

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING  
JULY 21ST, 2011 – 9:45 A.M.  
ASPHODEL-NORWOOD COMMUNITY CENTRE, NORWOOD, ON

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	✓			
Bobbie Drew	✓			
Rob Franklin	✓			
Mike Gibbs	✓			
Dave Golem	✓			
Rosemary Kelleher-Maclennan		✓		
Robert Lake	✓			
Gerald McGregor	✓			
Glenn Milne	✓			
Terry Rees		✓		
Mary Smith	✓			
Bev Spencer		✓		
Richard Straka		✓		
Wayne Stiver	✓			
Alix Taylor		✓		
Mae Whetung	✓			
Dave Workman	✓			

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

#### **COMMITTEE SUPPORT STAFF:**

Jennifer Stephens, Project Manager  
Myriam Genet, Administrative Assistant  
Marilyn Bucholtz, Communications Coordinator

#### **CONSERVATION AUTHORITY STAFF:**

Crowe Valley SPA: Marnie Guindon, Vicki Woolfrey  
Ganaraska Region SPA: Pam Lancaster  
Kawartha-Haliburton SPA: Mark Majchrowski, Paul Buckley  
Lower Trent SPA: Kelly Weste  
Otonabee-Peterborough SPA: Meredith Carter, Jennifer Bull, Bev Hurford  
TCC Regional Staff: Jeffrey Meyer

#### **OTHERS:**

Lucy Burke, Rob Gamache, *City of Kawartha Lakes*

---

#### **1. WELCOME**

Chair Hunt welcomed the Committee. An EMC newspaper clipping was shared showcasing Rosemary Kelleher MacLennan charity work to raise money for Trent Hills Relay for Life. Rob Franklin's birthday was also noted.

#### **2. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 10.02 a.m.

#### **3. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

There were no conflicts of interest.

#### **4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

A numerical error on the agenda was noted. It will be fixed.

#### **SPC 2011-07-21-01**

By consensus, the agenda was approved.

#### **5. DELEGATIONS**

There were no delegations. A request was received, but with insufficient notice. Chair Hunt indicated that the delegation may appear at a future meeting, and if that should occur, the Committee would receive any information in advance.

#### **6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING – JUNE 10TH, 2011**

Chair Hunt asked for any revisions.

#### **SPC 2011-07-21-02**

By consensus, the minutes of June 10, 2011 were approved.

---

[www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca](http://www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca)

## 7. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

There was no business arising.

## 8. CORRESPONDENCE

### a) Letter from Keith Willson re: Submission of Amended Proposed Assessment Reports

The letter was provided for information.

#### SPC 2011-07-21-03

By consensus, the correspondence was accepted for information.

## 9. REVIEW OF DRAFT POLICIES –J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer Stephens provided an overview of the draft policy material included with the agenda package. *Draft* policy wordings to address fuel, dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPLs), organic solvents, non-agricultural source material, and road salt prescribed drinking water threats were reviewed by the five municipal working groups at their June Meetings. The *draft* policies contained within the agenda package reflect the feedback obtained from members of the Municipal Working Groups. Outstanding comments have been identified. Further, the “general provisions” policies related to the delivery of education and outreach programs have been updated based on feedback received from the June Source Protection Committee meeting. Lastly, a new general provisions policy was drafted to reflect the lack of comfort of the SPC with the Section 59 Restricted Land Use Policy tool.

Feedback and decisions are noted below:

Policy	Discussion	Decisions
<b>Updated General Policies</b>		
G-4: E&O – General Provisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Define “delivery agent”</li><li>• Some typographic errors need to be addressed</li><li>• If the province creates information packages for use by delivery agents, it may be easier to deliver such a program without the need for extensive technical expertise.</li><li>• Re: Fuel Handling E &amp; O program - TSSA has the expertise, and should have the responsibility.</li><li>• The Ministry of Consumer Services directs TSSA. MOE is currently initiated in discussions with them to understand the role TSSA could have in the source protection planning process.</li><li>• Be specific that more money is required. A business case to the province is the avenue to address the need for implementation funding.</li><li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> outstanding issue (re: Province should have a greater role in the delivery of E &amp; O programs) to be a focus in policies given the key partnership the province has with implementers.</li><li>• Obtaining information and records specific to relevant landowners – not realistic for many of the SPAs</li></ul>	<i>Supportive of passive education across the region; outreach where there are significant threats</i>
G-5: Review of Planning Act and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Add the words <b>municipal drinking water</b> to these policies</li><li>• RMO must be involved upfront</li></ul>	<i>Municipal drinking water will be added (throughout)</i>

[www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca](http://www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca)

