

DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION

ACT FOR CLEAN WATER

TRENT
CONSERVATION
COALITION
SOURCE PROTECTION
REGION

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 2, 2012
ASPHODEL-NORWOOD COMMUNITY CENTRE, NORWOOD, ON
DRAFT 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	✓			Departed at 2:00 p.m.
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	✓			Arrived at 11:20
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
Myriam Genet

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

CONSERVATION AUTHORITY STAFF:

Crowe Valley SPA: Vicki Woolfrey, Adam Willis
 Ganaraska Region SPA: Pam Lancaster
 Kawartha-Haliburton SPA: Mark Majchrowski, Paul Buckley
 Otonabee-Peterborough SPA: Meredith Carter, Ron Baker
 TCC Regional Staff: Andrew Doiron, Diana Tyner, Jeff Meyer

1. WELCOME

Chair Hunt welcomed the Committee.

2. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10.05.

3. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A revised agenda had been distributed to the Committee via e-mail and a hard copy provided.

SPC 2012-02-02-01

By consensus, the Committee approved the agenda.

5. DELEGATIONS

There were no delegations.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING – JANUARY 19, 2012

Chair Hunt asked for any revisions.

A few clerical items were pointed out, and these will be fixed.

SPC 2012-02-02-02

By consensus, the Committee approved the minutes of the January 19th, 2011 meeting.

7. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

No business arising.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

a. CA SPA Comments re: Pre-Consultation with Conservation Authorities and Source Protection Authorities

- Donna Villemare, Chair, Kawartha Conservation to Chair Hunt – November 7, 2011
- Donna Villemare, Chair, KH-SPA to Chair Hunt – November 7, 2011
- Craig Kerr, Chair, LTC – Chair, LTC SPA, to Chair Hunt and Jennifer Stephens – November 10, 2011
- Suzanne Partridge, Chair, CVCA and Tim Pidduck, General Manager, CVCA to Chair Hunt and TCC SPC – November 21, 2011
- Terry Low, Chair, OP-SPA to Chair Hunt – October 14, 2011
- Terry Low, Chair, ORCA to Chair Hunt – October 14, 2011
- Raymond Benns, Chair, GRCA – Chair, Ganaraska Region SPA to Chair Hunt – November 7, 2011

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

- b. Tom Cathcart, Manager, Inspections Programs, Peterborough County-City Health Unit to Chair Hunt re: comment on draft policy S-1: Reporting on Mandatory Septic Maintenance Inspections – January 6, 2012
- c. Mary Anne Covelli, Director, Source Protection Programs Branch, MOE to Max Christie, Chair, Quinte SPC re: response to letter of December 21, 2011 regarding addressing the threat from handling and storage of fuel –January 20, 2012

Jennifer Stephens reported that the above correspondences (Item A) are pre-consultations comments from TCC Conservation Authorities and Source Protection Areas. The comments have been incorporated into summaries and agendas.

Item B is in response to the *draft* policies circulated for pre-consultation. Although, Tom Cathcart represents all health units in the Source Protection Region on the Source Protection Committee, the correspondence comes from the Peterborough-City-County Health Unit. The correspondence indicates that the Health Unit has no concerns with the wording of *draft* policy S-1.

Item C is a response from the MOE to the correspondence from the Quinte SPC Chair.

SPC 2012-02-02-03

By consensus, the Committee accepted the correspondence received for information.

9. REVISIONS TO SEWAGE THREAT POLICIES

Policy	Discussion	Decisions
S-1: Reporting on Mandatory Septic Maintenance Inspections		
S-1 (2)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>2. Reporting (<i>specify additional recipients</i>)</p> <p>Decision: Where inspections carried out under OBCA have been delegated, require the inspection authority to copy the municipality, building official, and/or RMO on the report provided to the SPA</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Location of the system should be noted. 	<p><u>Consensus on accepting the decision with the following:</u></p> <p><i>Report should indicate the number and locations of systems inspected.</i></p> <p><i>Report to be copied to municipality, building official, and RMO.</i></p>
S-2: Existing C of A's for Sewage Systems		
S-2(1a)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>1. Timelines (<i>compliance with CofA conditions</i>)</p> <p>Decision: Specify timeline for holder of CofA to comply with new/amended conditions required by MOE review?</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MOE should be given flexibility 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change.</u></p>

