

**SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 14, 2011
WATERFRONT HOLIDAY INN – PETERBOROUGH ON
MINUTES**

ATTENDEES

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS	PRESENT	REGRETS	ABSENT	NOTES
Jim Hunt	✓			
Monica Berdin	✓			
Darla Blodgett		✓		
Alanna Boulton	✓			Arrived during lunch break (Item 14)
Dave Burton	✓			Departed during lunch break (Item 14)
Bill Cornfield	✓			
Edgar Cornish	✓			
Bruce Craig	✓			
Pam Crowe		✓		
Kerry Doughty			✓	
Bobbie Drew	✓			
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	✓			Arrived at 9:45 a.m. (item 6)
Dave Workman	✓			

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

COMMITTEE SUPPORT STAFF:

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

CONSERVATION AUTHORITY STAFF:

Crowe Valley SPA: Marnie Guindon

Ganaraska Region SPA: Mark Peacock, Pam Lancaster

Kawartha-Haliburton SPA: Rob Messervey, Mark Majchrowski, Paul Buckley

Lower Trent SPA: Kelly Weste

Otonabee-Peterborough SPA: Meredith Carter, Terri Cox, Kathy Reid

TCC Regional Staff: Shan Mugalingam

1. MEET AND GREET

Chair Hunt provided long stem roses for everyone as a Valentine Day's gift. Jennifer Stephens brought chocolate.

2. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hunt called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Wayne Stiver was congratulated on his being elected as one of four Vice Presidents of the American Water Works Association (AWWA).

3. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures.

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**SPC 2011-02-14-01**

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee approved the agenda.

5. DELEGATIONS

There were no delegations.

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

Two sets of minutes were reviewed; the Source Protection Committee Minutes and In-camera Session Minutes of the January 14, 2011 meeting. Bob Lake noted a typographic error in the Minutes of the In-Camera session, which will be amended.

SPC 2011-02-14-02

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee approved the January 14, 2011 SPC Minutes (including the In-camera Session).

7. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

This item will be covered under item 11.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

- a. Letter from Director Ian Smith to participating municipalities re: Update on *Clean Water Act*, 2006 – Completion of Assessment Reports (January 20, 2011)
- b. *Clean Water Act* Source Protection Planning Bulletin - Threats related to on-site sewage (septic) systems (January 27, 2011)

SPC 2011-02-14-03

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the correspondence for information.

9. APPROVAL OF SOURCE PROTECTION PLANNING WORKPLAN (TIMELINE, POLICY REVIEW TABLE)– JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

The Policy Review Table was reworked based on feedback received at the January 14, 2011 SPC meeting now incorporating a “check mark” approach rather than scoring. Room was also available to provide feedback on the policy concept, as written. It is expected that the Policy Review Table will be used as a tool at Municipal Working Group meetings scheduled this week. Once the table is used, its workability will be judged and we’ll be able to determine if any further editing of the table is required.

Municipal Working Group (MWG) meetings for each SPA are scheduled through June. In February and March, each group will be handling a specific threat or set of related threats. The focus will be to determine whether the policy concept is an acceptable approach for use in the entire Source Protection Region.

Municipal representatives are at each of these meetings however, Jennifer indicated that any SPC member interested in attending a particular MWG meeting is certainly welcome to do so.

Jennifer reviewed a set of flowcharts provided to the Committee detailing the policy development process being used by the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee. It was noted that this material was not new, but rather presented in a different format. A complete workplan for 2011 – 2012 will be brought forward to the March SPC meeting for approval.

Action: Dave Golem noted that the date for the Crowe Valley Municipal Working Group is March 18th. Staff will make the correction noted by Dave.

10. APPROVAL OF SOURCE PROTECTION PLANNING COMMUNICATION – CONSULTATION WORKPLAN– MARILYN BUCHOLTZ, COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR

Marilyn Bucholtz provided the Source Protection Planning Communication – Consultation workplan for 2011 and highlighted key areas. She noted that items in red text indicated items when the legislation allows these decisions to be made locally as directed by the SPC. Marilyn also noted that the approach being used is typical to that which has been implemented in the past.

SPC 2011-02-14-04

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following Staff Recommendation outlined in Staff Report #07/11:

That the Communications/Consultation Work Plan for 2011 be accepted by the Source Protection Committee.

