

DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION

ACT FOR CLEAN WATER

TRENT
CONSERVATION
COALITION
SOURCE PROTECTION
REGION

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

MARCH 11, 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 at 10:00 a.m.
Dave Burton	✓			Departed during lunch(after item 11)
Bill Cornfield		✓		
Edgar Cornish	✓			
Bruce Craig				
Pam Crowe		✓		
Kerry Doughty	✓			
Bobbie Drew	✓			
Michael Gibbs	✓			
Dave Golem	✓			Arrived at 10:05 a.m.
Rosemary Kelleher-Maclennan	✓			
Robert Lake	✓			
Gerald McGregor	✓			
Glenn Milne	✓			
Terry Rees	✓			
Mary Smith	✓			
Bev Spencer	✓			
Richard Straka	✓			
Wayne Stiver	✓			
Alix Taylor		✓		
Mae Whetung	✓			
Dave Workman	✓			

SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE LIAISONS	PRESENT	REGRETS	ABSENT	NOTES
Tom Cathcart	✓			
Glenda Rodgers	✓			Arrived at 9:50 a.m.
Wendy Lavender	✓			
Angelune DesLauriers, MOE (Guest)	✓			

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

COMMITTEE SUPPORT STAFF:

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

CONSERVATION AUTHORITY STAFF:

- Crowe Valley SPA: Marnie Guindon, Vicki Woolfrey
- Ganaraska Region SPA: 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, Bev Hurford
- TCC Regional Staff: Shan Mugalingam, Jeff Meyers

OTHER:

- Nadia Cicco, City of Kawartha Lakes

1. MEET AND GREET

Chair Hunt welcomed Mike Gibbs, the Source Protection's new Public-Urban Representative. Chair Hunt also welcomed Angelune DesLauriers, Land Use Planner with the Source Protection Planning Branch, from the Ministry of the Environment. Angelune attended the meeting to provide planning support from the perspective of the MOE. Chair Hunt also welcomed Bev Hurford, Planner at Otonabee Conservation and Nadia Cicco, Staff at City of Kawartha Lakes.

2. CALL TO ORDER

The Meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m.

3. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures.

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

An item was added to Other Business: *Modeling for Gasoline Spills, Staff Report #11/11.*

SPC 2011-03-11-01

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee approved the agenda.

5. DELEGATIONS

There were no delegations.

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

Bob Lake noted a clerical error in the numbering. Staff will make the correction.

SPC 2011-03-11-02

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee approved the February 14, 2011 SPC Minutes.

7. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

- a. Staff Report 09-11– Review of IPZ-2 Delineation for the Peterborough Surface Water Drinking Water System Intake within the Trent River Watershed– Jennifer Stephens, Project Manager

Chair Hunt thanked Staff and Committee members for their review and input.

SPC 2011-03-11-03

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following Staff Recommendation as outlined in Staff Report #09/11:

*That the results of the IPZ-2 delineations corresponding to the Peterborough surface water drinking water system 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 Otonabee-Peterborough Source Protection Area.*

- b. Notice of Plan Preparation – Updated Draft Letter – Jennifer Stephens, Project Manager

The Notice of Plan Preparation draft letter was presented to the Source Protection Committee at the February Meeting. Changes have been made based on feedback received from the Committee and TCC Staff. Jennifer Stephens reminded Committee Members that the content needed to meet a number of regulatory requirements. The amended letter will be brought to the April 2011 SPC meeting for Committee review and approval.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

- a. Letter from Mike Traynor, Chair Saugeen-Grey-Sauble-Northern Grey Bruce SPC re: *Nutrient Management Act* and Environmental Farm Plan Program (February 15, 2011)
- b. *Nutrient Management Act* Motion – Saugeen – Grey-Sauble-Northern Grey Bruce SPC (February 15, 2011)
- c. Environmental Farm Plan Program Motion – Saugeen – Grey-Sauble-Northern Grey Bruce SPC (February 15, 2011)

SPC 2011-03-11-04

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted *Correspondence Items a-c* for information. It was agreed to revisit these items at a later meeting when the relevant Ministries have had the opportunity to respond to the motions and more information becomes available.

