisions
LO-G1 - Spill Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time is of the essence 	Add timeline
LO-G2 - Contingency Plan for Water Treatment Plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desktop exercise different than an “actual” exercise. Redundant 	<i>Remove and amend the standard to take into account the SDWT that impacts emergency preparedness.</i>
LO-G3 - Regular Testing of Contingency Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is covered in LO-G2. 	<i>Accept</i>
LO-G4 - Lake Ontario Circulation and Water Quality Monitoring to support the Lake Ontario Collaborative model	N/A	<i>Accept</i>
LO-G5 - Lake Ontario 3-D Hydrodynamic Circulation and Water Quality Simulation Model	N/A	<i>Accept</i>
LO-G6 - Undertake Additional Spill Scenario Modelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressed in LO-G4 and LO-G5. 	<i>Remove</i>
LO-SA2 - Collaboration with Adjacent Jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraging continued communication. 	<i>Accept</i>

SPC 2011-09-05

By consensus, the Source Protection approved the following recommendation as outlined in Staff Report 27/11:

That the TCC Source Protection Committee (SPC) approves the Lake Ontario *draft* policies as discussed above for the purposes of pre-consultation with the Ministry of the Environment;

AND FURTHER THAT the SPC authorizes staff to make the refinements to the policy wordings and any additional minor corrections as necessary to clarify the intent and ensure consistency in wording prior to the *draft* policies being sent to the Ministry of the Environment along with the Notice of Pre-Consultation.

11. COMPARISON IN SOURCE PROTECTION PLANNING POLICIES ACROSS ALL SPR/SPAs (STAFF REPORT (I)) – J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer Stephens provided a document prepared in collaboration with Conservation Ontario. The document summarizes all of the tools and implementing bodies outlined in policies developed to date by all SPR/SPAs. The document was intended to show members that the approaches used by the TCC SPC are generally consistent with those being employed by other SPRs. Over the next couple of months, TCC SPR staff will review the *draft* policies prepared by adjacent SPR/SPAs to identify any major inconsistencies.

SPC 2011-09-06

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee received the document for information.

12. UPDATE ON PRE-CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES (STAFF REPORT (I)) – J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer Stephens reported that most municipalities have responded (Table 1: Status of Feedback received from municipalities Issued Pre-Consultation Notices on September 2nd, 2011) with written comments. It was noted that Douro-Dummer was omitted from the list of municipalities that were issued pre-consultation notices.

Staff will prepare a document to be issued to municipalities summarizing all the changes to the *draft* policies as a result of the written comments received. It was agreed that a combination of the following be used (depending on the circumstance)

- Circulate a document to municipalities that summarizes all the changes made to the policies as a result of comments received;
- Issue a “custom” response to municipalities that explains how each of their comments were addressed (or not addressed, and why).

SPC 2011-09-07

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee provided staff with the direction as outlined above.

13. CORRESPONDENCE

- a) H. Malcolmson, *Acting* Director, Source Protection Planning Branch to J. Hunt and S. Partridge, *re*: Approval of Assessment Report for Crowe Valley Source Protection Area (October 6th, 2011)
- b) H. Malcolmson, *Acting* Director, Source Protection Planning Branch to J. Hunt and C. Kerr, *re*: Approval of Assessment Report for Lower Trent Source Protection Area (October 6th, 2011)
- c) H. Malcolmson, *Acting* Director, Source Protection Planning Branch to J. Hunt and D. Villemaire, *re*: Approval of Assessment Report for Kawartha – Haliburton Source Protection Area (October 6th, 2011)
- d) H. Malcolmson, *Acting* Director, Source Protection Planning Branch to J. Hunt and T. Low, *re*: Approval of Assessment Report for Otonabee – Peterborough Source Protection Area (October 6th, 2011)
- e) H. Malcolmson, *Acting* Director, Source Protection Planning Branch to J. Hunt and R. Benns, *re*: Approval of Assessment Report for Ganaraska Region Source Protection Area (October 6th, 2011)
- f) H. Malcolmson, *Acting* Director, Source Protection Planning Branch to SPC Chairs and PMs, *re*: Water Budget Assessment Reporting Requirements (Section 12 of O. Reg. 287/07 of the *Clean Water Act*) (October 5th, 2011)
- g) H. Malcolmson, *Acting* Director, Source Protection Planning Branch to SPC Chairs and PMs, *re*: Launch of Source Protection Plan Policy Database and Directors Instructions for its Use (September 14th, 2011)

Correspondence Items *a-e* are letters to each TCC SPA regarding approval of the Amended Proposed Assessment Reports. Even though each of the Assessment Reports are now approved, we cannot make this information public until the Notice of Approval is posted on the Environmental Bill of Rights. It is anticipated that this will occur in December or January. Meanwhile, staff will update minor editing and grammar. Once posted, a letter will be issued to each municipality. For further discussion of this item, see staff report [Activities following Assessment Report Approval \(14\)](#)

Correspondence items *f* and *g* relate to data. Item *f* confirms that TCC SPR has 4 months to upload all relevant digital information (shapefiles, etc.) produced through the preparation of the Assessment Report to the Province. Item *g* is related to the source protection planning process. Polices will continue to be uploaded to this database as they are developed or revised.