S-2(1b)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>1. Timelines (for MOE to review C of A's)</p> <p>Decision: Increase compliance date for MOE to review C of As?</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Currently, is the MOE required to report anything? ▪ What does several years mean? Get clarification. <p>ACTION: Clare Mitchell will follow up with MOE on what is meant by “several years” in the official response received from MOE through pre-consultation.</p>	<p><i>Consensus: Increase compliance date to 3 years.</i></p>
S-2(2)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>2. Environmental Compliance Approvals</p> <p>Decision: Refer to Environmental Compliance Approvals in the policy.</p>	<p><i>Consensus to ACCEPT the change.</i></p> <p>Refer generically to “approvals” and include definition in glossary to clarify.</p>
S-2(2)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>3. Reporting</p> <p>Decision: Require MOE to copy the municipality on their reporting to the SPA.</p>	<p><i>Consensus to ACCEPT the change</i></p> <p>Content of the report should specify how the changes to the certificate of approval will ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat.</p>
S-3: Prohibition of Future Sewage Threats		
S-3(1)	<p>Opposition to Policy</p> <p>1. Enhanced Treatment Standards</p> <p>Decision: Replace the restriction on C of As with a requirement for enhanced treatment standards (i.e., use similar approach as for future septic systems – “constructed to standards that will ensure that the activity is not a SDWT”</p>	<p><i>Consensus to DENY change.</i></p>
S-3(3)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>3. MOE Comment: Alternate Wording</p> <p>Decision: Replace “[MOE WILL] Not issue any new Certificates of Approval for the activity” with “[MOE will] Prohibit future occurrences of the activity.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why prohibit – and not “will not allow”. MOE wants prohibit ▪ Prohibit has a definite meaning under the Act. <p>ACTION: Clare Mitchell will look into why MOE wants the word “Prohibit” used in the policy.</p>	<p><i>Consensus to ACCEPT change– if there is leeway – use the wording “will not allow” instead of “Prohibit”.</i></p>

<p>S-3(4)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>4. MOE Comment: Land Use Policy</p> <p>Decision: Approve the following new clause: Implementer: Municipality Policy Tool: Land Use Planning</p> <p>“Require that applications for land uses that would require the activity are not approved”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to define the trigger. 	<p><u>Consensus to ACCEPT the change</u></p> <p>May need to “massage” wording to take into account relationship to Official Plans and By-Laws.</p>
<p>S-3(5)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>5. Proposed Exceptions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Where the proposed sewage system would decrease the overall risk to the water supply b. Renewals to existing C of A’s c. Expansions to existing sewage facilities d. Pumping stations required to meet servicing demands <p>Decision: Allow future C of A’s in the cases above.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Measuring risk can be subjective. ▪ Having one facility, as opposed to several, could decrease the risk. ▪ This new C of A must include conditions that it is not as great a risk. ▪ It was clarified that the existing policy text would not include pumping stations. 	<p><u>Consensus to allow an exception to the prohibition in cases where there is an existing sewage activity that is a significant threat and the proposed future activity would result in a lower risk to source water than the risk posed by the existing activity.</u></p> <p><i>In these cases, the future C of A must contain conditions that ensure that the future activity is not a significant drinking water threat, and the reporting from the MOE to the SPA must describe how the CofA for the future activity would achieve a lower level of risk than the existing activity.</i></p>
<p>S-4: Connection of existing on-site sewage systems to a municipal collection system</p>		
<p>S-4(1)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>1. Connection Costs</p> <p>Decision: Specify in the policy text that where connection to a municipal system is required that the cost will be borne by the property owner.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No support 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change.</u></p>
<p>S-4(2)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>2. Feasibility Criteria</p> <p>Decision: Elaborate on the criteria that must be considered to determine if connection to a municipal connection system is feasible</p> <p><i>Staff: “where connection is feasible given financial and technical constraints”</i></p>	<p><u>Consensus to ACCEPT new change</u></p>

