



SPC MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 18, 2011
Meeting # 44

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on November 18, 2011 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority (SCRCA) Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

Bob Bedggood	Patrick Sobeski
Dean Edwardson	Augustus Tobias
Pat Feryn	John Trudgen
Paul Hymus	John Van Dorp
George Marr	Joe Van Overberghe
Earl Morwood	Darlene Whitecalf
James Maudsley	
Doug McGee	
Valerie M'Garry	
Darrell Randall	
Joe Salter	
Charles Sharina	

Regrets:

Murray Blackie (SPA Liaison)
Teresa McLellan (Provincial Liaison)
Brent Clutterbuck
Pat Donnelly
Joe Kerr
Kennon Johnson
Don McCabe
Sheldon Parsons
Jim Reffle (HU Liaison)
Carl Kennes

Staff:

Chris Tasker	Linda Nicks
Deb Kirk	Rick Battson
Derekica Snake	Melissa Kiddie
Girish Sankar	
Steve Clark	

1) Chair's Welcome

Bob Bedggood welcomed everyone. The committee was given a copy of a Drinking Water Report Card from Ecojustice entitled "*Waterproof 3*" as well as related news articles that evaluated water policies, programs and legislation across Canada. Each province and territory, as well as the federal government was given a grade based on how well they have been protecting their drinking water. Ontario received an "A" grade which has been attributed to Source Water Protection.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by James Maudsley-seconded by John Trudgen

"RESOLVED that the agenda be approved."

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

There were no delegations.

4) Minutes from Previous Meeting

Moved by Darrell Randall-seconded by Charles Sharina

"RESOLVED that the October 12, 2011 SPC meeting minutes be approved."

CARRIED.

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

a) AR status Update

The St Clair Region updated Assessment Report revisions have yet to be submitted as they were not yet approved by the SPC. In item 6. b) the AR revisions are presented for approval.

b) SCR Assessment Report Revisions approval

Comments from the Ministry of Environment have resulted in revisions to the St. Clair Region Assessment Report. A package with the revisions was circulated to the SPC. The revisions outlined were:

- IPZ-3 maps have been updated to include the sub-areas where each modeled activity is a significant threat;
- spill locations have been identified and numbered in the maps;
- a description was included to provide clarity and details on the circumstance of the spill used to model the activities;
- maps have been updated to include highways, creeks and other locations where spills were modeled; and,
- Appendix 10 now includes the local threats letter and modeled scenarios.

Moved by John Van Dorp-seconded by John Trudgen

“RESOLVED that the SPC approve and accept revisions to the St. Clair Region Assessment Report for submission to the Ministry of Environment.”

CARRIED.

c) Municipal Policy Advisory Committee Update

Melissa Kiddie reported the Municipal Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) continues to review the updated discussion papers. The MPAC has been given all the discussion papers to date with the exception of Spills Prevention Plans and Transport Pathways. A concern was noted at the previous SPC meeting of MPAC comments resulting in changes to the draft policies. A table was distributed outlining all of the comments to date. The committee will be informed of how these comments have been incorporated into draft policies.

d) First Nations Liaison Committee Update

Derekica Snake reported the First Nations Liaison Committee meeting is scheduled for the end of the month. There have also been inquiries of having a water festival on the First Nations lands.

Darlene Whitecalf reported there has been no progress in meeting with the London Districts Chief's Council pertaining to Walpole Island and the SPC representative, however, she is continuing her attempts. Augustus Tobias gave an update on the recent conference he attended in Orillia and of the positive responses from various First Nations concerning Source Water Protection.

e) Threats Discussion Paper Update

An updated "*Threats Discussion Paper Table*" was circulated to the committee outlining the status of each discussion paper.

f) Cross Jurisdictional Report

Brian McDougall gave an update on cross jurisdictional issues. He reported the First Nations Liaison Committee is an avenue to gather information and receive acceptance of the maps from Walpole First Nations. Darlene Whitecalf, Augustus Tobias and Derekica Snake will attempt to arrange a formal meeting with Walpole First Nations to discuss cross-jurisdictional issues and the lack of understanding of them.

Brian has contacted some of the American water treatment plant operations and has obtained "*Source Water Assessment Reports*" He reported it is a large volume of information requiring simplification and when this is done it will be provided.

