

DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION

ACT FOR CLEAN WATER

TRENT
CONSERVATION
COALITION
SOURCE PROTECTION
REGION

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

JANUARY 19, 2012

10:15 AM – 2:55 PM

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	✓			
Bobbie Drew	✓			
Rob Franklin	✓			
Mike Gibbs	✓			
Dave Golem	✓			Late arrival
Rosemary Kelleher-MacLennan	✓			
Robert Lake	✓			
Gerald McGregor	✓			Late arrival
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	✓			Departed after lunch
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, Paul Buckley

Lower Trent SPA: Kelly Weste

Otonabee-Peterborough SPA: Meredith Carter, Kathy Reid, Bev Hurford

TCC Regional Staff: Andrew Doiron, Diana Tyner

1. WELCOME

Chair Hunt welcomed the Committee. The importance of quorum and attendance at future meetings was discussed.

2. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m.

3. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chair Hunt asked for any additions.

Bob Lake noted a clerical error which was fixed.

SPC 2012-01-19-01

By consensus, the Committee approved the agenda.

5. DELEGATIONS

Jim Hunt welcomed Andrea Loyst from the Township of Havelock-Belmont-Methuen.

There were no delegations.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING – NOVEMBER 9, 2011

Chair Hunt asked for any revisions. There were none.

SPC 2012-01-19-02

By consensus, the Committee approved the minutes of the November 9th, 2011 meeting.

7. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

No business arising.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

- a. John Presta, Director – Environmental Services, **Region of Durham** to Jim Hunt, TCC SPC Chair and Jennifer Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – December 29th, 2011 (Attached)

- b. Lee Orphan, Assistant Director - South-western Region, **Ministry of the Environment** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – December 28th, 2011 (Attached)
- c. Clarence Haverson, Director (A) - Environmental Management Branch, **Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs** to J. Hunt, TCC SPC Chair, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – December 21st, 2011 (Attached)
- d. Max Christie, Chair, Quinte Region SPC to Mary Anne Covelli, Director – Source Protection Programs Branch, Ministry of the Environment, re: Addressing the threat from handling and storage of fuel – December 21st, 2011 (Attached)
- e. Nicole Stewart, Director, Public Safety Branch, **Ministry of Consumer Services** to J. Hunt, TCC SPC Chair, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – December 20th, 2011 (Attached)
- f. Dan Ethier, Planner, Municipal Services Office, **Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – December 19th, 2011 (Attached)
- g. Max Christie, Chair, Quinte Region SPC to Mary Anne Covelli, Director – Source Protection Programs Branch, Ministry of the Environment, re: Source Protection Planning Implementation Costs – December 16th, 2011 (Attached)
- h. Terry Hilditch, Policy Analyst, Environmental Policy Office, **Ministry of Transportation** to J. Hunt, TCC SPC Chair, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – December 12th, 2011 (Attached)
- i. Terry Hilditch, Policy Analyst, Environmental Policy Office, **Ministry of Transportation** to Source Protection Committees, re: MTO Information Package Specific to Salt Management and Road Signs – December 12th, 2011 (Attached)
- j. **County of Hastings** Planning and Development Department to J. Hunt, TCC SPC Chair and J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – December 5th, 2011 (Attached)
- k. Ronald Chittick, CAO, **Municipality of Marmora and Lake** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – December 2nd, 2011 (Attached)
- l. TCC SPC Chair's Quarterly Report to TCC Source Protection Authorities – December 1st, 2011 (Attached)
- m. Donald Gordon, Director - Public Works and Parks, **Township of Scugog** to P. Buckley, SPP Technician, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – November 29th, 2011 (Attached)
- n. Chris Voth, Environmental and Property Operations Manager, **Township of Minden Hills** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – November 28th, 2011 (Attached)
- o. Wayne Stiver, Vice-President, **Peterborough Water Utilities Services**, to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – November 25th, 2011 (Attached)
- p. S. Dawe, Director - Corporate Services / Municipal Clerk, **Municipality of Port Hope** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – November 15th, 2011 (Attached)
- q. Irene Cook, Municipal Clerk, **Municipality of Highlands East** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – November 9th, 2011 (Attached)
- r. David Crome, Director - Engineering Services, **Municipality of Clarington** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – November 7th, 2011 (Attached)
- s. Robin van de Moosdyk, Municipal Clerk, **Township of Alnwick / Haldimand** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – November 7th, 2011 (Attached)
- t. Doug Thompson, Manager – Water Operations, **Township of Hamilton** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – November 1st, 2011 (Attached)
- u. Jim Peters, Director - Planning, **Municipality of Trent Hills** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 31st, 2011 (Attached)