- d. *Clean Water Act* Source Protection Planning Bulletin – Explanatory Document (February 18, 2011)

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

- e. Letter from SPPB Director Ian Smith to SPC Chairs re: Assessment Report Requirements: Section 12 of O. Reg. 287/07 of the *Clean Water Act* (February 22, 2011)

Jennifer Stephens noted that Jeff Meyers, TCC GIS Specialist / Data Management Coordinator followed up on the requirements outlined in the letter and has since received compliments from Conservation Ontario for his efforts.

SPC 2011-03-11-05

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted *Correspondence Items d-e* for information.

9. EXISTING POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN PLACE TO SUPPORT SOURCE PROTECTION PLANNING (STAFF REPORT) – ANDREW DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR

SPC 2011-03-11-06

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

10. POLICY REVIEW TABLE – ANDREW DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR

Andrew Doiron reported that the Policy Review Table in the meeting package was similar to a table presented at the February SPC Meeting, but has been updated to incorporate feedback. Andrew recommended that Committee Members use the Policy Review Table in conjunction with the review of the policy concepts.

11. REVIEW OF POLICY CONCEPTS – SEWAGE – ANDREW DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR

Residential on-site sewage systems <10,000L (Policy 2-1a, 2-1b and 2-1c)

Comments/Feedback

- Wendy Lavender noted that there is an inspection protocol that will be included in the Ontario Building Code. Once MWGs see the protocol, concerns may be alleviated.
- Mae Whetung asked how the policy would apply to First Nations. Chair Hunt reported that any policies would be voluntary because of jurisdictional issues.
- Wayne Stiver questioned the use of “Principal Authority”. There was confusion over who this was. Angelune noted that Principal Authority is defined in the *Ontario Building Code* – it could be a Municipality, Health Unit, Conservation Authority, or other.
- Tom Cathcart questioned the time frame, and asked why 2 years was noted when the MWG suggested 5.
- Mary Smith indicated concern about different policies among neighbouring SPR/SPAs and felt there should be consistency across the Province. Wendy Lavender reminded the Committee that the premise of the *Clean Water Act* is the development of locally appropriate policies. Wendy also reminded the Committee of the Conservation Ontario webforum where SPCs across the Province can share and compare their policies.
- Bev Spencer voiced concern about visual inspections and that these would not likely be as informative. The suggestion of hiring seasonal staff for this purpose was noted by several members as not to be a good idea.

- Tom Cathcart noted that there is existing legislation (Ontario Building Code, Mandatory Inspection Program) and wondered why we are suggesting changes. Angelune DesLauriers replied that policies would complement existing policies.
- Jennifer Stephens said that the point of the *Clean Water Act* is not to “reinvent the wheel,” but to address current gaps in legislation. We will make use of existing policies/programs and existing legislation. Jennifer also reminded the Committee that the concepts discussed at this meeting are just preliminary, to ensure the recommended tools available through the *Clean Water Act* being employed to address a significant threat are appropriate. As the TCC SPC continues to move forward with policy development, it is anticipated that the resources needed to complement our efforts will be provided (i.e. the inspection protocol for the Septic System Mandatory Inspection Program).
- Andrew Doiron reminded the Committee that there needs to be a policy for every existing threat and that for every policy we need to ensure that there is a monitoring policy. Angelune pointed out that policies supporting existing legislation will direct adherence to existing guidelines.
- Wayne Stiver indicated that simply monitoring the number of inspections is pointless and suggested that monitoring be expanded to include adherence to guidelines. Dave Workman said he would like to know what “inspection” entails and agreed that there needs to be a protocol.