A question was asked of whether spills prevention information is included for the American side. Scientific research available relates more to assessing where their water is coming from, as opposed to what happens if a spill occurs. The studies are not consistent.

7) Business

a) Policy Tool Matrix

A "*Policy Tool Matrix*" table was circulated. The matrix was developed as a result of discussions with Oxford County. The policy tools used for each threat based on the policy examples have been listed. A legend for the acronyms will be

added to the table for clarity. In the process of developing the table, once all the threats were pieced together, some inconsistencies were discovered.

One such inconsistency was with the incentive tools. Originally the policy examples suggested that incentives were suggested for existing and future threats. The question of “are incentives appropriate for future threats?” was posed to the SPC. An example of a person being eligible for an incentive for installing a new (future) septic system was used to start the discussion. Standards would have to be met if building new. After some discussion, the committee agreed the intent of an incentive was for existing threats only.

More inconsistencies may be discovered in the process of working on the draft policies and it may not be as simple as using one policy tool.

b) Nutrient Management Act as a policy tool

At the workshop held on November 10, 2011, the topic “*Nutrient Management Act as a policy tool*” was discussed. This discussion was brought to the SPC due to concerns that were raised about the functionality of the Nutrient Management Act (NMA) as a prescribed instrument for managing significant drinking water threats. Representatives from Oxford County, OMAFRA and the MOE liaison (Teresa McLellan) attended to provide the SPC members with further clarification on this topic. The highlights of this discussion were:

- As of January 1, 2011, Nutrient Management Plans (NMPs) are no longer reviewed by OMAFRA. The farmer utilizes a certified consultant to develop the NMP. As a result, pre-consultation would need to occur with each farmer in vulnerable areas. The responsibility would be on the individual farmer to update their plans without a clear understanding of the review and compliance process.
- Risk Management Plans (RMP) may be a viable alternative to using the prescribed instrument tool for agricultural threats since farmers within vulnerable areas are more likely to have other threats such as fuels or pesticides that would require RMP.
- Questions asked included:
 - Nutrient Management Strategies (NMS) and NMP do not allow for the application of nutrients within 100 meters of a well. Could this be extended into areas with a vulnerability score of 10?
 - What is the utility of the NMA for commercial fertilizers?
 - How is the inspection and enforcement process implemented?

- Various options were considered with regards to the use of the NMA as a prescribed instrument
 - Go forward with pre-consultation and rely on the NMA as a prescribed instrument to deal with what it can while also relying on the RMP to fill the gaps
 - Wait for comments from MOE during pre-consultation
 - Rely on RMP

The consensus of the SPC was to use *RMPs* as the policy tool for the agricultural threats, with the *NMA* principles forming the basis of the RMP provided those requirements, in the opinion of the Risk Management Official, adequately manage the significant threat. Principles covered in Environmental Farm Plans may also be incorporated.

Moved by George Marr-seconded by John Van Dorp

“RESOLVED that the SPC endorse using Risk Management Plans as the policy tool for agricultural threats, utilizing Nutrient Management principles as the basis for managing the threats provided, in the opinion of the Risk Management Official, they adequately manage the threat .”

CARRIED.

- c) Policy concepts from workshop
 - i. Industrial Sewage

Steve Clark gave a presentation on prescribed drinking water threat #2-subthreat “*Industrial Effluent Discharges.*” The presentation gave an overview of the threat definition, local scale of the threat, key policy considerations and policy ideas from the November 10, 2011 workshop.

Key Points:

- Industrial effluent discharges can only be a drinking water threat in an IPZ or WHPA-E (GUDI) and significant threats are possible only in areas with vulnerability scores of 8 and 10.
- There are no significant threats identified in this region. Potential locations could be IPZ-1 for LAWSS (v=8) and Wallaceburg (v=9).