<p>S-4(3)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>3. Require Connection for Failing System Only</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Planners' Working Group Comment b. MMAH Comment <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require existing on-site sewage systems to connect to a municipal system only where a maintenance inspection shows that the system is failing • Make compliance date for connection relative to the date of the inspection that showed that the system is failing. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shouldn't the system be connected before it fails? ▪ Waiting for a failing system would be a reactive, and not proactive. 	<p><i>Consensus to DENY changes.</i></p>
<p>S-4(4)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>4. Planners' Working Group:</p> <p>Decision: Add the following clause: "Where connection to a municipal sewage collection system required per requirement (1) is not feasible, the system must be repaired, replaced, or upgraded. (same timeline)</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within one year. ▪ Should we add the word "maintain"? 	<p><i>Consensus to require that where connection to a municipal collection system is not feasible, and a maintenance inspection shows that there are problems with a system, the landowner will be required to take actions as appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>For example, if the inspection shows that the system requires maintenance, the landowner will ensure that it receives maintenance; where the inspection shows that the system must be replaced, the landowner will ensure that it is replaced; etc.).</i></p>
<p>S-5: Requirements for Future On-Site Sewage Systems</p>		
<p>S-5(1)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>1. Treatment Standard (where connection is not feasible)</p> <p>Decision: Give more detail in the policy regarding acceptable stands for future on site systems. Consider alternate wording "enhanced system that ensures that the activity is a managed significant threat"</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add definition to glossary 	<p><i>Consensus to DENY change.</i></p>

<p>S-5(2)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>2. Reporting</p> <p>Decision: Where not municipality, require septic approval authority to report annually to the municipality regarding any approvals of septic systems in areas where they are SDWT.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion that there be a reporting mechanism that this is communicated with the municipality 	<p><u>Consensus to ACCEPT new wording</u></p>
<p>S-5(3)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>3. Implementing Body (where approvals delegated)</p> <p>Decisions: Where the approval of on-site systems has been delegated to a Health Unit:</p> <p>a) Make Health Unit the implementing body *</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Req. 1a) For feasibility assessment • Req. 1b) For approval of non-SDWT systems <p>b) OR keep implementer as munic. and require munic. To ensure that requirements of the policy are reflected in their service agreements with the Health Unit</p> <p>*this would change legal effect from “conform with” to “strategic action”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not in support ▪ Leave the responsibility with the municipality 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY changes (A and B)</u></p>
<p>S-5 (4a&b)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>4. Feasibility Assessment for Connection</p> <p>Decision (4a) Require new lots to connect to a municipal systems “where available” (<i>i.e.</i>, Stronger language – if there is a municipal system you must connect)</p> <p>Decision (4b) Use “where connection is feasible given financial and technical constraints”</p>	<p><u>Consensus:</u></p> <p>4a : DENY change – keep policy as is.</p> <p>4b: ACCEPT change.</p>

S-6: Existing Sewage Collection Infrastructure		
S-6(2)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>2. Feasibility and Cost</p> <p>Decision: Make the prioritization of asset management activities subject to the clause “where feasible and within approved budgets”.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was clarified that the policy applies to piping and pumping stations. ▪ Does this apply to groundwater? <p>ACTION: Staff will verify.</p>	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change.</u></p> <p><u>Consensus to require MOE to review C of A’s for existing sewage collection systems (i.e., by adding that threat subcategory to Policy S-2)</u></p>
S-7: Future Sewage Collection Infrastructure		
S-7(1)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>1. Construction Standards</p> <p>Decision: Give more detail in the policy regarding the acceptable construction standards for future sewage collection systems in SDWT areas</p> <p>Suggested alternate wording (PWG/Munic): “Require that any future sewage infrastructure is constructed to standard that ensure that the activity is a managed significant threat”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Committee was reminded that the third chapter of the Source Protection Plan will specify the details of the threat circumstances. 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change.</u></p> <p><u>Consensus to add a new clause that requires MOE to ensure that any future CofA for a sewage collection system contains conditions to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat.</u></p>
S-9 (Combined with Policy S-3)		
S-9&10	<p>New Sewage System Policies</p> <p>Decision: Approve the following approaches:</p> <p>For existing cases: (new S-9) Require Risk Management Plans</p> <p>For Future Cases: (New S-10) Apply Section 57 Prohibition</p>	<p><u>Consensus to ACCEPT the approaches.</u></p>