- v. Malcolm Hunt, Director - Planning and Development Services, **City of Peterborough** to J. Hunt, TCC SPC Chair, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 31st, 2011 (Attached)
- w. **City of Kawartha Lakes** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 31st, 2011 (Attached)
- x. Karen Ellis, Director - Planning, **Township of Cavan Monaghan** to J. Hunt, TCC SPC Chair, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 31st, 2011 (Attached)
- y. Dayna Lafferty, Policy Planner, **City of Quinte West** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 31st, 2011 (Attached)
- z. Bryan Weir, Director - Planning, **County of Peterborough** to J. Hunt, TCC SPC Chair, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 28th, 2011 (Attached)
- aa. Jane Tousaw, Director - Planning, **County of Haliburton** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 28th, 2011 (Attached)
- bb. **Township of Cramahe** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 28th, 2011 (Attached)
- cc. Rob Franklin, Manager – Planning Services, **Town of Cobourg** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 28th, 2011 (Attached)
- dd. Angela Chittick, Clerk, **Township of Smith-Ennismore-Lakefield** to J. Stephens, TCC SPR Project Manager, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 28th, 2011 (Attached)
- ee. Linda Reed, CAO, **Township of Havelock – Belmont - Methuen** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 27th, 2011 (Attached)
- ff. **Township of Asphodel – Norwood** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 26th, 2011 (Attached)
- gg. Kevin Heath, Clerk, **Township of Stirling – Rawdon** to J. Hunt, TCC SPC Chair, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 26th, 2011 (Attached)
- hh. Christine Wright, CAO / Director of Planning and Economic Development, **Township of Otonabee – South Monaghan** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 25th, 2011 (Attached)
- ii. **Township of Galway – Cavendish – Harvey** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 24th, 2011 (Attached)
- jj. **Township of Douro – Dummer** to TCC SPC, re: Comments on TCC SPC Draft Source Protection Policies – October 19th, 2011 (Attached)

Jennifer Stephens summarized the correspondence received. The correspondence fell into three categories:

- I. Letters received from implementing bodies in response to the call for written feedback on the *draft* policies through pre-consultation;
- II. Chair Hunt's Quarterly Report; and
- III. Letters from the Chair of the Quinte Region SPC to the Director of the Source Protection Programs Branch, MOE on the topics of TSSA participation in the policy development process and implementation costs for small municipalities.

All written pre-consultation comments submitted to the TCC SPC have been summarized in the reports included in this meeting agenda, as well as those to be prepared for the February 2nd meeting.

There was concern expressed that some municipalities chose not to comment on the *draft* policies. Jennifer noted that the TCC SPC has actively engaged its municipalities throughout the policy development process through the five Municipal Working Groups, but also by way of the three Municipal Forums held over the past couple years. A particular municipality might have chosen not to

submit written comments during pre-consultation since their concerns might have already been recorded in Municipal Working Group minutes, or made vocal at one of the Municipal Forums.

Additional concerns were brought forward with reference to the pre-consultation correspondence from the Ministry of Transportation. Committee members felt that the commenting agency (Ministry of Transportation) did not seem receptive to any of the proposed policy recommendations. Jennifer Stephens replied that she, Andrew Doiron, and Clare Mitchell had met with staff from the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) in the fall (2011). During this meeting, MTO staff drew attention to the similarities and inconsistencies between what the TCC SPC is proposing through their *draft* policies, and the practices currently happening under the auspices of the Ministry of Transportation. The comments made by MTO will be considered by the Committee when reviewing the feedback on the road salt threat policies. Although the *draft* policies might not change following this review, at the very least the Committee will have shown due diligence in considering the feedback obtained from MTO.

Terry Rees asked whether the Committee would be discussing the correspondence from Quinte Region SPC Chair Max Christie pertaining to TSSA. Jennifer noted that the Committee would be discussing this particular issue when reviewing the pre-consultation feedback related to the fuel threats. Jennifer also confirmed that at the SPC Chairs meeting earlier in January with Ministry of the Environment staff, including the Chief Drinking Water Inspector; SPC Chairs and Project Managers reaffirmed their concerns with the current lack of feedback being received from TSSA during the pre-consultation phase of the policy development process.