- “*Education and Outreach*” is proposed as a policy tool. A program will be developed by municipalities and/or other associations. Some municipalities already have programs in place.
- “*Incentives*” is not an appropriate tool in managing this threat since standards obligate compliance.
- “*Land Use Planning*” is a less effective tool and focus should be on the “*Prescribed Instrument.*”
- Under “*Prescribed Instruments*” the use of Certificates of Approval (C of As) is the most effective tool for this threat. The MOE will review C of A for significant threats.
 - a concern was raised of prohibiting issuances of new C of As where there is significant threat. After some discussion the point referring to prohibition will not be included in the draft policies and it will be documented in the discussion paper that prohibition was considered.
 - The committee agreed with the general statement of the province being required to ensure C of As are reviewed as being sufficient and to remove the list of details/requirements.
- Under “*Municipal Operations/Infrastructure*” the emphasis is on the use of “*Prescribed Instruments*” since most industrial legislation is enforced at the provincial or federal level.
- “*Risk Management Plans.*” Part IV tools cannot be used for this significant threat areas except that a sewage system which may result in a bypass discharged to surface water is exempted from the C of A process under Ontario Reg. 525/98, (Approval Exemptions). A discussion occurred of why a RMP would be necessary for a plant to operate out of compliance. Industry by-passes are rare and should be covered in a C of A through design standards which limit the potential for a bypass except under rare conditions. The bypass is more common in municipal systems where storm water enters the sanitary sewer system. Industries already have contingency plans for spills in place. The committee agreed that by-passes should be considered as a spill and therefore the threat is managed through the *Prescribed Instrument* and *Spill Contingency Plans*.
- The committee wanted more clarity of who does what during a spill. More information on this could be added if it becomes available through the consultation process.
- Under *Other/Specify Action*, MOE shall be encouraged to review and update the Spills Action Center Operations- “*Procedures Cards*” will

be remove and replaced with a more general requirement that procedures need to be updated to reflect the protection of drinking water sources and the information contained in the Assessment Report and Source Protection Plans.

d) Policy Examples for approval

i. Sewer and Sewage treatment Policy Examples

A working group developed the Sewer and Sewage treatment concepts that were used to develop policy examples. The discussion paper was circulated Nov.18, 2011 for the committee's review.

Key points:

Education and Outreach (policy example 2b-1);

- Enhance existing education and outreach programs and if they do not exist develop new programs. These programs will promote Best Management Practices.
- The promotion of the W.I.P.E (Washing Initiative to Protect our Environment) to also include residential sectors was included as the working group wanted to encompass everyone.
- Under the 4th bullet point "*The Promotion of awareness programs associated with the performance and operation of WWTPs. These programs would target operators, elected officials and the general public.*" A discussion occurred to remove operators from the list. Waste water treatment operators are all licensed now and the training is mandatory. Wording to ensure Source Protection education is included in the training should be used instead.

Incentives (policy example 2b-2);

- Municipalities to "*should consider*" rather than "shall initiate" incentive programs to conduct a review of sewers to reduce flow direct connects from weeping tiles and eaves troughs to not bind municipalities as most do this already.
- Under the policy idea; "*Municipalities shall identify illegal connections to sewer networks.*" The question of what is an illegal connection was asked and discussions were

directed to focus more on ensuring the municipalities have by-laws to address these connections.

Land Use Planning (policy example 2b-3):

- Under the policy idea: Through zoning by-laws and site plan control, municipalities shall require minimum setbacks between municipal wells and sanitary sewers. Revised to “*shall consider.*”
- Municipalities shall prohibit new or expanding sewage treatment plants in areas where they would be a significant drinking water threat. A discussion of whether prohibition should be applied to only the construction of new or should include the expansion of existing water treatment plants. It was identified that risks may be reduced if new or upgraded waste water treatment plants are permitted while other members questioned why new plants would be permitted if the risk is a possibility, especially given the limited area where these discharges could be a significant threat in this region.

Prescribed Instruments (policy example 2b-4):

- Under the policy idea which suggests that Director’s orders under s.53 (1) of the Environmental Protection Act (no person shall establish, alter, extend or replace new or existing sewage works except in accordance with an approval from the Director) be used to determine the location of sewers and sewage treatment plants, preventing the issuance of new C of As in vulnerable areas. This should be directed at sewage treatment plants in *significant threat areas*.
- It was noted that some municipalities review C of As for sewers.
- A suggestion was made that wording needed to clearly define what existing means and being sensitive to the cost benefits of enhancing/moving. The goal is to mitigate significant risk.
- It was suggested using the *Fuel Discussion Paper* as a guide to determine how new and expanding facilities were dealt with and to use the same concept for sewers and sewage treatment.

