

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING  
NOVEMBER 15, 2013  
MINUTES

ATTENDEES

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS	PRESENT	REGRETS	NOTES
Jim Hunt	✓		
Monica Berdin	✓		
Darla Blodgett	✓		
Alanna Boulton	✓		
Dave Burton		✓	
Bill Cornfield	✓		
Edgar Cornish	✓		
Kerry Doughty	✓		
Bobbie Drew	✓		Arrived at 11:40 AM
Rob Franklin	✓		
Mike Gibbs	✓		
Dave Golem	✓		
Rosemary Kelleher-MacLennan	✓		Arrived at 12:45 PM
Robert Lake	✓		
Gerald McGregor	✓		
Glenn Milne	✓		
Terry Rees	✓		
Mary Smith	✓		
Bev Spencer	✓		Departed at 1:30 PM
Richard Straka	✓		
Wayne Stiver		✓	
Alix Taylor		✓	
Mae Whetung	✓		
Dave Workman	✓		

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE LIAISONS	PRESENT	REGRETS	NOTES
Glenda Rodgers	✓		
Wendy Lavender	✓		
Health Unit - vacant		✓	

COMMITTEE SUPPORT STAFF:

Andrea Hicks  
Marilyn Bucholtz  
Shan Mugalingam  
Andrew Doiron

**CONSERVATION AUTHORITY STAFF:**

Crowe Valley SPA: Tim Pidduck  
 Ganaraska Region SPA: Mark Peacock, Pam Lancaster  
 Kawartha-Haliburton SPA: Mark Majchrowski, Stacy Porter  
 Lower Trent SPA: Anne Anderson  
 Otonabee-Peterborough SPA: Meredith Carter

**OTHER:**

Peter Doris, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food/Ontario Ministry of Rural Affairs (OMAF/RA)  
 Rob Gamache, City of Kawartha Lakes

**1. WELCOME**

Chair Hunt welcomed the Committee.

**2. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 10:09 AM

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

No conflicts of interest were declared.

**4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Agenda item #11 (MOE Comment: Monitoring Policies) will be deferred to next meeting. One additional piece of correspondence from L. Mark, Director, MOE was also added.

**SPC 2013-11-15-01**

By consensus, the TCC SPC approved the agenda as amended.

**5. DELEGATIONS**

There were no delegations.

**6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING****SPC 2013-11-15-02**

By consensus, the TCC SPC approved the minutes and in-camera minutes of the meeting held July 18, 2013.

**7. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

There was no business arising.

**8. CORRESPONDENCE**

- a) Otonabee-South Monaghan to T. Low and J. Hunt: New Keene Well – September 10, 2013
- b) Otonabee-South Monaghan to L. Mark: MOE Funding for Technical Studies – September 25, 2013
- c) Durham Region to A. Hicks: Pre-consultation comments on IPZ-3 Policies – September 26, 2013
- d) A. Hicks to Medical Officers of Health: SPC Representative – October 15, 2013
- e) L. Mark, Director, MOE: MOE Funding for Technical Studies – November 14, 2013

Andrea Hicks reviewed the items of correspondence with the Committee.

**SPC 2013-11-15-03**

By consensus, the TCC SPC received the items of correspondence as information.

**9. NASM POLICY REVIEW**

Peter Doris, Environmental Specialist, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture & Food/Rural Affairs (OMAF/RA) provided the Committee with an overview of existing tools and processes related to the regulation of non-agricultural source material (NASM).

Andrea Hicks provided background on the draft/proposed NASM policies and the comments received from MOE and Municipal Working Groups.

MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	MWG Comments
<b>Policy N-2: Prohibition of Future NASM</b>		
Recommend policy be amended to permit future NASM category 2 & 3 outside of WHPA-A and IPZ-1 unless the SPA/SPC could provide a more robust rationale for prohibiting future NASM activities when ASM activities are allowed given that the chemicals of concern (nitrogen, phosphorous and pathogen) are the same for <u>both</u> ASM and NASM, and thus have the same impact on drinking water sources. This could be done by changing the policy approach so that future NASM category 2 & 3 application, handling and storage is managed outside WHPA-A and IPZ-1 using a prescribed instrument.	Prohibits all future NASM in vulnerable areas where it would be significant, both inside and <u>outside</u> of WHPA-A and IPZ-1 (with the exception of category-1).	The following rationale points and comments were provided by the SPC and MWGs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most NASMs are “imported” to a farm from elsewhere; therefore spreading them inside the WHPA or IPZ is completely avoidable with no extra cost to the generator or receiver (compared to ASM, which, if produced on the farm, may be a hardship to dispose off-site).</li> <li>• ASMs are well-understood threat in terms of content and composition and the pathogen aspect can be treated through disinfection. Category 2 and 3 NASMs may contain unknown elements such as heavy metals, pharmaceuticals, etc. &amp; could introduce contaminants, the risks of which may be unknown and/or not addressed through water treatment.</li> <li>• Category 1 materials are not regulated through a PI; what are the risks posed by these materials?</li> <li>• Public Notice not required under NASM Plans</li> <li>• Transition from Certificate of Approval, through MOE, to Nutrient Management Plans, through OMAFRA, may result in transition gaps in regulating NASMs</li> <li>• Set-backs from municipal wells are based on a “one-size-fits-all” premise of 100m; Assessment Report science provide stronger foundation for site specific vulnerabilities and supports the need to determine set-backs on a case-by-case basis</li> <li>• Violations: applying to areas outside the approved areas, application at the wrong time of year, not adhering to the conditions of the CofA</li> <li>• Pulp and Paper sludge composition is different depending on the methods use to produce the paper, concerns about the ability of the legislation to effectively regulate these different products</li> <li>• Sewage biosolids may contain dangerous levels of metals, pathogens, industrial chemicals, pharmaceuticals including antibiotics, and personal care products; environmental effects of some of these are still largely unknown</li> </ul>
<p>Option 1: Leave policy as written, i.e. prohibit wherever the activity would be a significant threat.</p> <p>Option 2: Prohibit NASM activities within WHPA-A and IPZ-1; manage with PI outside these areas.</p> <p>Option 3: Prohibit NASM activities within IPZ-1, WHPA-A, and WHPA-B with vulnerability score of 10; manage with PI outside these areas. Within TCC, 20 municipal systems have a WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10.</p> <p><b>SPC Decision: Decision was tabled until December meeting.</b></p>		

MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	MWG Comments
<b>Policy N-1: Policy Gap for Existing Category 1 NASM</b>		
There is no policy to address existing cases of Category 1 NASM application. Consider addressing the threat through the E&O policy.	Activity was already included in E&O policy.	<p>Previous SPC Decision was generally supported by the working groups</p> <p>What risks are posed by Category 1 NASM?</p> <p>Future Category 1 NASM threats require RMP (Policy N-3), should be expanded to include existing Category 1 NASM</p>
<b>SPC Decision:</b> Keep E&O policy to manage existing Category 1 NASM threats, add clarification in NASM threat summary of the SPP (page 70).		
MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	MWG Comments
<b>Policy N-3: Future Category 1 NASM Storage</b>		
The policy requires RMPs for the “application” of Category NASM but is silent on “handling and storage” of Category 1 NASM.	Add “handling and storage” to the applicable activities for the policy	The Previous SPC Decision was supported by the working groups.
<b>SPC Decision:</b> Revise the policy to include handling & storage		

**SPC 2013-11-15-04**

By consensus, the TCC SPC agreed to the SPC decision as noted above.

**10. MILLBROOK CORRECTIONAL FACILITY – RESULTS OF TECHNICAL REVIEW**

A number of environmental site assessment and hydrogeological reports have been reviewed as it relates to the former Millbrook Correctional Facility. Based on the analysis of conditions at the site and the technical rules for this site, a condition for the site does not apply. Therefore, the facility will not be listed as a Drinking Water Condition and therefore Conditions Policies will not be developed for the SPP.

Similar to the draft policies presented at the previous meeting which included a *Collaborative Communication Strategy*, MOE, MOI and the Municipality have met to review the ESA reports and site specific concerns. MOE has requested additional monitoring and investigation of the site and MOI has agreed to complete this.

**SPC 2013-11-15-5**

By consensus, the TCC SPC accepted the findings of the technical review for the former Millbrook Correctional Facility and further, that a letter be drafted to the Township of Cavan Monaghan regarding the results of the Technical Review.

**11. SPC MEMBERSHIP EXPIRATION**

There is a requirement to initiate a process to determine the expiration of one third of the committee membership in each of the three categories (municipal, commercial/industrial, other interests) upon approval of the Source Protection Plan. Committee members were asked to consider whether they are interested in submitting their names.