11. REVIEW OF CLEAN WATER ACT PART IV TOOLS – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS – JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer Stephens reported that questions are sometimes asked that require more follow up, confirmation or additional details. The report presented to the Committee is a summary of questions received at the January 14th SPC meeting with approved answers provided by the Ministry of the Environment. Feedback from the Committee indicated that this type of follow up was useful; therefore, this approach will continue to be used.

There was further discussion pertaining to the accuracy of the answer provided with Question 4.

Action: After additional input from the Committee’s Agricultural Representatives, it was decided that the SPC’s MOE Liaison, Wendy Lavender, would investigate further the accuracy of the answer provided to Question 4.

SPC 2011-02-14-05

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the Staff Report for information.

12. PRESCRIBED INSTRUMENTS (PRESENTATION, ATTACHED)**a. Pesticides Permits (Paul Buckley, KRCA)**

Paul Buckley presented an overview of Pesticides Permits using the slide deck provided by the MOE at the Source Protection Committee Chairs meeting on January 17th, 2011.

Following Paul's presentation, a short dialogue ensued. Jennifer Stephens requested feedback from the Committee about whether the TCC SPC was interested in having expertise from provincial ministries attend any of meetings. Bev Spencer noted that she preferred having local "experts" advising the SPC. This approach was favourable to the rest of the Committee. Jennifer suggested that provincial experts could also be invited to attend the June Municipal Forum when draft policies were to be discussed. It was agreed that the Committee will move forward without scheduled visits from provincial experts. Should the Committee decide the need to engage provincial expertise, it will do so through the MOE Liaison Officer.

b. Certificates of Approval and Renewable Energy Approvals (Jennifer Stephens)

Jennifer Stephens provided an overview of the Certificates of Approval Program using a slide deck provided by the MOE at the Source Protection Committee Chairs Meeting on January 17, 2011.

13. EXISTING POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN PLACE TO SUPPORT SOURCE PROTECTION PLANNING – JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

A brief presentation and staff report updated the Committee on the information obtained through the Municipal Working Groups on existing policies and programs in place within the TCC municipalities. This information will be summarized and used for reference when developing area specific policies.

SPC 2011-02-14-06

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the Staff Report for information.

14. NOTICE OF PLAN PREPARATION – DRAFT LETTER – JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer Stephens presented the Committee with a Notice of Plan Preparation Draft letter and asked for feedback.

Suggestions to the letter included:

- ❖ *1st paragraph: "our municipal drinking water" – change to Municipal Drinking Water.*
- ❖ *2nd paragraph: (prescribed instruments) – needs to be clear – use plain language*
- ❖ *3rd paragraph – change "it is to be submitted" to "will be submitted"*
- ❖ *Throughout letter: use plain language*
- ❖ *Reword section about how to become involved – reword it to read "you may be eligible".*
- ❖ *Provide a due date in the letter.*
- ❖ *Streamline references on page two.*

A number of the members expressed concern that individuals purchasing properties in vulnerable areas might not be aware that there could potentially be restrictions on activities taking place on their properties. Discussion ensued and it was decided that the Committee would revisit this issue at a later date.

Action: The Committee will need to address if and how, it would like to advise future property owners of vulnerable areas and potential restrictions in these areas.

Action: Jennifer Stephens will rewrite the letter based on feedback and bring the revised Notice of Preparation letter forward at the March 11, 2011 SPC Meeting.

15. POLICY DEVELOPMENT – REVIEW OF PRESCRIBED THREATS

TCC CA Staff provided presentations summarizing a series of background documents circulated to the Committee. A background document was prepared for each threat or group of related threats being discussed at the March 2011 meeting.

Action: All policy development presentations will be provided to the Source Protection Committee

a. *Septic systems (Mark Majchrowski)*

Mark Majchrowski provided an overview.

b. *Fuel: Pam Lancaster*

Pam Lancaster provided an overview.

c. *Pasturing and Grazing: Meredith Carter*

Meredith Carter provided an overview.

There was some discussion about the Peterborough zoo, and to what extent it is related to this activity.

