



Thames – Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee Meeting Minutes

Please be advised that a meeting of the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee has been called for the following time. If you are unable to attend please contact Deb Kirk at 519-245-3710x 46.

Meeting Date: November 12, 2010

Meeting Time: 9:00 am to 3:30 pm

Meeting Location: St. Clair Conservation Authority office

Proposed Agenda

Item	Time
1. Chair's Welcome	9:00
2. Adoption of the Agenda	
3. Delegations	
4. Minutes From the Previous Meeting	
a. Review of principles	
5. Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
6. Business arising from the minutes	10:00
a. Cross jurisdictional issues in planning stages	
b. UTRSPA Assessment Report submission	
c. Tier 2 water budget	
7. Business	10:30
a. LTVSPA amended proposed AR	
b. Source Protection Plan preparation work plan	
i. SP Municipal Policy Advisory Committee Terms of Reference	
ii. Generic Working Group Terms of Reference	
Lunch	12:00
iii. Decision making criteria – <i>discussion paper</i>	
iv. Drinking Water Threats Policy Discussion paper outline – <i>discussion paper</i>	
v. Policy development framework details – <i>discussion paper</i>	
8. Information	2:00
a. Member appointments	
9. In Camera Session	
10. Other business	
11. MOE Liaison report	
12. Members reports	
13. Adjournment (next meeting December 10, 2010)	3:00



Meeting Materials

Agenda Item	Description
2010.11.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> October SPC Meeting Minutes Includes policy principles – please review carefully for acceptance at meeting
2010.11.7.a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MOE directions to amend LTV AR
2010.11.7.a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Edits to LTV AR (<i>will be distributed at meeting</i>)
2010.11.7.b.i	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP Municipal Policy Advisory Committee terms of reference
2010.11.7.b.iii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making criteria
2010.11.7.b.iv	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy Discussion Paper Outline
2010.11.7.b.v	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy development framework detail



SPC MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 12, 2010
Meeting #32

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on November 12, 2010 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority (SCRCA) Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

Bob Bedggood
Murray Blackie (SPA Liaison)
Brent Clutterbuck
Pat Donnelly
Dean Edwardson
Pat Feryn
Paul Hymus
Carl Kennes
James Maudsley
Don McCabe
Earl Morwood

Sheldon Parsons
Richard Philp
Charles Sharina
Darrell Randell
Jim Reffle (MOH Liaison)
Joe Salter
Patrick Sobeski
John Van Dorp
Teresa McLellan (Provincial Liaison)

Regrets:

Keenon Johnson
Joe Kerr
Valerie M'Garry
Doug McGee
Augustus Tobias
Joe Van Overberghe

Staff:

Steve Clark
Chitra Gowda
Chris Tasker
Deb Kirk
Ingrid Vanderschot
Derekica Snake
Melissa Sherran (Oxford County)
Bonnie Carey

Teresa Hollingsworth
Ralph Coe
Rick Battson
Robert Olivier
Ian Wilcox



1) Chair's Welcome

Bob welcomed the committee and advised them of the local MP, Bev Shipley attending the meeting this morning to announce Habitat Stewardship Program funding for species at risk.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

moved by Paul Hymus-seconded by Jim Maudsley

"Resolved that the agenda be approved."

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

None.

4) Minutes from Previous meetings

moved by Sheldon Parsons-seconded by John Van Dorp

"that the October 15, 2010 meeting minutes be approved."

In considering the approval of the minutes, the committee was asked to pay special attention to page nine of the minutes under *Item 7.c.ii- SPP Preparation Principals* as discussed at the previous meeting. There are eleven principles along with the committees' Guiding Principles for review and discussion. The intent is to insert these principles into the work plan, once approved by the Source Protection Committee as part of these minutes.

Discussion:

- A question was asked of whether *Number 4 Incentives* on page 10 is defined as monetary. Incentives can mean monetary as well as other methods such as encouragement, acknowledgment may which could be used. A concern was raised regarding the municipalities lack of funds for projects. The SPC is not responsible for providing incentives. Any policies developed will indicate who the implementing body is. In the case of the municipality's being the implementing body, there will be consultation throughout the process. It was noted there will be many opportunities for discussion throughout the various stages of the plan development.