Residential on-site sewage systems <10,000L (Policy 2-3)

Comments/Feedback

- Mary Smith wondered who would be paying for these policies. She wondered if the delivery cost would be tagged to the bill that Municipalities pay Health Units or Conservation Authorities. Andrew Doiron reported that responsibility for the expense is with the implementing body (Principal Authority).
- Angelune DesLauriers was encouraged to learn that programs are already in place for education. Jennifer pointed out that a policy could be further refined to reflect local existing programs.
- Gerald McGregor voiced concern about future costs with the City of Kawartha Lakes. There are many private water wells, waste water systems, and agreeing to an inspection program that isn't on the table caused him discomfort. Gerald noted that he was not agreeing or accepting any downloading to the Municipality.
- Tom Cathcart asked if the policies were suggesting the establishment of additional programs.
- Chair Hunt noted that the inspections are only for significant threats, and that given the concern about resources, significant threats should be the priority.
- Jennifer Stephens noted that where there are programs that promote the education, if there is already outreach for wells, it is just as simple to add a septic component. Where there isn't a program, then it is suggested that one be developed.

Residential on-site sewage systems <10,000L (Policy 2-4)

Comments/Feedback

- Jim Hunt pointed out that policies already exist to ensure that new lots are hooked up.

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

- Rob Messervey mentioned that further discussion occurred at the Kawartha-Haliburton MWG regarding the use of Section 57 (Prohibition) to address these significant threats.
- Wayne Stiver added that there are huge implications for prohibition as this could affect growth.
- Wendy Lavender reported that the Town of Madoc has a communal system, but four new lots have been created with septic systems. No policy was in place indicating the requirement for connection to the communal system.
- Bev Spencer said that prohibition is not always practical because a communal system is not always available.
- “Where Applicable” needs to be a focus of this policy.
- Richard Straka indicated that Municipal Planners would like this direction for ease of dealing with permits and planning. When not practical (available) the lot could get a septic.
- Mark Peacock added that Municipalities may struggle with the definition of “practical” and that the word should be defined. Angelune noted that one should not concern themselves with particular words right now – these are just concepts. Editing can occur as we move forward.

Residential on-site sewage systems >10,000L (Policy 2-2a and 2-2b)

Comments/Feedback

- Leave any policies general.
- Tom Cathcart suggested that MOE be consulted to ensure MOE can do what is being asked of them. This consultation is legislated and will take place as the policy development continues.

Sanitary Sewers and Pipes (2-5a, 2-5b)

Comments/Feedback

- Wayne Stiver– pipes are a low priority. Pumping stations, gravity pipes and forced mains need to be included. Dave Workman disagreed. He does not like the term “clay plugs” and would prefer to see “trench seepage collars” – leave out the specifics and mention only the technology.
- Richard Straka felt there is a need to monitor and understand which pipes do what and address them.
- Mark Majchrowski noted that if something happens, we want containment. Education allows the public to understand what to do when something goes wrong. (Best Management Practices)

Discharge of untreated stormwater from retention pond (policy 2-6 and 2-7)

Comments/Feedback

- No comments.

Future Threats policies:

- Wayne Stiver noted that prohibiting effluent discharge is impossible. Andrew pointed out that prohibition in this case means no new Sewage Treatment Plants in specific areas. Angelune suggested moving outflow pipes away from the WTP intake.

SPC 2011-03-11-07

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the policy concepts for Threat 2 (Sewage) presented for information and agreed that the policy concepts with some attention to the feedback received by the Committee were an appropriate start to the evolution of draft policies.

12. REVIEW OF POLICY CONCEPTS – LIVESTOCK GRAZING/PASTURING – JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer noted that there are three categories:

1. Existing Threats
2. Future Threats, and
3. Education, Outreach and Incentives

Where Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) is required (>300NU 21-1a and b)**Comments/Feedback**

- Kerry Doughty asked if the NMP addresses runoff. Yes – they address proactive mitigation.
- Wayne Stiver asked for confirmation that any NMP adequately manages the potential for contamination by pathogens, as well as chemicals.

Where Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) is NOT required (<300NU 21-2a and b)**Comments/Feedback**

- Edgar Cornish wondered who would be required to pay if a RMP is required to address a farm with few animals. The cost would default to the Municipality.
- Richard Straka wondered what the trigger mechanism was for identifying a need for a RMP. A property could be zoned agricultural; have no animals but a few days later acquire a herd.
- This is a GAP. There needs to be a mechanism in place to notify the Municipality/Risk Management Official that a change in landuse has occurred.