**12. LAKE ONTARIO INTAKES: FUEL AND WWTPS MODELING**

The Committee was provided with an overview of technical work completed for two threat scenarios for the Lake Ontario intakes at Cobourg, Port Hope and Newcastle. Details of each scenario and the modelling results are as follows:

**Scenario 1:** Determine if gasoline spilled from marina storage tanks at Cobourg, Newcastle and Port Hope would reach the intakes of the three systems.

- Cobourg Marina fuel spill is a significant drinking water threat to Cobourg intake
- Newcastle Marina fuel spill is a significant drinking water threat to Newcastle intake

**Scenario 2:** Determine if a disinfection failure at the Cobourg, Newcastle, Port Hope and Port Darlington wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) would reach the intakes of the three systems.

- Disinfection Failures at:
  - Cobourg WWTP 1 and 2 is a significant drinking water threat to Cobourg intake
  - Newcastle and Port Darlington (within CLOCA) WWTPs is a significant drinking water threat to Newcastle intake
  - Port Hope WWTP is a significant drinking water threat to Port Hope intake

### **Public Consultation on Draft Updated Ganaraska Assessment Report**

Based on this new technical information, Ontario Regulation 187/07 outlines a public consultation process for the Draft Updated Ganaraska Assessment Report.

- Publish Draft AR Update on Internet November 18
- Issue Letter and Notice to Municipalities, First Nations, and effected landowners (email and hard copy)
  - 33 Day consultation period ending December 20, 2013
- Post notice and provide hard copies to the public at municipal offices and GRCA
- Issue Media Release of Public Notice

A final draft will be brought to the SPC in February once staff have reviewed comments received during the public consultation and made any necessary changes. The Updated AR would then be submitted to the Ganaraska Region Source Protection Authority in March 2014 and to the Director of MOE by end of March 2014.

### **SPC 2013-11-15-6**

By consensus, the TCC SPC accepted the updates to the Ganaraska Assessment Report to address the modelled scenarios for fuel tank spills and WWTP disinfection failure for the Cobourg, Port Hope and Newcastle municipal water intakes and further, to proceed to public consultation.

### **Overview of Pre-consultation Comments: Durham Region**

Input was received from the Region of Durham as an implementing body on the preliminary policies (based on using existing policies within the draft SPP) as follows:

<b>Fuel Tanks Policies</b>	<b>Durham Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
	What is the definition of a large fuel tank? More background is required to understand the quantity of fuel that was spilled in the modelled scenario and the approximate concentrations that could occur at the water supply plant intake.	Actual circumstance will be provided in the Assessment Report Update.
F-2(1)	Durham still believes that the TSSA should be the implementer for fuel policies.	Through consultation, it was determined that TSSA does not perform fuel oil tank inspections; TSSA licensed technicians, through oil suppliers, do the inspections. RMP were selected to ensure more frequent inspections occurred.

G- 5(1)	It is inappropriate for the municipalities to be creating an educational program. This should be done by the TSSA, MOE or Conservation Ontario to ensure consistency in the materials produced and eliminate duplication of efforts.	This was considered during policy development, and options to delegate to another delivery body and to harmonize with existing education programs were provided.
<b>WWTP Disinfection Failure Policies</b>	<b>Durham Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
	More background is required to understand the quantity of wastewater that was spilled in the modelled scenario and the approximate bacteria counts that could occur at the water supply plant intake.	Actual circumstance will be provided in the Assessment Report Update.
S- 2(1)	If capital budget is required for the plant upgrades as a result of the amendments, a three year time line will not be enough time to ensure completion.	Three year timeline applies to MOE review and amendment of Prescribed Instruments. Clarification will be provided to Durham Region.
S-6(1),(2)	This policy should be incorporated into policies S-2(1), (2). The emergency response plan should be a requirement of the prescribed instrument. The implementer would then be the MOE. The policy should also be more specific than stating a system failure, it should read disinfection failure.	PI would contain provisions for ERP or Contingency Plans, which would be carried out by the municipality. Policy S-6 requires the municipality to have a separate ERP in place.  This policy is not specific to disinfection failure: it covers other system failure as well as these modeled disinfection failures. ➤ Policy Revision: “Applicable Area” to specify both failures of wastewater collection facilities and disinfection failures for wastewater treatment plants.
S- 6(3), (4): Maintenance and Monitoring Policies	The policy should be more descriptive to specify that maintenance and asset management activities related to disinfection system policy should be specific to the disinfection system.	This policy is not specific to disinfection failure: it covers other system failure as well as these modeled disinfection failures. ➤ Policy Revision: “Applicable Area” to specify both failures of wastewater collection facilities and disinfection failures for wastewater treatment plants.