- A significant threat policy is binding.
- A question of whether Number 8 *Impacts of policies on others*, third bullet, *Implementation costs should be a shared responsibility* should read multi-government. Shared responsibility was used to cover multiple partners, land owners, water users, not just government. A comparison was made to the Drainage Act and the cost sharing model where costs are shared by beneficiaries and proponent. An amendment was agreed upon of adding “*shared responsibility of all stakeholders.*”
- Further revisions to Number 8 to include changing the word *should* to *may* in the third bullet point and the last bullet point.
- A note was made of when process is complete, it will be important to have consistency with surrounding partners across the province. Communication with other regions will also occur during the policy development stage.

Motion;

That the principles be accepted with amendments to #8 *Impacts of policies on others*; third bullet point to read “*Implementation costs may be a shared responsibility of all stakeholders.*” And the fifth bullet point, changing the word *should* to *may* to read, “*New operations may be responsible for implementation costs while existing operations may have access to financial support.*”

moved by Sheldon Parsons-seconded by Charles Sharina

“Resolved that the 7.a.ii SPP Preparation Principles be accepted with the above mentioned revisions.”

CARRIED.

The committee considered their motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting, which prior to the above noted discussion had been

moved by Sheldon Parsons-seconded by John Van Dorp

“Resolved that the October 15, 2010 meeting minutes be approved with the noted amendments to the principles.”

CARRIED.

Pat Donnelly noted that his members report in the previous meeting requires an update regarding the Clear Water Rival charette date of November 25th which has been postponed. For further info contact Pat.

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

a) Cross jurisdictional issues in planning stages

Information is not available at this point. This item remains on agenda to not lose site of this issue.

b) UTRSPA Assessment Request submission

The Upper Thames River Proposed AR was submitted in October 2010 to the MOE. The Kilworth-Komoka system wells were decommissioned in late October 2010. Amendments to the proposed AR will include the removal of this system and any work plans related to it, from the report.. Now that the wells are confirmed to be decommissioned, the Ministry has been informed. It was also identified that amendments to the Terms of Reference may be required.

c) Tier 2 water budget

The consultants were able to complete the changes to the model to allow it to run in unconfined transient mode required to assess drought conditions. Calibration statistics were reassessed and it was determined that additional work on model calibration was required..

7) Business

a) LTVSPA Amended proposed AR

A letter addressed to Jerry Campbell and Bob Bedggood was received from Ian Smith, Director of Source Protection Programs Branch, Ministry of Environment, dated October 29, 2010 outlining the amendments required to the proposed AR for the Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area.

A table was circulated to the SPC showing each of the directions, the responses and status of each. Appended to the table are the changes to the Assessment Report which were made based on discussions with the Ministry of Environment, and comments received during the comment period of the Proposed LTV Assessment Report. Each of the directions and resulting changes were discussed.

Following consultation with those affected during a 30 day posting period, the *Amended Proposed Assessment Report* will be re-submitted to the MOE with a document outlining the changes that were made including chapter references. Submission of the report must be by January 15, 2011, as per the MOE directions.

The SPC meeting took a break at 10:05 a.m. at which time the HSP funding announcement proceeded.

St. Clair Proposed AR update

A letter from Ian Smith, Ministry of Environment was received dated November 5, 2010, for the St. Clair Proposed AR and circulated to the committee. The twenty two directions in the letter will be populated into a similar table to the Lower Thames Valley and will be provided to the SPC at the December meeting. The submission date for the St. Clair Proposed AR is February 28, 2011 and the hope is to have it posted for comment in January 2011. The changes will be posted on the website, through a general advertisement and there will be a two week comment period, going beyond the requirement as the amendments will not have a direct relevance to property owners.

b) Source Protection Plan Preparation work plan

i. SP Municipal Policy Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

The *Working Group Terms of Reference* document was distributed to the members outlining the formation criteria of the working group based on the needs of the committee. The document included a table indicating the purpose of working group, the Chair, Members, Deliverables and Proposed Schedule and meeting frequency details.