- C of A should continue to be approved through the MOE or designated (delegated) authority.

Committee broke for lunch 12:20-1:00 p.m.

After a lengthy discussion, a motion was brought forward to prohibit new sewage water treatment plants and not the expansion of existing ones since prescribed instruments manage the risk in these incidences.

Moved by Darrell Randall -seconded by Dean Edwardson

“RESOLVED that for the expansion of sewage treatment plants the policy tool prohibition will not be used.”

CARRIED.

S. 26 p.1 Other- Specify Action (policy example 2b-5))

- Under policy ideas, in the first paragraph, the examples pipe joint wrapping and seals, engineered standards for operations in WWTP to be removed.
- Municipalities, through mandatory inspection programs shall include more frequent audits where sewers or WWTP are located within vulnerable areas. *“Mandatory inspections program”* will be removed.

S. 26 p.1 Other- Specify Action (policy example 2b-6))

- Municipalities shall enact and enforce sewer use by-laws for all users regardless of scale. Enforcement would be difficult. Will be revised to *“Municipalities should be encouraged to enact sewer use by-laws to improve quality of their sewage effluent.”*
- In the monitoring policy *“this report will also include if networks have been created between different municipalities”* will be removed and is covered in the point above it, *“Municipalities shall be encouraged to network with each other to provide expertise with regards to engineering standards and practice.”*

ii. Storm Water Management Policy Examples

A working group was formed to develop the Storm Water Management concepts in order to develop policy examples. The storm water management discussion paper was circulated Nov. 18, 2011 for review.

Education and Outreach (policy example 2.1-1)

- A general policy to enhance existing education and outreach programs and if they do not exist develop new programs has been included.
- A question was asked about the point “*Additional methods of identification relating to vulnerable areas.*” An example outlined was London Victoria Park where the catch basins have fish stamped into them and signage to raise awareness.

Incentives (policy example 2.1-2)

- “*Municipalities shall consider providing incentives will be removed.*” The municipalities dictate what storm water requirements are, so there is not a need for incentives.

Land Use Planning (policy example 2.1-3)

- A concern was noted of current legislation with cleaning ponds due to settling.
- **Prescribed Instrument (policy example 2.1-4)**
- MOE shall prohibit the issuance of new C of As for storm water management ponds where they would be a significant threat.
- MOE shall review existing C of As for storm water management ponds and include conditions to mitigate the threat.

S.26 p1.Specified Action (policy example 2.1-5a)

- Under policy idea: “*Municipalities shall be required to ensure that poor storm water management facilities are brought into compliance with current standards*” will be replaced with “municipalities shall be required to ensure that existing storm water management facilities are brought into compliance with current standards”.

- Instead of “*in vulnerable areas, municipalities shall use appropriate design standards...*”, change to “municipalities shall consider requiring design standards that mitigate the risk”.

Specified Action (policy example 2.1.5c)

- Under policy idea, “*municipalities shall encourage emergency responders*” will be removed as they already do this.

iii. Waste Disposal Policy Examples

A working group was formed to develop waste disposal concepts that were used in the development of the waste disposal policy examples. The waste disposal discussion paper was provided to the committee Nov. 18, 2011 for review.

Education and Outreach (policy example 1.3-1)

- To enhance existing education and outreach programs or if they don’t exist new programs will be developed to promote best management practices. It was noted municipalities are already doing this and to avoid duplication.
- A question was asked if reporting/monitoring policy requirements are only for significant threats. If a program is in existence that satisfies the risk; it should be documented.

Incentives (policy example 1.3-2)

- A concern was raised that if Certificate of Approvals need to be updated a reapplication fee may be required, which could result in high costs for the applicant.

Land Use Planning (policy example 1.3-3)

- A concern was raised about the definition of waste disposal sites and whether the definition includes mobile sites, transfer stations, recycling stations? The definition and types of waste disposal sites indicated in the MOE tables of drinking water threats are outlined in the discussion paper. Clarity on this will be provided or the alternative might be to request landfill sites as a local threat. Municipalities who operate landfill sites or transfer stations provide an exemption within their own by-laws so if not included in this policy, they would not be covered.