**SPC 2013-11-15-7**

By consensus, the TCC SPC accepted the pre-consultation comments from the Region of Durham and the policy revisions as presented for inclusion in the updated SPP for public consultation.

### 13. POLICY REVISIONS: MUNICIPAL WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK – MOE COMMENTS

The table below outlines feedback received to date on policies of the Source Protection Plan including:

- A summary of the original comments received from MOE
- Background on the previous decisions made by the SPC & how SPC decided to address MOE comments
- Changes proposed to the Municipal Working Groups (MWG)
- Summary of MWG Comments

MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Expansion Policies: G-2(1) &amp; G-8(3)</b>			
Clarify intent of expansion clauses  Clarify how policy applies for existing and future activities	Expansion can occur for both existing and future activities, as long as the future activity is not prohibited.  Add a definition to clarify “expansion”. <i>Expansion means an increase of the activity (land area, amount of discharge/effluent, quantity stored ...), occurring on the same parcel, for an activity already taking place.</i>	(add as new clause) “The expansion of a significant drinking water threat is defined as the following:  An increase in scale of an activity already taking place on the land parcel, where the person engaged in the activity remains the same. The increase in scale may include, but is not limited to:  a) Increasing the area of land where an activity is taking place, b) Increasing the amount of effluent or discharge from an activity, c) Increasing the quantity of chemical or pathogen containing material handled or stored, d) Increasing the quantity of chemical or pathogen containing material applied.”	Adding the proposed definition was generally supported  Clarify G-2 policy intent by adding header text specifically refers to Prescribed Instrument policies (i.e. Similar header as for G-8(3) for Risk Management Plan Policies)  Area of buildings or facilities should also be included in the definition, to cover storage activities.  Should the permissibility of expansions be associated with land ownership? i.e. “where the person engaged in the activity remains the same”
Option 1: Approve the definition as proposed to the MWGs Option 2: Revise the definition to remove ownership statement  <b>SPC Decision: Option 2 – “where the person engaged in the activity remains the same” will be removed.</b>			
MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Land Acquisition: Policy G-3</b>			
Increase flexibility of the policy by re-adding the affordability criterion	Re-add the affordability criterion	( <u>underlined</u> ) To prevent the activity causing the threat, consider the purchase of properties located in the most vulnerable areas on an ongoing basis. Criteria for evaluating the feasibility of purchasing land can include, but are not limited to:  a) The nature of any existing and potential future significant drinking water threats. b) The availability of the lands for purchase. c) <u>The availability of funds and</u>	Re-adding affordability clause was generally supported.  Concerns expressed regarding implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffing resources required to set up and monitor a process</li> <li>• Liability of not pursuing purchases when available, should a contamination event occur</li> <li>• Willingness of councils to purchase properties that cannot be used for other</li> </ul>

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

MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
		<u>financial feasibility.</u>	things Community Improvement Plans (Planning Act tool) – could be used to designate areas to be acquired
Option1: Approve revised policy as proposed to the MWGs Option 2: Remove policy G-3 from the SPP			
<b>SPC Decision: Option 1 and staff will work to provide municipalities with guidance on parameter to include in a process for this policy.</b>			
MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Prohibition Through Land Use Planning: Policy G-7</b>			
Policy has effect of prohibiting very broad land uses  Replace “land uses” with “land use activities” and do not refer to “land uses that would facilitate [application & handling threats]”	Re-word policy to refer to all activities and land uses in a single consolidated list as “land use activities”  Add definition to glossary: Land use activities listed here may be considered as <i>land uses</i> under the <i>Planning Act</i>	“The following land use activities are not permitted where they would be a future significant drinking water threat, unless stated otherwise: a) The application or storage of agricultural source material; b) The management of agricultural source material (i.e., aquaculture); c) The application, handling, or storage of non-agricultural source material; d) The application, handling, or storage of commercial fertilizer; e) The application, handling, or storage of pesticide; f) The handling or storage of road salt; g) The storage of snow; h) The handling or storage of fuel; i) The handling or storage of a dense non aqueous phase liquid; j) The handling or storage of an organic solvent; or k) The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard.”	One working group supported the proposes change as given  The use of “land use activities” was not supported by all groups. It was noted that the term: • Would be difficult to implement using planning tools • Is not a recognized term under either the Planning Act or Clean Water Act  Certain activities cannot be controlled through planning: • Some activities would not trigger a planning application • There are limitations on what Site Plans can address, e.g.: • Can prohibit outdoor DNAPL storage but not indoor handling & storage • Cannot regulate sale of DNAPLs in a hardware store  Policy should apply only for storage threats, which can be addressed through planning. Suggested rewording of the first sentence of G-7(2): “Rezoning and establishment of the following land uses will not be permitted:” (listing only the drinking water threats related to storage)



MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
			Policy may be redundant given that the Section 59 policy already serves to “flag” future land uses that trigger planning applications
<p><b>Policy Intent:</b> Require Land Use Planning documents to identify the activities that are prohibited under SPP policies; and, identify the intention to prohibit these activities using land use planning, understanding that there are limitations to what LUP can regulate.</p> <p>Directed at a higher level (i.e. OP Update) than Section 59.</p> <p>Identifies the need for LUP to consider land uses in the context of the activities they facilitate; may require changes to business models to implement SPP.</p> <p>NOTE: Explanatory Document will be revised to state the intent of the policy more explicitly.</p> <p>Option 1: Approve revised policy as proposed to the MWGs, i.e. refer to “land use activities” and include a consolidated list of all activities</p> <p>Option 2: Revise the policy to refer to “activities”, i.e. remove reference to “land use” completely, to address concerns around the undefined term</p> <p>Option 3: Apply the policy to storage threats only, i.e. the threats that can be considered as “land uses”.</p> <p>Option 4: Revise the policy to more explicitly state the intent, i.e. <i>The Official Plan update will include provisions to ensure that the following activities are not permitted where they would be significant drinking water threats, unless otherwise stated in the SPP.</i></p> <p><b>SPC Decision: Option 1 and provide additional explanation to include a consolidated list of all activities.</b></p>			
MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Policy S-3(1): Future Sewage Threats with Prescribed Instruments</b>			
The policy is intended to allow a future sewage threat only where it replaces an existing activity and would “lower the risk” to drinking water. To avoid confusion with other defined terms (e.g. risk score), replace “lower the risk” with “would be more protective of drinking water.”	Accept the proposed revision (i.e. replace “lower the risk” with “would be more protective of drinking water”).		The proposed revision was generally supported
<b>SPC Decision: Approve the revised policy as written</b>			
MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Policy S-7: Wastewater collection facilities (future case)</b>			
Land use planning cannot be used to require/specify construction standards for wastewater collection facilities	No change to Policy S-7(1) – i.e. policy is intended to red flag actions early in the development process (otherwise applicant would not know about the requirement for “no-SDWT”		Previous SPC Decision was generally supported by the working groups, i.e. don’t change S-7(1) and add rationale to Explanatory Document

MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
Construction standards are considered through Prescribed Instruments  Policy S-7(1) should be removed	construction standard until late in the ECA approval process)  Add further details in Explanatory Document – use of a prescribed instrument leaves outlining required actions too late in the process		It was commented that the policy should be removed because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The threat is sufficiently managed through Prescribed Instrument</li> <li>• Land use planning cannot be used to specify construction standards for wastewater collection infrastructure</li> <li>• Planning staff do not have the expertise to specify construction standards, i.e. this should be addressed as part of the MOE approval process</li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 1:</b> Approve previous SPC Decision, i.e. No change to Policy S-7(1) and add rationale to Explanatory Document</p> <p><b>Option 2:</b> Remove policy S-7(1)</p> <p><b>SPC Decision: Option 1</b></p>			
MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Policy A-2: Review of NMPs &amp; Inspection of NMP Properties</b>			
Policy requires OMAFRA to review NMPs within 3 years; and MOE to prioritize inspection of NMP properties within 1 year – these timelines should be harmonized	Revise policy (changes underlined)  Require OMAFRA <u>and MOE</u> to prioritize review of NMPs within one year  Make the timelines for review of NMPs and for inspection of NMP properties relative to the prioritization (i.e. add “Following the prioritization developed under A-2(1)...” to A-2(2) and A-2(5)  Allow for implementation of NMP amendments by the landowner		Previous SPC Decision was generally supported by the working groups (i.e. accept proposed changes)  The following alternate changes were suggested for simplifying the policy while harmonizing the timelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Postpone all MOE inspections until after the three-year review period (i.e. after all NMPs have been amended);</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Carry out inspections in phased approach as NMP reviews are completed (i.e. inspect properties that have had their NMPs reviewed one year following the completion of the review).</li> </ul>
<b>SPC Decision: Approve revised policy as proposed to the MWGs</b>			

MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Policy A-5: Agrichemical Warehousing Standards Association (AWSA) Certification</b>			
Municipal powers do not extend to enforcing private sector certification. Present the policy as a part of the E&O policy (G-5) to “promote the environmental benefits of the safe storage of pesticides and encourage businesses to obtain certification”	Make AWSA certification a requirement of a Risk Management Plan (i.e. change implementer to RMO and add new policy requiring RMP for existing)		No consensus among MWGs  Previous SPC Decision was generally supported  It was commented that the AWSA Certification should be made part of the E&O policy (i.e. comply with MOE comment)
<p><b>Option 1:</b> Approve the revised policy as written, i.e. RMP requiring AWSA Certification</p> <p><b>Option 2:</b> Revise the policy to be an E&amp;O policy, advising of the AWSA Certification</p> <p><b>SPC Decision: Option 1</b></p>			
MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Policy R-2: Implementer for Road Salt Monitoring Policy</b>			
MTO requested that SPA contact MTO rather than MTO reporting to the SPA (RE: road salt management plans)	Leave implementer as MTO		Previous SPC Decision was generally supported by MWGs  One MWG felt that the MOE change should be adopted.
<p><b>Option 1:</b> Approve previous SPC Decision</p> <p><b>Option 2:</b> Comply with MOE Comment</p> <p><b>SPC Decision: Option 1</b></p>			
MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Policy R-6: Prohibition of Future Road Salt Storage</b>			
Since land use planning (i.e. Site Plan Control) can only regulate the placement and not the design of storage structures (i.e. covered/uncovered), it is not the appropriate tool to achieve policy intent of prohibiting uncovered salt storage. As currently written, policy would prohibit all salt storage structures (not just those that are significant threats)	Disagree with MOE comment. Since policy refers specifically to salt storage that is a significant threat (i.e. per threats tables this means only uncovered storage), policy only addresses uncovered storage.  Site Plans can include conditions to specify covered/uncovered storage		Previous SPC Decision generally supported by working groups  It was agreed that Site Plans can dictate the conditions of bulk storage

**SPC Decision: Leave policy as previously written.**

**NOTE: Policy G-7(2) was designed to consolidate all LUP policies which prohibit future activities. If policy G-7(2) remains in the SPP, policy R-6(2) is therefore redundant and should be removed.**

MOE Comment	Previous SPC Decision	Change Proposed to MWGs	MWG Comments
<b>Policy P-1(3): Reporting on Aircraft De-icing</b>			
The policy identifies Transport Canada as the implementer for the monitoring policy (i.e. reporting to SPA on how design standards/mgmt practices were included in the design of a new airport). Transport Canada cannot be named as an implementing body for a monitoring policy because it is a federal body.  Pipeline Owner also cannot be named as an implementing body under Ganaraska SPP policies	Change the implementing body for the policy to the Source Protection Authority (i.e. SPA to "Request, and report on, information from Transport Canada)		Previous SPC Decision was supported by all working groups
<b>SPC Decision: Approve previous SPC Decision</b>			

**SPC 2013-11-15-8**

By consensus, the TCC SPC agreed on the changes to the Trent & Ganaraska Source Protection Plans as noted above.

**14. REPORTS/UPDATES**a) AR Update & SPP Revisions Timeline

The Committee was provided with an outline of key timelines over the next 4 months for completing updates to the Assessment Reports and revisions to the Source Protection Plans including public consultation requirements.

b) Website Updates & Resources

Implementation Guides for municipalities are now available on the website.

c) Source Protection Municipal Implementation Fund (Media Release Attached)

The Fund is intended to help build municipal capacity to implement source protection plans and to support sustainable, local actions to protect drinking water. This one-time funding is available to small, rural municipalities over three years (December 2013 to December 2015). Twenty-five of 29 municipalities with implementation responsibilities under the TCC SPPs were provided funding ranging

from \$30,000 to \$81,772, totalling \$1,487,789. Additional funding of up to \$15,000 is also available to each municipality for “Collaborative Incentive”.

d) Municipal Working Group Meetings – Various

All of the Municipal Working Groups have met to review and input on the MOE comments on the draft policies. Minutes of these meetings were provided to the Committee.

e) Committee Members (updates on public engagement/conferences)

There were no updates provided.

**15. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no questions.

**16. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

**17. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be scheduled for December 3, 2013 at the Waterfront Holiday Inn, Peterborough.

**18. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 3:09 PM.