



SPC MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 13, 2012
Meeting # 46

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m. on January 13, 2012 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority (SCRCA) Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

Bob Bedggood	Jim Reffle (HU Liaison)
Brent Clutterbuck	Joe Salter
Pat Donnelly	Charles Sharina
Dean Edwardson	Augustus Tobias
Pat Feryn	John Trudgen
Paul Hymus	John Van Dorp
Joe Kerr	Joe Van Overberghe
Carl Kennes	Teresa McLellan (Provincial Liaison)
George Marr	
James Maudsley	
Don McCabe	
Earl Morwood	
Valerie M'Garry	
Darrell Randall	

Regrets:

Murray Blackie (SPA Liaison)
Doug McGee
Kennon Johnson
Sheldon Parsons

Holly Waite
Patrick Sobeski
Darlene Whitecalf

Staff:

Chris Tasker	Rick Battson
Deb Kirk	Bonnie Carey
Derekica Snake	Melissa Kiddie
Girish Sankar	
Steve Clark	Paul Michiels, Oxford County
Linda Nicks	Sharilyn Johnston, Aamjiwaang FN



1) Chair's Welcome

Bob Bedggood welcomed the committee and acknowledged there was not a quorum; a quorum was established mid-morning. A copy of the draft agenda for an upcoming *Source Protection Plan Early Engagement* meeting being held in Perth South on January 18, 2012 was circulated to the committee. Bob advised the committee he would be attending along with Joe Salter. The meeting will provide an opportunity for the County of Perth and City of Stratford and Town of St Marys to prepare for pre-consultation. Bob also made note of a recent article in the Kindcardine Independent titled "*Septic Inspection program helping to improve water quality in Huron-Kinloss*" which outlined the benefits to water quality when septic systems are inspected.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Jim Maudsley-seconded by Charles Sharina

"RESOLVED that the agenda be approved."

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

There were no delegations.

4) Minutes from Previous Meeting

Moved by George Marr-seconded by Dean Edwardson

"RESOLVED that the December 9, 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) Municipal Policy Advisory Committee Update

The comments from the *Municipal Policy Advisory Committee* (MPAC) were distributed to the committee in November. The remaining Threats Discussion papers associated with waste disposal, stormwater management, sewage treatment, industrial sewage and local threats were forwarded to the MPAC in December for comment. To date, no comments have been submitted.

b) Threats Discussion Paper update

The Threats Discussion paper table was circulated to provide the committee with a progress update. As indicated in the MPAC update, all threats discussion papers have been submitted to the MPAC. Draft policies associated with *Education and Outreach, Incentives, Prescribed Instruments, Land Use Planning, S.57 Prohibition, S.58 Risk Management Plans* and *S.59 Restricted Land Use* have been developed and brought to the committee prior to this meeting. The final policy tool discussion papers “*S.26 Other*” and “*Monitoring Policies*” will be discussed later in the meeting.

c) First Nations update

Bob Bedggood welcomed and introduced Sharilyn Johnston, an Environmental Officer from Aamjiwaang First Nations who is to be appointed by the London District Chief’s Council as the new SPC representative, replacing Kennon Johnson. The Southern First Nations Secretariat will be providing a letter to formalize this.

7) Business

a) Draft Policies for pre-consultation

i. S.26 Other Tools

The “*S.26 Other Tools*” draft policy tool discussion paper was circulated prior to the January 13, 2012 meeting. Tools outlined within S.26 of Reg.287/07 manage a threat activity by non-regulatory means and include Stewardship Programs, Best Management Programs, Pilot Programs, Govern Research and Specify Action.

Through the Threat Discussion paper development phase, the committee indicated that there should be policies developed using this policy tool.

As policy development progressed it was apparent that many of these threats were covered through the other tools that have been provided. The concept of compiling the ideas not covered by policy in a separate document as general recommendations was brought forth to the committee.

The policies have been separated into three categories:

- Policies affecting municipalities
- Policies affecting the province
- Policies affecting other stakeholders

The committee was asked to consider which policies outlined in the document should be highlighted as important to retain and which ones should be removed. The policies highlighted for the committee's review and consideration included those pertaining to the Municipal Act, inspections, low/moderate threats, transport pathways, spills prevention, contingency and emergency response plans and local threats.