Prescribed Instrument (policy example 1.3-4)

- “MOE shall prohibit the issuance of future waste site C of A where the site activity is a significant threat unless terms and conditions identified within the C of A adequately manage the threat” contradicts the land use policy. “unless terms and conditions identified within the C of A adequately manage the threat” to be removed to be consistent.

Specified Action (policy example 1.3-6)

- Under policy idea “Municipalities shall consider collaborating with each other to increase accessibility to cross municipal household hazardous waste programs in order to cease the threat from being significant.” Standard working will be used in the second part of sentence to be tweaked.

iv. Transportation Corridors Policy Examples

The Local Threat-Transportation Corridors Discussion Paper was circulated for review. This paper is based on the concept of an extreme event modeling analysis focused on the IPZ-3 regions of the Sarnia (LAWSS), Petrolia and Wallaceburg intakes within the St. Clair Region.

Education and Outreach (policy example LT-1)

- Enhance existing education and outreach programs, or if they do not exist develop new programs to promote Best Management Practices related to the transportation of fuel and fertilizer along highways and transportation of liquid petroleum through pipelines. The policy offers a tool for people to be made aware of where the IPZs are. A question was asked as to whether it was liquid fertilizer. The modeling was done with dry fertilizer being the worse case scenario as far as concentration. Liquid fertilizer is however much more mobile. Instead of using “enhance” existing education and outreach programs in was suggested to use “ensure existing programs are adequate.” If programs are already being done properly, then enhancement would not be necessary.

S.26 Other Specified Action (policy example LT-2a)

- Under policy ideas, “Municipalities shall consider developing municipal traffic regulating bylaws to prohibit transportation of fertilizers and fuel through IPZs” will be removed as it is far too restrictive.
- Municipalities shall consider where possible rerouting highways and arterial roads around more vulnerable areas.
- Municipalities shall consider placing road signs at the entrance to IPZs for emergency responders. The MTO agreed with this but also will follow their signage protocol.
- Municipalities shall consider upgrading/reviewing their water treatment plant response time and equipment. It was noted that some may already be doing this and some may not have the capability.

S.26 Other-Specified Action (policy example LT-2b)

- Further information on the *Spills Action Centre* will be provided.

S.26 Other-Specified Action (policy example LT-2c)

- MTO shall be encouraged to conduct a regional and province wide review of Emergency Detour Routes. This review would take into consideration the location of these routes through IPZs.

e) Draft Policies for pre-consultation

i. Prescribed Instruments

The *Prescribed Instruments Draft Policies* (Revised Nov. 16) was circulated and discussed.

Key Points;

- Reviewing and amending existing C of As for Waste Disposal (policy PI2.2.2 vi) and Sewage Treatment systems (policy PI2.2.2 vii) have been added.
- Based on earlier discussions, prohibiting the issuance of new C of As for waste disposal (policy PI2.2.4) will be incorporated into the draft policies.
- Policy PI2.3.1 under OWRA stipulates the time lines for C of A approval: Future C of As to be implemented

immediately following the effective date of the SPP and within one year of the effective date of the SPP for existing C of As.

- Under Policy PI.2.3.2 two additional draft policies have been developed: conditions on C of A for existing storm water management facilities and industrial sewage to manage the activity such that it is no longer a significant drinking water threat.
- Based on the earlier discussion relating to the Province prohibiting the issuance of new C of A's for sewage works (policy PI2.2.5) sanitary sewer systems are to be removed.
- Under PI.2.4 Nutrient Management Act, PI.2.4.2 was removed. This stated where the following drinking water threats are significant i) storage of ASM, ii) application of ASM, iii) application of fertilizer, iv) outdoor confinement areas or farm yards, the province (Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs) through the NMA shall review and ensure NMS and NMP required for existing or future (including expanding) operations adequately manage the risk to the extent possible. This has been replaced by "The Province (Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs) through the Nutrient Management Act shall prohibit the application of non-agricultural source material (NASMs)" only.
- Agricultural threats will be managed under RMP policies. The NMA will be used as a guideline to manage or prohibit the activity.
- For consistency, the implementation schedule outlined in 2.4.1 will stipulate for new it is effective immediately and existing is within one year and this applies equally to both 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.
- PI2.5.1 i) Prohibiting the application of pesticides "containing specific chemicals" as identified within the Provincial Drinking Water Threats Tables. The words "containing specific chemicals" were used based on comments from a member of the Municipal Policy Advisory Committee. Pesticide permits only pertain to specific pesticides, therefore the scope is very limited.
- Under Aggregate Resources Act draft policies, PI. 2.6.2 an implementation schedule was not outlined as MNR already

prohibits the importing of snow removal material at aggregate operations.