SPC 2012-01-19-03

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

9. FINAL 8 MONTHS: DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRENT AND GANARASKA SOURCE PROTECTION PLANS – J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer Stephens provided a high level overview of the timeline for the final eight months prior to submitting the Trent and Ganaraska Source Protection Plans.

SPC meeting dates have been revised and are now posted on the TCC Source Protection Region website.

Marilyn Bucholtz presented the *draft* consultation workplan outlining activities between January and August 2012. As with the consultation activities affiliated with the preparation of the Assessment Report, a number of items listed in the workplan are legislative requirements. Marilyn reviewed a number of decisions that needed to be made by the Committee, and corresponding staff recommendations. The Committee agreed that where documents (*i.e.* *draft* source protection plans, proposed source protection plans, and explanatory document) were required to be available to the public, they would be placed at municipal and conservation authority offices. Furthermore, the Committee confirmed that when the Notice advising that the *draft* source protection plans are posted on the TCC SPR website for public comment, this Notice would be published in all newspapers, and not a selection.

As mandated in the *Clean Water Act*, a minimum of one public meeting is required to take place within each Source Protection Area during the 35 day consultation period when the *draft* source protection plans are made public for the first time:

Date	Source Protection Area	Location
April 10	Otonabee-Peterborough	Peterborough
April 11	Crowe Valley	Havelock
April 12	Ganaraska	Baltimore
April 16	Kawartha-Haliburton	Minden
April 17	Kawartha-Haliburton	Lindsay
April 18	Lower Trent	Codrington

Meetings are scheduled from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. with a presentation to be given at 7:00 p.m.

An additional item for consideration by the TCC SPC was whether members were interested in pursuing outreach to landowners currently living in the most vulnerable areas. Generally, these landowners are those with the potential to create *future* significant drinking water threats (SDWT). Given the location of their property, these landowners might not now be engaging in an activity listed as a prescribed threat, but could in the future. Last year, when the SPC was reviewing the *Notice of Plan Preparation*, members decided to only send these *Notices* to landowners enumerated as SDWTs in the Assessment Reports. This was the *minimum* requirement under the *Clean Water Act*. Other SPCs had decided to send their *Notice of Plan Preparation* to all SDWT landowners, existing and future. If the TCC SPC were to engage these landowners, the ideal timeframe would be in advance of the legislated public meetings.

In advance of this SPC meeting, a scoping exercise had been completed by local CA staff to determine the level of effort to carry out a variety of options to engage these landowners with the potential to create “future” threats. Marilyn Bucholtz presented the results of this scoping exercise which indicated that the best way to ensure that the landowner received the information provided was to drop it off directly at their property. Marilyn informed the SPC that the amount of effort for each CA to carry out this exercise would vary depending on the size and number of municipal drinking water systems within their jurisdiction. Generally, it would take each CA a minimum of one week (full time) to visit each of these landowners. CA staff will not be making arrangements to speak to the landowners, but will drop off the information to front doors or mailboxes.

The information document being provided to these landowners will take the form of a simple factsheet. Given timing of the public meetings, this outreach would take place over the months of February and March. Although the material being distributed would be consistent, the local contact details on the factsheet will differ.

The Committee supported the proposal to outreach to landowners with the potential to create *future* drinking water threats. Members suggested that a customized local map would likely be more appropriate, as opposed to showing the entire TCC Source Protection Region on the factsheet. Jennifer Stephens explained that current timelines might not make the creation of new mapping products an option. The Committee requested that they be given the opportunity to comment on the final *draft* product.

SPC 2012-01-19-04

By consensus, the Committee approved the recommendations outlined in Staff Report 01/12:

THAT the TCC SPC adopt the revised schedule for the development of the proposed Trent and Ganaraska source protection plans in 2012, and

THAT the TCC SPC endorse the *draft* consultation workplan with consideration of the discussion relevant to the decisions that the SPC is required to make.