Key points/discussion:

- A membership criterion is indicated and potential members from three groupings; planners and/or septic/building officials, storm and sewer managers and water system operators are shown in the table.
- Deliverables will be built around Drinking Water Threat Policy Discussion Papers.
- The working group will be formed in the next few months. Documents will be submitted electronically to the group for feedback and comments.

Two meetings will be required; one planned for early 2011 to get focused and understand roles and another for later 2011.

- There was some discussion as to whether advisory committees should be established on a watershed basis.
- There was also some discussion as to whether surface and groundwater should be separated, having two distinct groups. Consistent policies are the goal and by separating the issues this may not happen.
- A workshop is being planned for December 9, 2010 for planners, Chief Building Officials across the region. Water system operators have been engaged in the process throughout and will be included in a future forum. The SPC will be informed of the workshop details.
- The Municipal Policy Advisory Committee will review Threat Policy Discussion Papers before they are presented to the SPC for acceptance. The municipalities will likely be a primary implementer and therefore need to be actively engaged in the policy development.
- There was some discussion as to whether it is necessary to restrict the number of participants if the process is done electronically. It was pointed out that the municipal participants would engage others from the municipality as they felt appropriate.
- There was also discussion as to whether municipalities not on the list could participate. The members list will be re-characterized as targets rather than limiting the members. It was noted that this is a critical junction and flexibility will help in engaging people. The SPC municipal reps can assist in this engagement.

In summary, the SPC accepted the Working Group Terms of Reference document with the revisions of the member list being characterized as *targets* rather than as a limit to the people engaged during the process. Terminology surrounding jurisdictions and title naming conventions will be revised. Pat Donnelly was nominated as the Working Group Chair and Joe Salter as the back up.

moved by Sheldon Parsons-seconded by Jim Maudsley

“Resolved that Pat Donnelly be appointed the working group chair and Joe Salter be a back up.”

CARRIED.

ii. Generic Working Group Terms of Reference

There may be other working groups formed and a similar template will be utilized. It will be included in the work plan appendices.

iii. Decision Making Criteria (2010.10.7b.iii)

A discussion paper was circulated to consider criteria that could be used to evaluate policies chosen from a range of existing and new policy options. The criteria will assist the SPC and the working groups in assessing policies and provide the rationale influencing the policy decisions. This rationale may then formulate the basis of the SPP Explanatory document. The SPC was asked to consider the criteria including; economic, effectiveness, and appropriateness. As possible evaluative process options, weighting criteria examples were outlined and a matrix that could assist in having more than one policy to address a threat.

Key points/discussion:

- A concern was raised about using a weighted policy scoring; the preference would be to use a higher level, common sense approach without applying numerical or other measures of scoring.
- Support was given for potentially using a version of the matrix to provide the SPC with greater context under each threat activity
- The question of whether policy development criteria would be modified based on financial capacity of the implementing body was asked. The SPC needs to consider financial impacts when developing policy. Community acceptance needs to be explored in terms of economic reality. Municipal engagement through the process will assist with the question of economic uncertainty. It may be some municipalities have the capacity to pay and others may not.
- Policies need to be defensible/palatable and are binding for significant threats.
- The SPC mandate is to mitigate risk and there needs to be common ground between parties. This is a tool to develop policies and if implementing bodies do not comply, enforcement may be necessary.
- A comment of the private sector not having control was made. This is a process tool not an outcome tool, everyone needs to be involved and flexibility is important.
- A suggestion was made that the wording , “*capacity of*” should be changed to “*burden on*” in the financial criteria. Financial burden was

noted as important to consider while the capacity issue may be highlighted more after the municipalities have had opportunity to provide feedback.

- Existing regulations and enforcement may already cover some areas of concern.

In summary, as policies are developed the process will evolve. Discussion papers will assist the SPC in being aware of what they are embarking on. When available the Explanatory document will also assist through the process.

iv. Drinking Water Threats Policy Discussion Paper outline (2010.11.7b.iv)

The Drinking Water Threats policy discussion paper outline was circulated. The proposed outline is based on discussion papers developed by the Cataraqui Region. For our purposes minor regroupings were made and a purpose section added. Conservation Ontario is leading a collaboration process for regionally consistent background work and papers some of which already have a first draft. The Thames-Sydenham and Region can then incorporate our own local information into these background papers.

v. Policy Development framework Discussion Paper (2010.11.7b.v)

A Source Protection policy development discussion paper was distributed to the committee to summarize discussions from the previous meeting and give further structure to the policy development framework. The Thames-Sydenham and Region will work with other SPR's across the region to avoid duplication in the work to gather background information.