Shan Mugalingam provided some background:

Livestock density was calculated for each vulnerable area using information from the 2006 agricultural census, which reported livestock density by “census consolidated subdivision” (CCS). An assumption was made that all livestock reported by CCS were uniformly distributed across the agricultural managed lands located in the CCS.

Livestock density was calculated by dividing the number of equivalent livestock (in nutrient units) reported in a CCS by the acreage of the agricultural managed lands within the CCS. The resulting livestock density value was assigned to the agricultural managed lands within the CCS.”

Therefore, Livestock Density (LD) is based on the number of farm animals reported on a CCS (municipality) geographic unit and not on an individual parcel (such as the Peterborough Zoo). This calculation based on a large geographic unit produced a LD value that is lower than a LD calculated if based on an individual parcel assessment.

d. *Pesticides – Kelly Weste*

Kelly Weste provided an overview.

e. *Waste Disposal Sites – Marnie Guindon*

Marnie Guindon provided an overview.

Chair Hunt thanked TCC CA staff for their presentations.

16. UPDATED ASSESSMENT REPORT (ATTACHED, PRESENTATION) –JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

a. Revision of Vulnerability, Issues, and Threats for Lutterworth Pines Groundwater Municipal Drinking Water System

SPC 2011-02-14-07

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following Staff Recommendation outlined in Staff Report #05/11:

That the results of the vulnerability, issues and threats assessment completed by XCG Consultants Ltd. for the new Lutterworth Pines municipal groundwater sourced drinking water system outlined in the following technical memos:

- *Technical Memorandum #1 (Draft), Vulnerability Assessment of the Lutterworth Pines Municipal Well Supply, January 2010*
- *Technical Memorandum #2 (Draft), Issue Evaluation for Lutterworth Pines Groundwater Sourced Drinking Water System, January 2011*
- *Technical Memorandum #3 (Draft), Significant Threats Enumeration for Lutterworth Pines Municipal Groundwater Sourced Drinking Water System, January 2011*

be accepted by the Source Protection Committee for inclusion in the Trent Updated Assessment Report (for the Kawartha-Haliburton Source Protection Area).

b. SGRA / HVA Edge Mapping

SPC 2011-02-14-08

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following Staff Recommendation outlined in Staff Report #06/11:

The observations of the Groundwater Vulnerability/Highly Vulnerable Aquifer and Significant groundwater Recharge Area Edge Matching Review conducted on the western and southern boundary of TCC by GENIVAR and on the eastern boundary of TCC by the TCC technical staff, be accepted by the Source Protection Committee for inclusion in the updated Trent and Ganaraska Assessment Reports (for the Kawartha-Haliburton, Lower Trent, Crowe Valley and Ganaraska Source Protection Areas).

c. Revision of Tier 2 Water Budget for Havelock

There was concern that a major event like the Havelock Jamboree might stress the municipal system. Wendy Lavender confirmed that such events are permitted, and in most cases, water is brought on site.

SPC 2011-02-14-09

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following Staff Recommendation outlined in Staff Report #04/11:

That the results of the updated tier 2 water quantity stress assessment indicating a low water quantity stress for the sub-watershed associated with the Havelock Municipal Wells, completed by XCG Consultants

Ltd. for the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Region as presented in the Addendum Memo (Tier 2 Water Quantity Stress Assessment Update for CROWE-4 Sub-watershed) dated Dec 20, 2010 and revised on Jan 31, 2011 be accepted by the Source Protection Committee for inclusion in the Updated Trent Assessment Report (for the Crowe Valley Source Protection Area).

d. Incorporate storm sewershed time of travel in IPZ-2 delineations and re-assess threats

This item was summarized in two staff reports: 03/11 and 08/11. The work in Staff Report 03/11 was completed by XCG Consultants Ltd. for the 16 Surface Water Municipal Drinking Water Systems in the Trent watershed. The assessment of the three Surface Water Municipal Drinking Water Systems in the Ganaraska watershed was done by GRCA staff (Staff Report 08/11).

