



LAKE ERIE REGION SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, June 2, 2011

The following are the minutes of the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee meeting held on Thursday, June 2, 2011 at the Grand River Conservation Authority Administration Office, 400 Clyde Road, Cambridge, ON.

Members Present: C. Ashbaugh, Chair; H. Cornwell, R. Haggart, J. Harrison, A. Henry, C. King, R. Krueger, I. Macdonald, J. Oliver, D. Parker, L. Perrin, R. Seibel, M. Wales, W. Wright-Cascaden

Members Regrets: M. Ceschi-Smith, P. General, M. Goldberg, K. Hunsberger, J. Laird, G. Montour, D. Murray, T. Schmidt, B. Ungar, P. Wilson, D. Woolcott

Proxy Representatives: *P. Busatto (J. Laird), S. Kongara (M. Ceschi-Smith), I. Macdonald (B. Ungar), L. Perrin (D. Murray), W. Wright-Cascaden (M. Goldberg & D. Woolcott), N. Kodousek (T. Schmidt & P. Wilson)

Liaisons: L. Ross, Provincial Liaison; J. Farwell, SPA Liaison

Region Management Committee: C. Evanitski, LPRCA; C. Murray, KCCA; R. Sackrider, LPRCA; K. Smale, CCA; E. VanHooren, KCCA

Staff: S. Brocklebank, GRCA; S. Cooke, GRCA; N. Davy, GRCA; J. Etienne, GRCA; L. Heyming, GRCA; E. Hodgins, Region of Waterloo; C. Jacques, LPRCA; M. Keller, GRCA; L. Lobe, Region of Waterloo; T. Ryan, GRCA; D. Schultz, GRCA; T. Seguin, GRCA; E. Stahl, GRCA; H. Waite, County of Oxford; A. Wong, GRCA; G. Zwiers, GRCA

1. Call to Order

C. Ashbaugh called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Certification of Quorum – 17 Members Constitute a Quorum (2/3 of members)

The Recording Secretary called the roll and certified quorum.

3. Chairman's Remarks

C. Ashbaugh welcomed members, staff and guests and noted that the public meetings for the notice of plan commencement have been going well. He thanked municipal and conservation authority staff and source protection committee members attending the meetings for their support and dedication.

4. Review of Agenda

Moved by: A. Henry
Seconded by: R. Krueger **carried unanimously**

THAT the agenda for the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee Meeting of June 2, 2011 be approved as distributed.

5. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest made in relation to the matters to be dealt with.

6. Minutes of Previous Meeting – May 5, 2011

Moved by: D. Parker
Seconded by: L. Perrin **carried unanimously**

THAT the minutes of the previous meeting May 5, 2011 be approved as distributed.

7. Hearing of Delegations

None

8. Presentations

None

9. Correspondence

a) Copies for Members

None

b) Not Copied

None

10. Reports

a) SPC-11-06-01 Draft Updated Kettle Creek Source Protection Area Assessment Report Public Comments

S. Brocklebank provided an overview of Report SPC-11-06-01.

R. Haggart asked how individuals who provided comments on the assessment report will be notified how their comments were taken into consideration. S. Brocklebank advised that the comments and the response to the comments are included in Appendix A of the

d) SPC-11-06-04 Livestock Grazing/Pasturing Discussion Paper

H. Waite provided an overview of SPC-11-06-04 and the Livestock Grazing/Pasturing Discussion Paper.

D. Parker commented that the discussion paper appears to have omitted dead stock control. M. Keller responded that the livestock grazing/pasturing discussion paper would not be the appropriate place to consider dead stock, and suggested that it would be better placed under waste. He added, however, that he does not believe dead stock is being considered under waste either, and suggested that this is more an omission of the regulation rather than the discussion papers. L. Ross added that dead stock is exempt from Source Protection Planning because there are other regulations in which it is addressed.

J. Oliver pointed out that he thought it was agreed at a previous meeting that there would be merit in the project team providing some sort of ranking of the policy options. M. Keller responded that this recommendation was taken back to the project team, and the project team expressed concern that a robust evaluation system and criteria would be required to rank the policy options; otherwise the ranking would be a subjective exercise. The project team was also concerned that ranking the policy options may impact the municipalities' flexibility when selecting policy options. As a compromise, they are using wording like 'most promising' and 'most useful' in the discussion papers. W. Wright-Cascaden added that the project team tried to include some sample policies that they thought were the most realistic for the broadest range of municipalities. She noted that there are still choices within those examples, but the examples provide a starting point. Because of the wide range of resources of the municipalities it would have been too prescriptive to have adopted a "good, better, best" ranking of the policy options.

R. Haggart asked how the discussion papers are being released to municipalities, noting that he has a number of organizations that are interested in reviewing the discussion papers once released. M. Keller responded that the discussion papers are being released to municipalities via e-mail, through the municipal water services and planning directors group. He added that it is also posted on the website as part of the agenda.

N. Kodousek asked if there will be a recommendation to implement common programs if there are synergies between various municipalities and if some recommendations could be directed towards the Ministry. She noted that although some programs already exist, any new programs would require funding, and funding will affect how municipalities do their policy evaluations. M. Keller replied that, although proposed policies can be directed to the province, in many cases they can only be recommendations. Whereas, policies directed towards the municipalities are a requirement for the most part. The cost will be, in many cases, the deciding factor. There are no commitments from the province with respect to future funding, although that is something this region can advocate. L. Ross pointed out that there is funding available under the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program until 2012 but beyond that, there has been no formal commitment. She noted however, the Source Protection Programs branch is currently investigating possible funding models for implementation and the chairs and project managers will be involved in that discussion.