The following provides a summary of the policies discussed:

Policies Affecting Municipalities

- *OT.M.3.5.0* “Municipalities shall be encouraged, through the powers granted under the Municipal Act”. Sewer use by-laws have been discussed at length; points: a) through d) to be retained.
- *OT.M.3.5.3* refers to the mandatory inspection policy for septic systems as per the Building Code Act. This policy is to be retained.
- *OT.M.3.7.0 and OT.M.3.7.1* policies encouraging the discretionary maintenance inspection of small septic systems and development of management plans at airports were identified as policies affecting low and moderate risks. These policies are to be retained.
- *O.T.M.3.8.0.1* Policy pertaining to transport pathways.
 - Subsection d) “...municipalities shall consider a risk management plan would be negotiated with property owners where a transport pathway as a result of Earth Energy Systems has been identified as contributing to a significant drinking water threat”. This policy will be re-worded: A RMP would be negotiated with property owners where a transport pathway as a result of Earth Energy Systems/“Geothermal Bore Holes” has been identified as “possibly” contributing to a significant drinking water threat. Additional text will be included to clarify transport pathways are

not a threat but could increase the level of vulnerability; therefore RMP would need to include these conditions, ensuring the well meets code. The first paragraph leading into this section will be reworded to deal with a transport pathway as a potential of increasing risk. The definition of Earth Energy/Geothermal boreholes (closed loop is not a well and an open looped is a well) is provided in the threats transport pathway discussion paper.

- OT.M.3.6.0 a) the wording to be clearer; the word municipality on second line will be removed. This point to be retained in recommendations.
- OT.M.3.8.0.2 “municipalities shall notify the SPA and the SPC if a person applies to the municipality for the approval of a proposal to engage in any activity in a WHPA or IPZ that may result in the creation of a new transport pathway or the modification of an existing transport pathway” highlights the requirement outlined in the regulation. Under OT.0.3.3.1 and OT.0.3.3.2 developing a notification program is recommended for municipalities and the province/federal agencies.
- OT.M.2.8.0.3 “municipalities shall consider using qualified professionals to determine the effect of municipal infrastructure and development servicing on the vulnerability of a WHPA in order to manage transport pathways so that they do not “*possibly increase the risk*” to municipal drinking water.
- OT.M.3.9.0 policies pertain to spills prevention, spills contingency and emergency response plans. Under c) Encouraging mining operations to share spills response plans, site sampling and monitoring activities where the storage of mine tailings from mining operations is a significant threat to drinking water. Mine tailings are outlined in matrix and how these are dealt with may exclude them due to there not being any in this region.
 - e) in the sentence “*consider updating emergency response plans for industrial sewage effluent to include requirements for contacting water treatment operators if overflow/by-pass occurs*” the word “*industrial*” to be removed.
 - The last paragraph should read “*for existing spill prevention, spill contingency and emergency response plans, the implementation of this policy shall be 1 year after the effective date of the Source Protection Plan. For new plans, this policy shall be implemented immediately following the effective date of the Source Protection Plan*”.
- OT.M.3.10.0 policies pertain to local threats (St. Clair Region only).

- Adding pipelines and IPZ's to the mapping was suggested. Clarification was given on pipelines; When pipelines cross rivers and ditches in an IPZ area, pipes are very well designed and are regulated for protection; they are not being prohibited.
- Under ii) road signs were discussed; the details are being worked on in collaboration with Ministry of Transportation which may result in a standard policy and the signage will have consistent SWP branding across the province.
- Under iii) *review* rather than *boosting* will be used in reference to emergency response programs. Caution was suggested in the wording to take the demand off of the local fire department. The wording will be changed to “Municipalities shall consider “*reviewing*” rather than “*improving*” their emergency reporting program with regard to their ability to contain chemical spills.” The examples of training, equipment will be removed.
- Under iv) wording to be changed to reviewing of their water treatment plant response time and equipment, the word “*upgrading*” removed.
- Under vi). Municipalities do not have the ability to share IPZ-3 flow data; Conservation Authorities have this information. The SPA/CA to share flow data with the Ministry of Environment to be used in response to spill incidents in this area.

Break 11:10- 11:20 a.m.

S.26 Other Policies Affecting the Province.