10. REVISIONS TO GENERAL POLICIES – A. DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR; J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Andrew Doiron explained how the summary documents had been prepared. These reports have noted opposition to the policy; suggest amendments; staff comments; and items for consideration from the feedback obtained through pre-consultation with implementing bodies (*i.e.* municipalities, source protection authorities, and the Crown). The comments and concerns related to 13 of the 19 prescribed drinking water (quality) threats have been summarized and distributed to SPC members as part of the January 19th, 2012 Agenda Package.

Policy	Discussion	Decisions
G-1: Land Acquisition		
G-1(1)	Opposition to Policy – Do not adopt policy or exempt small and / or rural municipalities.	<u>Consensus</u> to maintain policy in the source protection plans – CHANGE DENIED
G-1(2a)	Suggested Amendments – <i>Feasibility</i> criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specify additional criteria – currently only “the availability of funding” is listed. 	<u>Consensus</u> to remove criteria (b) - the availability of funding; additional criteria (a) and (c) to be included in updated policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The nature of any existing drinking water threats c. The availability of the lands for purchase
G-1(2b)	Suggested Amendments – <i>Feasibility</i> criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Frequency for consideration - Text currently reads “Consider the purchase of the affected properties on an ongoing basis”. 	<u>Consensus</u> to maintain existing frequency wording.
G-1(3)	Make policy apply to “would be” threats	<u>Consensus</u> to add “would be” to updated policy text.
G-2: Support of Incentive Programs		
G-2(1)	Suggested Amendment - Change text to read “the Conservation Authority will”... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Conservation Authority is <u>not</u> a legal entity under the CWA. - Source Protection Authority has no staff to implement policy. - Committee suggested that definitions for both SPA and CA be added to the glossary. 	<u>Consensus</u> to edit text The SPA will request that CA carries out the requirement to “support incentive programs”.

G-2(2)	Suggested Amendment – Reporting should also go to the municipality.	<u>Consensus</u> to revise text. <i>Report to the SPC and the municipality on the number and nature of SDWTs.... funding from an incentive program.</i>
G-3: Risk Management Plans		
G3-1(a)(b) and (c)	Timeline - Clarify the meaning of “completed” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed the differences between submission of, approval of, and adoption of the Risk Management Plan. - Support was given for all three options. - Some members were concerned that there might be delays in approving the <i>Plan</i>. - Members what would be a reasonable amount of time for a RMP to be submitted and implemented. 	<u>Consensus</u> to revise text. <i>Within 1 year the RMO prioritizes the RMPs to be completed; Within 3 years, all RMPs must be submitted; Within 5 years, actions listed in RMPs should have begun to be implemented.</i> <i>DO NOT remove clause (i.e. unless otherwise stated) included in G-3(1c)</i>
G-6: Education and Outreach		
G-6(1a)	Implementing Body – Add new clause	<u>Consensus</u> to revise text. <i>Add New Clause: “Consult with relevant provincial ministries and industry associations during the development of E&O programs”</i> <i>Add “and other relevant organizations/bodies”.</i>
G-6(1b)	Implementing Body - Change implementing body for development and implementation of education programs to Conservation Authorities	<u>Consensus</u> to maintain existing wording.
G-6(1c)	Soften wording - The E&O program will seek to educate anyone engaging in an activity that is a significant drinking water threat...	<u>Consensus</u> to revise text.
G-6(3)	Minimum Content - Specify additional details regarding the expectations of the E&O programs.	<u>Consensus</u> to maintain existing wording since additional details are already outlined in policy.
G-6(4)	Applicability of Future Threats – Make the policy apply to future threats (<i>i.e.</i> require a “vulnerable area-based” instead of a “threat-based” program).	<u>Consensus</u> to revise text. <i>Extend policy to anyone engaging in an activity that is or would be a significant drinking water threat.</i>
G-11: Restricted Land Use		
G-11(1)	Suggested Amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Copying RMO on Applications 2) Complete Applications under <i>Planning Act</i> 	<u>Consensus</u> to add text. <i>“Forward relevant applications...to the RMO for the issuance of a notice under Section 59 of the CWA.”</i> <i>Add new clause: “Add a notice from the RMO... of the <i>Planning Act</i>”.</i>