- Changes will be incorporated into draft policies for the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Water Resources Act to reflect the ideas of the committee for Sewage Treatment, Waste Disposal and Storm Water Management.

ii. Risk Management Plans

S. 58 Risk Management Plans Draft Policies (Nov 11, 2011) was circulated for review and discussion.

Key notes:

- A preamble and rationale was included outlining what the RMP is and how it can be used.
- Municipal Councils are responsible for enforcing Part IV of the CWA; which is highlighted in the rationale section.
- Policy RM.1.0 was modified to add wording from the ideas on fuels, organic solvents, livestock grazing and DNAPLs.
- Policy RM.1.1 outlines the implementation of these policies. This was discussed at the workshop. Insight was given from an Oxford rep who has taken the RMO training. The goal is to ensure the process is started with some flexibility.
- Policy 2.0 NMA will form the basis of RMP as they pertain to agricultural threats. The RMO will have authority to go beyond the NMP with solid reasons. A balance of not having an over enthusiastic RMO who looks at the risk was noted as important. Any appeal process should be based on science.
- A question was asked as to whether there will be a Risk Management Catalogue (RM.2.1). The Risk Management Catalogue will be available, MOE has been working on this for quite some time and it is eagerly awaited.
- Specific Threat Policies reviewed included: RM3.0 Fuels, RM.4.0 Aircraft Deicing.
- Under RM.5.0 *Inspection Policies* the statement “*these inspections may be combined with other inspection*”

programs such as Fire Department visits when appropriate” will be removed. The RMO should be able to inspect anytime independently and can coordinate with others if they choose to.

iii. Prohibition

The *Prohibition Draft Policy* was circulated at the workshop and was deferred to this meeting, due to time constraints.

Key Points:

- PR1.0 outlines the policies for prohibition are directed to the Prescribed Drinking Water threats as under O. Reg 287 and circumstances are found in the Drinking Water Threats Tables.
- Policy PR1.1 outlines one year from the SPP except where a specific time frame has been established. The Municipal Policy Advisory Committee had questions about this time frame not being necessary; dependent on how existing or future is defined. A conflicting comment related to budgeting and training was that it may take longer than one year. The committee agreed that prohibition polices shall be implemented immediately upon the effective date of the SPP except where otherwise established.
- Policies PR1.2, 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 have been moved to the rationale section to be consistent; covering who has the authority for RMO/agreements.
- Policy PR.2.0 outlines activities that municipalities shall prohibit. The committee decided to deal with prohibiting temporary and permanent storage the same. Safeguards may not be there for temporary storage.
- In Policy PR.2.0 b iii with regards to DNAPLS and organic solvents, household use of will be determined by the RMO and defined as “*not typical household use in the opinion of the Risk Management Official*” giving them latitude.

f) Pre-consultation

It is anticipated pre-consultation with the province on the “*Prescribed Instruments*” will happen before the next meeting but not with municipalities.

Work will continue with Oxford County keeping up to date on where they are in the process. If any major changes are required, the information will be brought back to the SPC. The goal is to not move the draft policies forward to consultation pre-maturely.

8) Information

a) SPP and Explanatory Document Outline

The SPP and Explanatory document outline was distributed for the member's information. More will follow on this at future meetings

b) MOE Guidance

None

c) SPPAC Update

Deferred until next meeting.

9) In Camera Session

None.

10) Other business

No other business.

11) MOE Liaison Report

None.

12) Members Reports

There were no member's reports due to time constraints.

13) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m. The next workshop is scheduled for Friday, December 2, 2011 and the SPC meeting is December 9, 2011. The meeting schedule up to May 2012 was circulated. The committee was asked to return their USB's at the next meeting in order to update them.