SPC 2011-09-07

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee received the Correspondence for information.

14. REPORTS/UPDATES

• Staff

❖ Inclement Weather Protocol – M.Genet, Administrative Assistant

A form was distributed to all Source Protection Committee members asking that they verify the contact information. Myriam Genet will finalize the document for the next SPC meeting.

❖ Scheduling of 2012 SPC Meetings – J. Stephens, Project Manager

With only 9 months remaining until the Source Protection Plans are required to be submitted to the Province, the following dates were proposed for TCC SPC meetings in 2012. The distributed staff report provided additional content. It was also agreed that the venue for meetings would continue to be the Norwood Community Centre.

- December 7, 2011
- January 19, 2012
- February 15, 2012
- February 29, 2012 (Buffer Meeting Date)
- March 15, 2012
- NO MEETING FOR APRIL
- May 10, 2012
- June 13, 2012
- August 1, 2012

It was noted that the March 15th meeting should likely be moved since it is currently scheduled during March Break. Jennifer Stephens confirmed that the schedule would be finalized for the January 2012 SPC meeting. Jennifer Stephens also stressed that the first three months of 2012 would be very important to the timely completion of the source protection plans and that attendance would be critical.

If too many people are unable to attend a certain meeting – it will be rescheduled, but it is understood that it is difficult to choose a date that everyone is able to attend.

Myriam Genet will contact Dave Burton to advise him of the dates and location.

SPC 2011-09-08

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee agreed with the above meeting dates and location for 2012 SPC meetings.

❖ Update on Activities following Assessment Report Approval (Handout, Presentation; Staff Report (I)) – J. Stephens, Project Manager

Jennifer Stephens provided an update on Activities following Assessment Report Approval. Although the Assessment Reports have received official approval from the Director, only after a Notice has been placed on the Environmental Bill of Rights can this approval be made public.

Once the Notice is posted on the Environmental Bill of Rights a letter will be issued to TCC SPR municipalities informing them that the Assessment Report has been approved. Contents of this correspondence will include:

- The approved Assessment Report digital GIS shapefiles outlining the vulnerable areas;
- The appropriate Threats Database;
- Direction regarding the acquisition of updates to information provided digitally;
- A summary of the relationship between this approval and the timelines imposed through the Mandatory inspection Program for Septic Systems under the Ontario building Code; and
- A summary of the printed material that will be provided.

SPC 2011-09-09

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee received the above noted report for information.

❖ Update on Activities related to Estimating Costs for Implementation of Source Protection Plan (Staff Report (I)) – J. Stephens, Project Manager

Jennifer Stephens updated the Committee on the efforts of CA staff and the Municipal Working Group Meetings over the past several weeks. MWG members have completed a preliminary exercise where for each *draft* policy developed; the following details are being estimated:

1. Funding Magnitude (high, medium, low)
2. Cost Estimates (\$/unit (Example: \$/RMP, \$/100 permit applications))
3. Description of how costs were generated
4. Funding mechanisms (*i.e.*, how funding is to be recovered?)

The feedback will be summarized and returned to each MWG for discussion at their November meeting. The intent is to have these cost estimates available when feedback on the *draft* policies received is being reviewed.

November MWG Meeting Dates will be circulated to SPC members. Jennifer Stephens asked that members interested in attending these meetings confirm their attendance first with Myriam Genet to discuss compensation.

SPC 2011-09-10

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee received the above noted report for information.

- **Municipal Working Groups**

- ❖ Minutes of Kawartha Haliburton SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – September 22nd, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Kawartha Haliburton SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – October 13th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Otonabee-Peterborough SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – October 14th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Lower Trent SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – October 17th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Ganaraska Region SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – October 18th, 2011

SPC 2011-09-11

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee received the MWG minutes for information.

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

- **Committee Members (updates on public engagement/conferences)**

No updates were discussed.

15. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions.

16. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

17. NEXT MEETING –DECEMBER 7TH, 2011 - ASPHODEL-NORWOOD COMMUNITY CENTRE, NORWOOD, ON

Next meeting date and location was noted.

18. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2.37 p.m.