Building Permit Applications within Vulnerable Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CWA or Source Protection Plan must be listed as applicable law for a building official to have power to address</li> <li>• Suggested approach is similar to Generic Regulation process where the municipality refers property owners to Conservation Authorities for direction</li> <li>• If we put it in our policy – it becomes “law”</li> </ul>	
<b>DNAPLs and Organic Solvents</b>		
C-1: Risk Mgmt Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipalities do not have the expertise to outline what a RMP should contain.</li> <li>• SPC suggested to avoid being too prescriptive – need to give flexibility to landowners and RMOs</li> <li>• RMP will not be peer-reviewed</li> </ul>	<p><i>Committee had concerns about laying down specific content of RMPs, but did like the idea of including minimum standards.</i></p> <p><i>Committee agreed that since the Technical Rules did not specify volumes, the policy should not either.</i></p>
C-2: Prohibition of Future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that once a building is designated commercial it is very difficult to track changes with internal use (i.e. – retail outlet to restaurant).</li> <li>• Rental units may be a problem</li> </ul>	<i>Committee agreed that the policy as written is appropriate for pre-consultation.</i>
<b>Fuel Storage and Handling</b>		
C-3: Support of Existing TSSA Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TSSA not listed as an implementing body in legislation, which could be problematic.</li> <li>• Perhaps the delivery agent should be the Ministry of Consumer Services; however this Ministry is not listed in the Act.</li> <li>• Discussion surrounding threat score differences between above and below grade tanks.</li> <li>• Liability concerns</li> </ul>	<i>Committee agreed that the policy as written is appropriate for pre-consultation.</i>
C-4: Creation of New Lots/Future Construction on Lots of Record	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too strict</li> <li>• Amending the OMB would be the best move to enforce this policy. Site plan controls may not address this policy.</li> </ul>	<i>SPC fine with using prohibition as long as there are other options for the landowner.</i>
C-5: Risk Mgmt Plans for Non-Residential Fuel Storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncomfortable with overall role of RMP and liability</li> <li>• Uncomfortable with the idea of moving fuel storage outside of vulnerable areas, if pipes are running to the building</li> </ul>	<i>Re-visit after pre-consultation phase.</i>
C-6: Prohibition of Future Refineries, Gas Stations & Bulk Plants		<i>Supportive</i>
C-7: Incentive Program for Switching to Alternate Fuel Source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the responsibility lies with the CA and not the municipality.</li> <li>• There are already existing funding programs including Eco Energy and the Canadian Oil Heat Association.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Wordsmith to link to an existing program</i></p> <p><i>Extend implementation time to be the same as other incentive programs</i></p>
C-8: Prohibition of Future Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the furnace needs replacing perhaps associate with the option to switch to an alternative energy source.</li> </ul>	<i>Remove – establish new policy requiring RMP option to</i>

Fuel Tanks after Incentive Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perhaps managing the threat is a better option.</li> <li>• This is our first policy prohibiting an existing activity.</li> <li>• An RMP may be cheaper than replacing furnaces, but the implementation of the RMP might be expensive.</li> <li>• Cost of clean-up is too much and therefore prohibition is good.</li> <li>• By-law option is problematic given enforcement difficulties</li> </ul>	<i>manage threat.</i>
<b>Non-Agricultural Source Material</b>		
NASM 1: Review of Existing Prescribed Instruments of Risk Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments</li> </ul>	
NASM 2: Prohibition of Future NASM Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibition is too extensive when considering organic plant waste as the NASM, but not when it is septage</li> <li>• Likes the idea of a strict policy in the plan to support Councils/municipalities with future municipal based policies</li> <li>• NMA and other legislation already prohibits spreading in areas closest to municipal wells</li> </ul>	<i>Committee agreed to go out for pre-consultation with existing policy as written and revisit following receipt of comments from municipalities.</i>
<b>Road Salt</b>		
S-1: Salt Mgmt Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern with the time and effort to sample raw water for the purpose of surveillance monitoring. It was felt that small municipalities may not be able to afford this.</li> <li>• Use pre-consultation to gauge concerns of operating authorities.</li> </ul>	<i>Edit policy text to reflect that operating authority will align monitoring with required obligations under the Safe Drinking Water Act.</i>
S-2: Provincial Highways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments</li> </ul>	<i>Change name of policy to specify that this policy would apply to all roads.</i>
S-3: Prohibition of Future Salt Storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments</li> </ul>	

## 10. SOURCE PROTECTION PLANNING UPDATE (STAFF REPORT (I)) – J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer Stephens provided an update on:

- Policy Development and Schedule
- Preliminary Enumeration of Risk Management Plans for TCC SPR
- Pre-consultation and Extension to affected Parties

### SPC 2011-07-21-04

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepts the report for information and further, that the date for the third Municipal Forum be scheduled for September 20, 2011.

## 11. REPORTS/UPDATES

### • Staff

#### ❖ Drinking Water Stewardship Program – J. Stephens, Project Manager

- Jennifer Stephens noted that applications have been received. The Review Committee will be meeting after the Source Protection Committee Meeting on August 16<sup>th</sup>. TCC

[www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca](http://www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca)

CA Stewardship Staff are scheduled to meet next week (July 28) to discuss the role of the Review Committee and finalize criteria for the evaluation of applications received.

- **Municipal Working Groups**

- ❖ Minutes of Ganaraska Region SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – June 14th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Crowe Valley SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – June 17th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Lower Trent SPA Municipal Working Group –June 22nd, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Kawartha Haliburton SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – June 23rd, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Otonabee-Peterborough SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – June 24th, 2011

Mary Smith asked what the workload would be for MWG members over the next year, and wondered if having no meetings in the summer was an option. Jennifer noted that this was to be a discussion item with CA staff at the next Staff Meeting.

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

Jim Hunt noted that Wayne attended the American Water Works Association (AWWA) Meeting last month in Washington DC in his new role as VP.

## **12. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no questions.

## **13. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business

## **14. NEXT MEETING - AUGUST 16TH, 2011 - ASPHODEL-NORWOOD COMMUNITY CENTRE, NORWOOD, ON**

Next meeting date and location was noted.

## **15. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 3.15 p.m.