Future Significant Threats (21-5 and 21-6)**Comments/Feedback**

- Managing or Prohibiting?
- Wayne Stiver noted that prohibition should not be taken off the table – the ultimate protection is to not have the threat there.
- Mary Smith was concerned with consistency – again asking how TCC policy concepts compare with policy concepts from other SPCs. Jennifer noted that information has not yet been plugged into the webforum, but the prohibition option has been discussed at other committees where it has some support.
- Bev Spencer felt that more information is required– what will the RMP include? The Ontario Environmental Farm Coalition weighs in on only environmental issues, not all aspects of farming.
- Bev Spencer said prohibition may be required – you cannot have 100 cows on a one-acre property.
- Angelune DesLauriers noted that most committees see prohibition as a last resort.

General policies (21-3 – 21-4)

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

Comments/Feedback

- Bev Spencer noted workshops are a bad idea suggesting there would be little turnout within the Agricultural Community. Bev suggested preparing a pamphlet as an alternative.
- Glenn Milne suggested making use of existing workshops such as the pasturing and grazing workshop. Edgar Cornish disagrees, seeing the forum for productive pastures, not environmental linkages. Edgar suggested supporting this area by area, on a regional basis. He also mentioned that should training be required, certification should be valid for several years and not renewed on an annual basis.

SPC 2011-03-11-08

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the policy concepts for Threat 21 (Pasturing/Grazing/Outdoor Confinement Areas) presented for information and agreed that the policy concepts with some attention to the feedback received by the Committee were an appropriate start to the evolution of draft policies.

13. REVIEW OF POLICY CONCEPTS – FUEL – ANDREW DOIRON, SPP COORDINATOR

Fuel Handlers (Policy 15-1)

Comments/Feedback

- Gerald McGregor wondered if there was a way to protect municipalities (liability and cost of cleanup) in the event of a residential or business spill that contaminates a municipal water system. Jim Hunt replied that such a policy would be reactive, addressing what happens after something occurs. The purpose of this exercise is proactive, to prepare policies to ensure that it doesn't happen.
- Wendy Lavender noted that delivery agents have indicated that a whistle blows when fuel is being transferred from the truck to a tank. Even in this situation there is some overflow.
- Terry Rees believed that there should be a standard for handling fuel whether you are near a water well or not.
- Richard Straka felt prohibition is appropriate.
- Mark Peacock noted that handlers have training through TSSA, but that source protection was not in the training.
- Wayne Stiver felt that spill response in a vulnerable area may not be adequate through TSSA and that additional requirements should be added in terms of Emergency Response Planning.

Past Users (Policy 15-2)

Comments/Feedback

- Kerry Doughty wondered if brownfields already address unused tanks. Yes, but this policy also addresses residential unused tanks.
- Wayne Stiver noted that TSSA is a private entity and doesn't report to the MOE. What control does the SPC have in telling the TSSA what to do? The TSSA plays an integral role. The SPC requires an appropriate delivery agent and a monitoring agent. There was considerable discussion surrounding the TSSA and how this was another gap.
- Wendy Lavender noted that we could draft policies that impact the TSSA and then consult with them. Nothing was stopping the SPC from attempting.

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

Residential Fuel Tanks (Policy 15-3a and b, 1-5, 15-5, 15-6, 15-8, b and c)**Comments/Feedback**

- Buried tanks are still permitted, but there are guidelines to follow.
- There are different standards for above and below grade.
- Wayne Stiver suggested that on the sale of a home, there be a policy that the homeowner needs to switch over.
- Rosemary Kelleher-MacLennan noted that insurance companies require full inspections.
- A concern was raised about cost for implementation.
- Tanks are inspected when oil is delivered. Wendy believed that an additional inspection is done every 10 years for residential by the fuel handler, 3 years for bulk (some annual). Wendy will verify.
- Mae Whetung liked the sticker idea and the education component.
- The incentives to remove tanks should be used first, and then perhaps prohibition should be used.
- Bob Lake noted that northern communities do not have natural gas as an option, it is electricity or oil.