- OT.P. 2.2.0 OMAFRA to include voluntary Nutrient Management Strategies and Plans in its review program where agricultural activities have been identified as significant threats to drinking water was highlighted as not being required if RMP is the tool for dealing with these threats. The committee determined that it should still remain as a policy.
- OT.P.3.3.0, OT.P.3.3.1, OT.P.3.3.2 were reviewed and discussed and will remain in policy.
- OT.P.3.3.3 outlines “*encouraging*” the province to develop compliance monitoring program for large septic systems. The last line of “*Systems found to be deficient shall be encouraged to undertake improvements to be in compliance*” was questioned and whether the word *encouraging* can be changed to *require*. The province does not have to comply with *Specify Action* and cannot be forced to do inspection programs through the *Prescribed Instrument* (PI). The PI can outline the property owner be required to have the system inspected by a qualified person (installer)

every 5 years as per the requirement under the Building Code. The compliance program at MOE can be for them to monitor and ensure these inspections are being done

A discussion on whether the expansion of a septic system will be permitted due to better standards/technologies which should improve the situation. Replacement system includes expansion. Clarification will be added allowing for expansion.

- OT.P.3.3.4 the province shall consider as a priority, geo-referencing Environmental Compliance Approvals (new term for Certificates of Approval). If geo-referencing is under *Specify Action* it does not bind the province but under the tools of *Prescribed Instrument* or *Monitoring* it is binding.
- OT.P.3.3.5 To manage the threat of handling and storage of fuel, the province shall consider requiring the removal of “*unused*” fuel storage tanks in vulnerable areas. “*Unused*” will be changed to “*abandoned*”. If it is an abandoned tank it is not being maintained and it needs to be removed. Additional wording to include this applies only where it is a significant threat and the tank owner who may not be present. If the tank is still maintained, the tank would not have to be removed.
- OT.P.3.5.1 Policies pertain to Spill Prevention, Spills Contingency and Emergency Response Plans. When the SPP comes into affect, the province shall consider reviewing and updating procedures of the Spills Action Centre. The expectation of the Spills Action Centre to notify the water systems operators will be included.
- OT.P.3.5.2 Within 1 year of the effective date of the SPP, the province shall consider decreasing the minimum volume spill reporting requirements in areas where handling and storage of fuel is a significant drinking water threat. A discussion of what is considered a spill, and if quantities should be established. This policy pertains to spills of fuel in IPZ-1 with a vulnerability score of 8 or 9 (edge of Chanel Ecarte and water front at LAWSS). The MOE determines quantity and when reporting is required. The committee agreed to prohibit handling of fuel in these areas; policy will be removed.
- OT.P.3.5.3 When the SPP comes into effect the province shall consider being lead for all fuel spills occurring within vulnerable areas; policy to be removed as the *Spills Action Centre* determines who is contacted.
- OT.P.3.6.0 Policies pertain to local threats policies. These policies were reviewed and will remain.

S.26 Other Policies Affecting Other Stakeholders

- The Ministry of Transportation provided a general comment letter to the Source Protection Project Managers related to salt management. This letter indicated salt management plans are in place already and it would be too difficult on a site specific scale to include identified vulnerable areas in their plans.
- The policies in this section associated with the application and handling/storage of road salt and the storage of snow will be removed and included in the separate recommendation document.

ii. Monitoring Policies

Monitoring and reporting are important elements of the Source Protection Plan because they evaluate the effectiveness of the policies that have been developed. The *Monitoring and Reporting* policy tool discussion paper was circulated and discussed.

Through the Threats Discussion paper development phase, the SPC developed specific requirements for monitoring. A “*Monitoring Policies Detail Table*” attached to the policy tool discussion paper was developed to summarize these specific details. These specific details have posed a challenge in the development of monitoring policies. Challenges identified at the committee meeting included:

- Municipalities may submit pieces which could not be assembled consistently to report on a regional level.
- February 1 is a busy time in general for municipalities and reporting. This reporting date for RMO is prescribed in the regulation and is not flexible.
- A concern was noted of being careful on what is required for the monitoring reports; cross-boundary issues may occur.

The concept of developing more general monitoring policies and supporting guidance document that would support the specific details was brought forth to the SPC. This concept is similar to the Education and Outreach policies.

The six *draft policies* were reviewed and discussed.

- Under the “*Rationale*” section the last paragraph will be re-written for clarity
- The additional reporting requirements for the RMO, which are already entrenched in the regulations will be included in the monitoring policies
- #1 no changes required.