SPC 2011-02-14-10

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following Staff Recommendation outlined in Staff Report #08/11:

*That the results of the modified IPZ-2 delineations corresponding to the three surface water drinking water systems completed by GRCA and summarized in the **Engineering Memo on Source Water Protection 2-hour Travel Time Delineation**, January 25 2011, be accepted by the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee for inclusion in the Updated Ganaraska Assessment Report (for the Ganaraska Region Source Protection Area).*

A number of necessary revisions were identified in the mapping products in Staff Report #03/11:

Fenelon Falls – The orange and red colours should be reversed.

Lindsay – The orange and red colours should be reversed.

Page 2 – Underneath notes section – year is incorrect, should read 2010

Wayne Stiver questioned the time of travel for Peterborough..

Action: TCC Regional Staff will follow up with XCG Consultants to verify the calculations and assumptions made when revising the IPZ-2 delineation at the Peterborough Intake.

SPC 2011-02-14-11

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following Staff Recommendation outlined in Staff Report #03/11 for all delineations **EXCEPT** Peterborough:

*That the results of the modified IPZ-2 delineations corresponding to the sixteen surface water drinking water systems completed by XCG Consultants Ltd., as presented in **IPZ-2 Modifications for the Sixteen Surface Water Drinking Water Systems**, December 2010, be accepted by the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee for inclusion in the Updated Trent Assessment Report for the Kawartha-Haliburton, Otonabee-Peterborough, and Lower Trent Source Protection Areas.*

Action: TCC Regional Staff will seek approval of the modified 1PZ-2 delineation for Peterborough at the March 11, 2011 SPC Meeting.

e. Lake Ontario Collaborative

Jennifer updated the Committee on the Collaborative with input from Mark Peacock. At the March meeting staff intend to present a resolution to the Committee to accept the Lake Ontario Collaborative work.

Bob Lake inquired why a potential spill from Darlington is not being considered a threat in the modeling scenarios, while such a scenario is being considered if it occurred at the Pickering facility. Mark Peacock replied that the two facilities have different containments. In addition, the Pickering facility has a history of a spill occurring, while Darlington does not.

17. REPORTS/UPDATES

• **Staff**

- ❖ Drinking Water Stewardship Program Media Release
- ❖ Source Protection Project Managers Meeting (January 11, 2011)
- ❖ Source Protection Committee Chairs Meeting (January 17-18, 2011)

SPC 2011-02-14-12

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the Staff Reports/Updates for information.

• **Municipal Working Groups**

- ❖ Minutes of Crowe Valley SPA Municipal Working Group Teleconference – January 6th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Ganaraska Region SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – January 7th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Otonabee-Peterborough SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – January 18th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Lower Trent SPA Municipal Working Group – Wednesday January 19th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Kawartha Haliburton SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – January 20th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Crowe Valley SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – January 24th, 2011
- ❖ Minutes of Ganaraska Region SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – January 25th, 2011

SPC 2011-02-14-13

By consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the Municipal Working Group Minutes for information.

- Committee Members (updates on public engagement/conferences)
 - ❖ Mary Smith noted she believes fluoridation will become a political issue.

18. NEXT MEETING

- ❖ Next SPC Meeting: March 11, 2011 – Holiday Inn - Waterfront, Peterborough
- ❖ Meeting date for the Municipal Forum: June 8th 2011

19. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions/comments from the public.

20. OTHER BUSINESS

The length of the SPC meetings was discussed. Bev wondered if there was adequate time in one meeting to discuss 5 threats appropriately. Chair Hunt believed that there was, but noted that meetings might need to be longer to accommodate the extra work.

Bev Spencer suggested that too much detail and information was given during the meeting. Jennifer responded that staff was trying to ensure that all SPC Members receive sufficient reference material so that it can be accessed if needed at a later date.

A brief discussion occurred about when meeting materials need to be provided to Committee members to ensure sufficient time for preparation. It was decided that staff would attempt to have materials to SPC members a minimum of 7 calendar days in advance of the meeting.

Action: Any Committee member interested in attending a Municipal Working Group is to contact Myriam Genet who will then pass on the details (location, time, etc and meeting materials).

Action: Myriam Genet will verify 911 addresses for some Committee members. Phone numbers and “no signature required” stickers will be put on the next courier packages being sent out to the Committee members.

Marilyn Bucholtz introduced the materials that were provided to each member. These documents are for inclusion in the System Summary Binder. Jennifer Stephens noted that this binder should be brought to each meeting.

21. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.