10. REVISIONS TO WASTE DISPOSAL SITE THREAT POLICIES

Policy	Discussion	Decisions
W-1: Existing Certificates of Approval		
W-1(1)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline Review of existing CofAs should be on the order of several years. <p>Decision: increase the compliance date</p>	<i>Consensus to ACCEPT change. Compliance date will be increased to 3 years.</i>
W-1(2)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting Should include notice to the municipality. <p>Decision: Add municipality as recipient of the Ministry's reporting on the review of CofAs</p>	<i>Consensus to ACCEPT change.</i>
W-2 Future Certificate of Approval		
W-2(1)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Wording Use text that prohibits the activity rather than the issuing of approvals. <p>Decision: Replace "[MOE will] Not issue any new Certificates of Approval for the activity" with "[MOE will] Prohibit future occurrences of the activity."</p>	<i>Consensus to ACCEPT change.</i>
W-2(2)	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> MOE Comments: Use a complementary land use policy <p>Decision: Approve the following new clause Implementer: Municipality Policy Tool: Land Use Planning</p> <p>"Require that applications for land uses that would require the activity are not approved"</p>	<i>Consensus to ACCEPT change.</i>
New waste disposal site policies		
W3&4	<p>Decision: Approve the following approaches:</p> <p>For existing cases: (NEW W-3) Require Risk Management Plans</p> <p>For future cases: (New W-4) Apply Section 57 Prohibition</p>	<i>Consensus to ACCEPT new policies.</i>

11. THREATS ASSESSMENT FOR ROAD SALT APPLICATION

Jennifer Stephens provided the results from the Road Salt Threats Assessment Exercise first discussed at the November SPC meeting. This topic was first brought to the attention of the SPC in November because preliminary comments from municipalities identified issues with the applicable location for road salt policies.

The determination of what roads and parcels will be significant threats for road salt application is sensitive to the location of a grid. The grid used for the Assessment Report was positioned based on the centroid of the SPR. A strict interpretation of the threat circumstances yields some impractical boundaries for policy applicability.

The SPC requested that staff complete a GIS exercise to identify only include vulnerable areas with at least the area of one grid cell (1km²) within the “significantly impervious” area. It was determined through this exercise that none of the TCC SPR drinking water systems fall within these criteria. It was explained that this is not surprising given that most IPZ-1 zones are < 1km², irrespective of imperviousness considerations.

Road Salt Application is a SDWT at 9 of 18 municipal surface water intakes. Irrespective of the methodology used to identify the SDWT, the TCC SPR source protection plan policies are required to address these SDWT. Applicable area and activity text in road salt application policies will reflect the need to have a SMP that addresses, at minimum, the area identified as a SDWT.

12. REVISIONS TO ROAD SALT THREAT POLICIES

Policy	Discussion	Decisions
R-1: Existing & Future Road Salt Application		
R-1(1)	<p>Opposition to Policy (MTO Comments)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> MTO does not support the requirement to develop a salt management plan, because they already have such a plan. <p>Decision: Remove MTO as implementer (i.e. do not require a DWSP-specific SMP for MTO)</p> <p>Other suggested amendments may address MTO’s concern.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee was concerned that MTO was not taking on the necessary responsibilities. 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change</u></p> <p>Add to policy the requirement that RMO review the salt management plan.</p> <p>New Policy: Risk Management Plans will be required for existing road salt application threats.</p>

<p>R-1(2)</p>	<p><i>Opposition to Policy (MTO Comments)</i></p> <p>2. Statement that specifies the required conditions of salt management plan.</p> <p>Decision: Revise text to reflect the commitment of MTO's SMP to use the best available winter maintenance practices.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do not agree. 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change</u></p>
<p>R-1(3)</p>	<p><i>Opposition to Policy (MTO Comments)</i></p> <p>3. Consideration of cross-country boundary conditions does not conform well with MTO's approach to winter maintenance (<i>i.e.</i>, same standards are applied province-wide)</p> <p>Decision: Limit the requirement for addressing cross-boundary considerations to municipalities (<i>i.e.</i>, do not require MTO to do so)</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MTO is a partner in the process, and therefore, should not be excluded. 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change</u></p>
<p>R-1(4)</p>	<p><i>Opposition to Policy (MTO Comments)</i></p> <p>4. MTO does not support the requirement to update SMP on a timetable consistent with approval of updated ARs</p> <p>Decision: Do not specify a date for MTO to update their salt management plan</p> <p>Discussion: No support</p>	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change</u></p>
<p>R-1(5)</p>	<p><i>Opposition to Policy (MTO Comments)</i></p> <p>5. MTO does not support requirement to report annually to the SPA.</p> <p>Decision: Remove requirement for MTO to report annually to the SPA.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If no date is specified, the Plan will likely never be updated. ▪ No support 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change</u></p>