- #2 “the information collected through these monitoring programs shall be included in a monitoring report”. The word “*annual*” to be included.
- #3 “the monitoring report shall be submitted annually to the Conservation Authority...”. The “*notwithstanding the above*” to be removed. “Conservation Authorities are required to report annually to the SPA in the implementation of policies for which they are the implementer”. Replace the word “*they*” with Conservation Authority.
- #4 “Monitoring reports shall include information since the submission of the previous monitoring report to December 31 of the year previous to the deadline of the report...” A reference to O.Reg.287 will be made.
- #5 a note was made that only guidance that is available by February 1 needs to be adhered to. The monitoring reports need to be developed upfront and built into business processes so the information can be generated and submitted. The goal being for the reports to be delivered to the CA’s and then compiled into a database so that higher level reports can be generated to summarize the information.
- #6 Due dates were determined considerable discussion across the province. This date will be consistent in most Source Protection Plans. All annual monitoring report needs to be delivered to the Director May 1, 2012.

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

b) Policy Matrix

The “*Overview of Policy Approaches*” chart was circulated for review and discussion. The table provides a high level comparison of the draft policy tool choices.

The chart color coding was described as follows:

- Blue shows conflicts between and the Lake Erie Region (developed by Oxford County for LER SPP) and Thames, Sydenham Region (TSR) draft policy tool choices;
- Green outlines gaps in TSR draft policies,
- Orange identifies conflicts within TSR draft policies.

Summary of each point of conflict between LER and TSR:

- TSR has used Section 59 Restricted Land Use (RLU) wherever Part IV tools (S.57 prohibition and S.58 risk management plans) have been identified for future in order to key into the planning process.

1. The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act.
 - TSR and Oxford County treated the activities associated with this threat in a different manner. Oxford County chose to use Prescribed Instruments (PI) to manage all existing activities and to use Risk Management Plans (RMP) where the PI was not required. For future activities, Oxford used PI to prohibit and where PI was not required to use S.57 prohibition. Paul Michiels of Oxford County explained that they treated all waste threats the same for consistency.
 - TSR chose to identify specific activities under this threat (application of untreated septage, tailings from mines and waste disposal sites).
 - For existing and future application of untreated septage, prohibition using PI was identified.
 - A gap existed in the TSR draft policy tool choice with regards to tailings from a mine. Since this activity has not been identified with the TSR and the fact that it is unlikely to become a significant threat to drinking water, the committee decided to treat existing and future the same and use PI to prohibit this activity. Where PI is not required, this activity would be prohibited through S.57 prohibition.
 - For waste disposal sites, existing would be managed through PI and future would be prohibited through PI.
 - After some discussion, the committee decided to keep the policy tool choices as they had been identified for TSR however the PI would be backstopped by either S.57 prohibition or S.58 risk management plans when a PI was not required. Oxford County's draft policy wording would be used to reflect those areas that are not subject to PI.
 - Oxford County was willing to change their policy to PI prohibit for existing application of untreated septage and tailings from mines eliminating this gap.
2. The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.
 - Storm Water Management. The discharge of untreated storm water from a storm water retention pond is the threat sub-category. The threats database outlines 25 circumstances making storm management ponds a significant threat. These circumstances are where the drainage area is greater than 100 hectares and the predominate land use is rural, agricultural, low density residential, high density residential or industrial;/commercial and where the drainage area is 10 to 100 hectares and the predominate land uses is industrial/commercial.

- TSR prohibited future Storm Water Management ponds through PI in WHPA-A and B. These ponds were prohibited in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 because these areas could be more vulnerable than WHPA-A.
- Oxford County chose to prohibit these ponds in WHPA-A through PI and land use planning. In WHPA-B Oxford chose to manage these ponds through PI and land use planning. The reasoning for this was that if they were prohibited it could then eliminate any development in areas where it may be logical to have a storm water management pond. Although LER is treating WHPA-A and B differently they could be persuaded to prohibit *communal* stormwater management ponds and manage *site specific* stormwater management ponds; to be determined during pre-consultation.
- Sewage treatment effluent and sewage storage is no longer a conflict. Oxford County used PI and land use planning (LUP) to prohibit future which is what TSR has done as well. TSR needs to revise the general LUP draft policy to include prohibition through PI.