Non Residential Fuel Tanks (Policy 5-3a and b, 15-7)**Comments/Feedback**

- Angelune DesLauriers asked if there were any developmental rights. The answer was yes for some marinas.
- Richard Straka enquired about transition policies (removing existing rights). MOE stated that the Municipality would have to conform to the SPP even if the planning documents were not revised. A number of planning issues need to be addressed.

New Policies (Policy 15-10 and 15-11)**Comments/Feedback**

- None.

SPC 2011-03-11-09

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the policy concepts for Threat 15 (Handling/Storage of Fuel) presented for information and agreed that the policy concepts with some attention to the feedback received by the Committee were an appropriate start to the evolution of draft policies.

14. REVIEW OF POLICY CONCEPTS – PESTICIDES – JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER**Pesticide Permits (Policy 10-1 a and b)****Comments/Feedback**

- Bev Spencer wondered how policy affects a pesticide permit holder versus a certificate holder.
- The Committee supported the direction.

Incentive Program (Policy 10-2 and b)

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

Comments/Feedback

- Bev Spencer wondered if it would be worthwhile to pursue the subsurface tile.
- It was agreed to drop 10.2

Pesticide Permits (Policy 10-1a and b)**Comments/Feedback**

- Wayne Stiver wondered what an emergency plan for pesticide application looked like. An emergency plan would be prepared for the handling and storage of a fertilizer.

Risk Management Plan (10-4a and b)**Comments/Feedback**

- The Committee may want to include in policy that the RMO have regard to best management practices already done.
- Glenn Milne suggested that a RMP be used only on portions of land that are vulnerable.
- Bev Spencer noted that this was another cost for farmers. Angelune reminded the Committee that one RMP could be used to address multiple threats.

Certification (11-3a and b)**Comments/Feedback**

- Edgar Cornish reported that in order to apply pesticide, one must take a course. A certificate is not the same as a permit.
- Richard Straka wondered what the trigger mechanism could be. A property could have organic farming one day; sold the next and then have a significant threat occurring on the property.
- This was noted as a gap.
- Shan Mugalingam explained that pesticide applications are a significant threat based on specific chemicals; not all are considered significant threats. The consultants assumed the worse, although most chemicals probably are not being applied.

Education and Outreach (Policy 11-5a- and b)**Comments/Feedback**

- Kerry Doughty asked if this was not already addressed through the licensing process.

Future Threats (Policy 10-5 and 11-6)**Comments/Feedback**

- Jim Hunt suggested that the Committee consider RMP for application for future uses in vulnerable areas and prohibition for bulk storage.
- There is no requirement to notify a WTP Operator after a spill. The Committee felt this should be changed.

SPC 2011-03-11-10

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the policy concepts for Threats 10 and 11 (Application/Handling & Storage of Pesticides) presented for information and agreed that the policy concepts with some attention to the feedback received by the Committee were an appropriate start to the evolution of draft policies.

15. REVIEW OF POLICY CONCEPTS – WASTE DISPOSAL SITES – JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer noted that there were 2 groups:

1. existing (with 5 sub-threats) and
2. future (with 5 sub-threats)

Existing Threats (1-1a and b and 1-2 through 1-5)

Comments/Feedback

- Mary Smith asked why a property standards by-law would be used. Bev Hurford replied that it was dependent on the Municipality.
- Sites are required to have a CoA. Angelune said that the onus is on the Crown to review a CoA, not the CA or Municipality. CoAs would need to be reviewed/updated to see if they are adequate.
- There may not be the expertise at staff or municipal level – Angelune said this would have to happen at the provincial level – the reporting can be relatively simple.
- Although CA staff / planners might not have the technical expertise, their local knowledge is useful.
- Wendy Lavender noted that when a CoA is being reviewed it does come to a local ministry office. Perhaps additional support is required for the local office as far as resources. A requirement in the CoA could be that a SPA is notified by the Crown when a CoA is being revised (when it could be a significant threat).

Future Threats

Comments/Feedback

- Prohibit through Official Plans and bylaws.

SPC 2011-03-11-11

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the policy concepts for Threat 1 (Waste Disposal Sites) presented for information and agreed that the policy concepts with some attention to the feedback received by the Committee were an appropriate start to the evolution of draft policies.