<p>R-1(6,7,15)</p>	<p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Decision: Revise wording (to replace first paragraph of Requirement 1):</p> <p>Ensure that a salt management plan is in place that contains provisions to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water without compromising road safety.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nice to have a plan, but what if it isn't implemented ▪ Keep "implement" in the policy 	<p><u>Consensus to compromise:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DO NOT ADD "without compromising road safety" - ADD "and provisions implemented"
<p>R-1(8)</p>	<p>Suggested amendments</p> <p>8. Private Roads</p> <p>Decision: Add landowners as an implementing body regarding private roads</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This approach would require landowners to develop a Salt Management Plan. ▪ Increases awareness ▪ Have the municipality pass a bylaw that road salt isn't allowed 	<p><u>Consensus to add landowner.</u></p>
<p>R-2- Monitoring of sodium and chloride</p>		
<p>R2-1</p>	<p>Opposition to Policy</p> <p>1. Feasibility of Sampling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested sampling is not feasible for sodium • Validity of results affected by location, weather, and timing <p>Decision: Remove policy.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitoring is necessary to determine if increasing concentrations are an issue. ▪ Support for monitoring program 	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change</u></p>
<p>R-2 (2)</p>	<p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>2. MOE Comment: Implementing Body</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not legally binding for private utilities • Should direct municipality with responsibility for drinking water system <p>Decision: Change implementing body to "municipality with responsibility for the drinking water system".</p>	<p><u>Consensus to ACCEPT change</u></p>

<p>R-2 (new)</p>	<p><i>Suggested Amendments</i></p> <p>Peterborough Utilities Services Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Require municipalities to sample raw water (at intake) and treated water <u>once annually</u> to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish long-term trends for sodium - Establish long term trends for chloride (where roads dept's use calcium chloride) b) Require roads departments to advise municipalities promptly if an alternate road salt product is used. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This would be a start to acquiring the necessary information to track changes in sodium and calcium concentrations. 	<p><u>Consensus to ACCEPT amendments to policy.</u></p>
<p>R-3: Recommended Research for Road Salt Alternatives</p>		
<p>R-3 (1)</p>	<p><i>Suggested amendments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MTO Comment: MTO is not a research ministry <p>Decision: Remove MTO as implementing body for this policy.</p>	<p><u>Consensus to DENY change</u></p>
<p>R-3(2a & 2b)</p>	<p><i>Suggested amendments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Wording changes <p>Decision: Approve the alternate wording below:</p> <p>Research is recommended regarding the following aspects of winter road maintenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identify alternatives to salt-based compounds that do not pose a threat to drinking water or the environment and b) Identify options to reduce the use of salt-based compounds <p>These alternatives and options should not compromise road safety and should be included in the guidelines for managing road salt.</p>	<p><u>Consensus to ACCEPT change</u></p>

R-4: Future construction of Roads and Impervious Surfaces		
R-4(1)	<p>Suggested amendments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing Body: Clarification by referring to approval authority under the <i>Planning Act</i> <p>Decision: Replace “Municipality” with “approved authority under the <i>Planning Act</i>” – extend to all Land Use Planning policies?</p>	<u>Consensus to ACCEPT change</u>
R-5: Prohibition of Future Salt Storage		
R-5 (1)	<p>Suggested amendments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Land use planning: Prohibition could be achieved or supported through zoning provisions and site plan control agreements. <p>Decision: Replace or supplement this policy with a land use planning policy.</p>	<u>Consensus to ACCEPT change (i.e., to add a land use planning policy to support the prohibition of future road salt storage)</u>

13. REPORTS/UPDATES

- **Staff**
No reports
- **Municipal Working Groups**
No reports
- **Committee Members (updates on public engagement/conferences)**
Rob Franklin reported that a successful meeting took place between staff from the Municipality of Port Hope, RM of Durham, Town of Cobourg, Ganaraska Region CA, with representatives from Trans - Northern Pipelines Inc. Jennifer Stephens and Chair Jim Hunt were also in attendance. The meeting was to discuss the policies prepared by the TCC SPC to address the local threat in the GR SPA.

14. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions.

15. OTHER BUSINESS

Jennifer Stephens reported that the agenda packages for the February 15th meeting would be sent on February 8th. After a number of members did not receive their agenda package in a timely fashion, staff have confirmed with the Courier that in the event of inclement weather, packages will be delivered the next day.

16. NEXT MEETING –FEBRUARY 15, 2012- ASPHODEL-NORWOOD COMMUNITY CENTRE, NORWOOD, ON

Next meeting date and location was noted. Attendance is critical. If you cannot attend, please contact Myriam.

17. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2.39