4. Handling and Storage of ASM

- For future handling and storage of ASM, TSR chose to use RMP to manage permanent facilities, while future temporary facilities have been prohibited through S.57 prohibition. Section 59 Restricted land use (RLU) would compliment these part IV tools. Oxford County has not made a distinction between permanent and temporary facilities. Oxford County has prohibited future ASM storage through S.57 prohibition and LUP due to local knowledge and the current status in the Official Plan (OP) (which already prohibits storage of ASM in these areas). The decision was to keep TSR policy tool choices and acknowledge that this is an area where policy may be different in Oxford than the rest of the region.

7. Handling and Storage of NASM

- Within future handling and storage of NASM there were two types of conflicts.
- One was a conflict between TSR draft policy tool choices. One policy manages this threat (through PI and S.58 RMP) while another prohibits this threat (S.57 prohibition).
- The second type of conflict was with Oxford policy choices. Oxford County was prohibiting this activity through PI. Prohibition is not prohibiting the issuance of the instrument but the prohibition of the activity in the area through the instrument.
- The intent is consistent that the storage should not be located within the vulnerable areas where it would be a significant threat.

- After discussion the committee agreed to follow Oxford County's direction and use *prohibit* using PI tool as well as S.57 prohibition.

9. Handling and Storage of Commercial Fertilizer

- The conflict between TSR and Oxford County was in the future handling and storage of commercial fertilizer. Initially TSR decided to prohibit short term (temporary storage) of commercial fertilizer through S.57 prohibition and manage permanent storage of commercial fertilizer through S.58 RMP. Oxford County had did not make a distinction between the different types of storage and prohibited this threat through S.57 prohibition.
- A discussion occurred as to the definition of storage and whether a policy could be written for temporary storage. Temporary storage and permanent storage need to be clearly defined. There are specific circumstances regulate the threat. The committee has identified temporary storage of fertilizer as part of this threat but it may not be outlined in the MOE tables therefore writing policy may not apply.
- After a discussion, it was determined that TSR will deal with existing permanent storage using RMPs and prohibit (s.57 prohibition) temporary storage. Future handling and storage (temporary and permanent) will be prohibited through S.57 prohibition.

11. Handling and storage of pesticides

- Future handling and storage of pesticides - Oxford County proposes using S.57 prohibition when handling and storage of pesticides greater than 2500 kg which is related to manufacturing, distribution or processing. This would only apply to specific pesticides and this needs to be described. This type of policy was missing from TSR. The discussion resulted in following Oxford's lead.

13. Handling and Storage of Road Salt

- For existing handling and storage of road salt, TSR prohibited this activity through S.57 prohibition because no road salt storage areas that fit the circumstances had not been identified during the Assessment Report. Oxford County used S.58 RMP for this activity because the RMP would address the circumstances and this then would not be a significant threat. Oxford County agreed to change their policy to prohibit.

14. Storage of Snow

- For the storage of snow, the SPC decided there could be areas such as large parking lots where the only option would be to place the snow in vulnerable areas. TSR made a distinction between non-transported snow and transported snow. TSR used S.58 RMP to manage non-transported snow while transported snow would be prohibited by S.57 prohibition for future.

Oxford County did not make this distinction and have used S.57 prohibition to prohibit this threat since this is not an issue in Oxford County as there are areas where the snow can be placed outside the vulnerable areas.

Summary of Gaps within TSR Draft Policy Tool Choices

Gaps in TSR's proposed policy tool choice were identified for a limited number of threats. The following is a summary of each gap identified and discussed:

1. The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act
 - Tailings from mine operations
 - As discussed above, a gap existed in TSR draft policy tool choice with regards to tailings from a mine. The committee decided to treat existing and future the same and use PI to prohibit the activity. Where PI is not required, this activity would be prohibited through Section 57 prohibition.
2. The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage
 - Septic systems
 - A gap existed in TSR draft policy tool choice with regards to existing large septic systems. After a short discussion, the committee decided that existing large septic systems should be managed through amending the certificate of approval (C of A) by including conditions such as monitoring, contingency planning and inspections. Oxford County's draft wording will be used to reflect this.