DNAPLs & Organic Solvents		
C-1(1)	Opposition to Policy – Remove policy and rely entirely on education and outreach for these threats.	<u>Consensus to maintain policy in the source protection plans – CHANGE DENIED</u>
C-1(2)	Suggested Amendment: Phase-out or Relocation	<u>Consensus to add text.</u> <i>Require RMPs for these activities to <u>recommend</u> phase-out or relocation</i>
C-1(3)	Suggested Amendment: Transportation of DNAPLs Consider additional provisions to identify DNAPLs being transported into the area where they are SDWT.	<u>Consensus to maintain policy text.</u> <i>Staff will investigate current Codes of Practice related to the Transportation of Dangerous Goods.</i>
C-2(1)	Opposition to policy – Replace with a requirement for a Risk Management Plan Andrea Loyst spoke to the implications of prohibiting this activity in the future and impacts on the Township of Havelock-Belmont-Methuen (HBM). Andrea is the Deputy Building Official with HBM. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members re-affirmed that they were not interested in specifying volumes in the policy text. - Members understood that locations where DNAPLs have been identified as existing SDWTs if sold to a similar business would continue to be recognized as an existing activity. - Members inquired whether the Township of Havelock – Belmont – Methuen had entertained moving their municipal wells. 	<u>Consensus to maintain policy in the source protection plans – CHANGE DENIED</u>

SPC 2012-01-19-05

By consensus, the Committee approved or denied recommendations outlined in the summary reports prepared for the *General Policies* and those for *DNAPL/Organic Solvent Threat Policies* based on feedback obtained through pre-consultation (*per Staff Report 02/12*).

AND FURTHER, by consensus, the Committee approved the incorporation of the decisions and relevant discussion points into the response document being prepared for the TCC SPR municipalities.

11. NEXT STEPS

The policy discussions took much more time than anticipated. Therefore, it was agreed that an additional meeting would be scheduled to address the remaining policy summaries.

SPC 2012-01-19-06

By consensus, the Committee agreed to schedule another meeting for January 30th at the Asphodel -Norwood Community Centre from 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

12. REVISIONS TO AGRICULTURE POLICIES – A. DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR; J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

DEFERRED TO JANUARY 30, 2012 MEETING

13. REVISIONS TO FUEL POLICIES – A. DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR; J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

DEFERRED TO JANUARY 30, 2012 MEETING

14. REVISIONS TO NASM POLICIES– A. DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR; J. STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

DEFERRED TO JANUARY 30, 2012 MEETING

15. REPORTS/UPDATES

- **Staff**

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

Jennifer Stephens updated the Committee. At the December 7, 2011 ODWSP Review Committee, additional projects were reviewed. All, but one project was approved. The project that was denied funding was due to the Committee not achieving consensus as to whether the project warranted funding. The proponent will be given the opportunity to appeal the decision. Currently, there is ~ \$40,000.00 left of Early Response Funding to be allocated. The next Review Committee meeting will follow in April 2012. The Committee agreed that project proposals received at the April 2012 meeting that address the management of fuel threats would be given priority.

- ❖ Framework of Source Protection Plans (Staff Report (I); Handout) – J. Stephens, Project Manager

A *draft* table of contents was distributed for information. Staff continue to develop chapter text and are working towards having *draft* Plans available for review at the February 15th, 2012 meeting.

- ❖ The Evolution of a TCC SPC Policy – A look at the Explanatory Document (Staff Report (D); Attached) – Diana Tyner, SPP Assistant

Diana Tyner provided an overview of Explanatory Document and the steps taken to document the evolution of *the* draft policies prepared by the Committee, with particular emphasis on the rationale for changes to the policies. The document is to be submitted with the Source Protection Plans in August 2012. In addition, the document is posted for reference prior to the *draft* Plan being made public.

SPC 2012-01-19-07

By consensus, the Committee accepted the proposed format outlined in Staff Report 03/12 as a template for use in the Explanatory Document.

- **Municipal Working Groups**

- ❖ Minutes of Crowe Valley SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – November 14, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Kawartha Haliburton SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – November 17, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Ganaraska Region SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – November 21, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Otonabee Peterborough SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – November 21, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Lower Trent SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – November 29, 2011

SPC 2012-01-19-08

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

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

Terry Rees was congratulated for having received an award from Water Canada magazine for his professional accomplishments related to the protection of Ontario's inland lakes.

16. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions.

17. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

18. NEXT MEETING –JANUARY 30, 2012- ASPHODEL-NORWOOD COMMUNITY CENTRE, NORWOOD, ON

Next meeting date and location was noted. Attendance is critical.

19. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.