Ingrid Vanderschot gave a presentation on the "*Source Protection Advisory Committee, Telecon materials.*" A Source Protection Policy Advisory Committee (SPPAC) set up through Conservation Ontario has been meeting bi-weekly to discuss methods of sharing information. The presentation ties into the two discussion papers (7b.iv, v.) and was given at last SPPAC teleconference.

Key points;

Two methods of sharing information will be used. A web forum is being devised whereby policies can be posted and project managers, SPC Chairs, DWSP staff, and SPC members, can make comments. Working groups are being established to provide threat background papers.

- The *web forum structure* was displayed on screen and reviewed. It was noted this is a collaboration tool for policy development not the actual plan policies. It is a method to generate ideas, not for public viewing. As

Oxford County has the lead for developing policies in their area, this too will allow them to be informed and access the same tools used elsewhere in the region and across the province.

- *Working groups* will work together across the province to compile threat based background papers much like the Threat Policy Discussion Papers that we will be developing in this SPR. As part of these Policy Development Discussion Papers, the twenty one prescribed drinking water threats listed will be reviewed. Due to Southwestern Region being the heartland of agricultural activities, someone from this region may take a leadership role.

Oxford County has been engaging the Lake Erie Region municipal groups and Melissa Sherran spoke about the process in that region. Consistency was noted as important and it will be important to work closely with other regions to ensure this happens.

Background papers will be written and collaborated on by the working groups. The provincial working groups do not write policies. The time frame to gather information is in the next three to four months. Cataraqui Region has provided their draft papers as a starting point for working group discussion.

A question was asked of whether the working groups will be tapping into other organizations such as agriculture. This will be brought forward to Conservation Ontario for consideration and the importance of having local experts involved was noted.

The Committee broke for lunch from 12:10-12:50 p.m.

A brief summary of the Discussion Papers reviewed prior to lunch was given. No concerns were brought forward by the committee on the Drinking Water Threat Policy Discussion Paper outline, or on the SP policy development framework discussion paper.

SPP Policy Discussions Timelines chart

A SPP Policy Discussion timeline chart was reviewed showing the timelines scheduled to complete the work, starting December 2010 to January 2012. Each threat policy discussion paper from the SP policy development framework discussion paper is included in the schedule. In the schedule some consideration of how long each topic may take as well as when they should start. Priorities established by the SPC at their last meeting were considered including using septic systems as a test. A minimum of three months is expected for each, to go through the various steps.

- Organic solvents and DNAPLs with Dean Edwardson's assistance were deemed high priority and will begin at the February meeting.
- Fuel will be looked at in March.
- Agriculture and managed lands will be left until we have provincial background papers in March-April.
- Transportation/Waste Disposal will be done in the summer.

8) Information

a) Members appointments

The Striking committee has interviewed candidates for vacant SPC positions. One position was filled and the other will be re-posted with the intent to appoint someone by January 2011. The vacant Vice-Chair role will be determined when the vacant seats are filled.

The 2011 SPC Meeting Schedule was distributed and is posted on the website. The meetings will conform to the second Friday of each month with the exception of the months where holidays will affect it. The proposed meeting schedule is also dependent on the consultation schedule for the Assessment Reports.

9) In camera session

None

10) Other Business

None.

11) MOE Liaison Report

Teresa McLellan reported the province wide training sessions are continuing. If the SPC has any feedback on the training, please advise her. The Ministry is working on policy guidance. Another SP liaison officer is being hired to share the workload. The Ministry is continuing to work through the approval process and the Upper Thames AR may take longer due to the size.

12) Members Reports

Don McCabe- reported on his attendance at a Global Conference on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change in the Netherlands. He highlighted the global water foot print and lessons that can be learned.



Sheldon Parsons-reported the IPZ3 working group met and have another meeting scheduled in mid-December.

Charles Sharina-asked about wind turbine updates. No new news.

13) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m. Next meeting is scheduled for December 10, 2010.