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

Jennifer referred to her handout and updated the Committee on the status.

SPC 2011-03-11-12

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the workplan for information.

17. STAFF REPORT 10-11– ISSUES UPDATE FOR NORLAND DRINKING WATER SYSTEMS – ALUMINUM – JENNIFER STEPHENS, PROJECT MANAGER

SPC 2011-03-11-13

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the following Staff Recommendation as outlined in Staff Report #10/11:

That the consultant’s recommendation “that aluminum be considered as a naturally occurring issue at the Norland Surface Water Drinking Water System” be accepted by the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee for inclusion in the Updated Trent Assessment Report (for the Kawartha-Haliburton Source Protection Area).

Terry Rees asked if there was any interest or obligation for the Committee to inform residents who are affected by the results, thinking it may be a good practice. Wayne disagreed, indicating that it is already heavily regulated. Wendy Lavender noted that Inspection Reports are available to the public. Bob Lake also noted that the aluminum levels in Norland are not a health risk.

18. REPORTS/UPDATES

- **Staff**

- Perth EMC – Oil leak forces area resident from her home – January 27, 2011

SPC 2011-03-11-14

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the article for information.

- **Municipal Working Groups**

- Minutes of Otonabee-Peterborough SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – February 15th, 2011
- Minutes of Lower Trent SPA Municipal Working Group –February 16th, 2011
- Minutes of Ganaraska Region SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – February 17th, 2011
- Minutes of Kawartha Haliburton SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – February 18th, 2011
- Minutes of Crowe Valley SPA Municipal Working Group Meeting – February 18th, 2011

Chairs of the Municipal Working Groups reported on their respective meetings.

Jennifer Stephens reminded the Committee that the MWG meeting minutes include the “*raw information*” that was presented during the policy concepts discussion and suggested further review of the minutes to gather more information.

Mary Smith requested that Meredith Carter (ORCA) provide a brief update on the status of the signage project being coordinated by Otonabee Conservation staff.

Action: Information on the signage project will be included in the materials provided at the next SPC meeting.

Chair Hunt indicated that he will share the success of this local signage project with the other SPC Chairs.

SPC 2011-03-11-15

By Consensus, the Source Protection Committee accepted the MWG minutes for information.

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

Glenn Milne and Jim Hunt reported on the Ontario Water Works Association Source Water Protection Workshop held on Thursday March 3rd, 2011 at Black Creek Pioneer Village in Toronto.

Mike Gibbs invited Committee Members to attend a World Water Day Event on March 22, 2011 at the Peterborough Public Library. Opening remarks will be given by Mike Gibbs and Meredith Carter. The keynote speaker will be Wayne Stiver.

19. NEXT MEETING

The next SPC Meeting will be held on April 8, 2011 at the Brighton Barn Theatre, Proctor Park Conservation Area.

20. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions/comments from the Public.

Other Business

- a. **GASOLINE SPILLS IN THE GANARASKA RIVER, COBOURG BROOK, GRAHAM CREEK, WILMOT CREEK, AND BOWMANVILLE CREEK**

Jennifer Stephens provided background information, while Mark Peacock (GRCA) provided an overview of the technical work.

SPC 2011-03-11-16

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

That the TCC SPC consider identifying benzene (gasoline) as a “local threat” to the Lake Ontario intakes in the Ganaraska Region Source Protection Area since the spill scenarios indicate an exceedance of the Ontario Drinking Water Standard, and

That an IPZ-3 be for the Lake Ontario intakes within the Ganaraska Region Source Protection Area in accordance with the technical rules, and

That the results of this gasoline spill modeling be incorporated into the Updated Ganaraska Region Assessment Report for the Ganaraska Region Source Protection Area.

b. FEEDBACK

Jennifer requested that if anyone had suggestions on how to improve today's meeting to contact her directly. Jennifer also suggested that any comments on the length of future meetings (1 day versus 2 days) should be directed to Myriam Genet.

c. NEWS FROM MATT TAFT

A postcard from Matt Taft was received and shared with the Committee.

21. ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.