15 Handling and Storage of Fuel

- For handling and storage of fuel, TSR suggested a variety of situations to be considered under this threat however volumes of 250 to 2500 L were not discussed. After some discussion, the committee agreed to use S.58 RMP to manage existing activities associated with volumes of 250 to 2500 L (below grade) and greater than 2500 L (above and below grade). Section 57 prohibition will be used to prohibit future activities associated with these volumes in vulnerable areas.
- The committee agreed that there would be an exception to this policy for back-up generators used for sewage works and water supply. Section 58

RMP would be used to manage both the existing and future storage of fuel for these generators.

21. The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm animal yard

- o Existing outdoor confinement areas within an IPZ will be managed and future will be prohibited. A confinement was defined as animals receiving 50% of food brought into the area. It was noted grazing is difficult to identify as permits are not required for this. This activity was only considered for WHPA-A and WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. The threats database shows it is significant in an IPZ with vulnerability of 9-10. This was not included within the Policy Tool matrix that was passed out to the committee since this does not apply to Oxford County. TSR policy tool choices did not reflect IPZ. In the IPZ the committee agreed to manage existing outdoor confinement areas and prohibit new and for grazing to manage both existing and future. This would be consistent with the how the threats are dealt with in the WHPA. It was also noted that how existing and future is defined will be important.

Summary of Conflicts Found with TSR Draft Policy Tool Choices

Through the development of the policy tool matrix, conflicts within TSR draft policies were identified. The following is a summary of these conflicts:

16 Handling and Storage of Dense Non-aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPLs)

- o The conflict within TSR's draft policy tool choices for DNAPLs was associated with the future handling and storage of DNAPLs. The policy tool choices indicated that both S.57 prohibition and S.58 RMP should be used for this threat. After some discussion, the committee decided that S.57 prohibition would be the tool to use for quantities of these chemicals that are not typical of household use in WHPA-A and B with a vulnerability score of 10. S.58 RMP would be used for these chemicals in WHPA-B and C.

A motion was passed to prohibit future handling and storage of DNAPL in WHPA-A and Bs with a vulnerability score of 10 and manage future handling and storage of DNPAL in WHPA-B and WHPA-C.

Moved by George Marr-seconded by Pat Feryn

“RESOLVED that new handling and storage facilities associated with DNAPLs will be prohibited in WHPA-A and B's with a vulnerability score of 10 and managed in WHPA-B and C.

CARRIED.

- A second conflict was identified for this threat. DNAPLs are considered hazardous waste and must be managed throughout their lifecycle. In terms of waste disposal, the conflict was that existing and future waste disposal of DNAPLs should be both managed and prohibited by PI. After some discussion, the committee agreed that existing waste disposal containing DNAPLs should be managed through PI. Future waste disposal containing DNAPLs should be prohibited in WHPA-A and B with a vulnerability score of 10 through PI.

17- Handling and Storage of Organic solvents

- The same conflicts that were flagged in the handling and storage of DNAPLs applied to the handling and storage of organic solvents. The committee agreed to use the same tools for future handling and storage of organic solvents and waste disposal. The one exception was that this threat is not significant outside of WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10.

21. The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm animal yard

- The conflict within this threat was within future outdoor confinement areas. The draft policy tool choices indicated that S.57 prohibition and S.58 RMP should be used for this threat. After some discussion the committee agreed to prohibit new outdoor confinement areas through S.57 prohibition.

c) Pre-consultation

As per the previous meeting, the committee was advised that the draft policies are not ready to be taken out for pre-consultation as further refinement is required.

8) Information

a) Spills Action Centre update

Teresa McLellan gave a presentation on an “Overview of the Spills Action Centre”. The presentation provided an overview of the MOE Spills Action Centre procedure cards based on Canada-US Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, reporting details,

primary assessment of spills, spills to watercourses and spills to Great Lakes. An incident in Port Lambton on December 20, 2011 was provided as a case study.

b) MOE Guidance

None.

9) In Camera Session

None.

10) Other business

Source Protection Plans across the province will differ in formatting, naming conventions, numbering etc. Since Regional boundaries may cause some issues in policies not being the same, the question of how to deal with cross over properties was asked. Although there may not be consistency in the wording of policies, the intent is to have harmony between the policies. TSR will structure its SPP so that there will be index tables to help organize the policies.

11) MOE Liaison Report

None.

12) Members Reports

Time did not permit for member's reports.

13) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m. The next workshop is scheduled for February 3, 2012 and the next SPC meeting is scheduled for February 10, 2012.