

**MINUTES OF THE FIFTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE  
NORTH BAY-MATTAWA SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
9:00 am, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2015  
Held at the North Bay-Mattawa CA Boardroom, 15 Janey Ave North Bay**

**1. Administration**

a) Meeting called to order at 9:12 am

b) Attendance Record and Quorum

<b>S P C Members</b>	<b>Staff and Liaisons</b>
Jeff Celentano, SPC Chair	Sue Miller, Manager DWSP
Randy McLaren (Arrival 9:20)	Sue Buckle, Supervisor Communications & Outreach
Dennis MacDonald	Samantha Rayner, Source Protection Specialist
Lucy Emmott (Arrival 9:30)	Mary Wooding, MOECC Liaison (Conference Call in)
Doug Brydges	Chuck Poltz, NBPSDHU Liaison
Maurice Schlosser	
George Stivrins	
Roy Warriner	
Beverley Hillier	
John MacLachlan	

c) Declaration of Pecuniary Interest – none

d) Approval of Agenda

**Motion** to approve Agenda as presented.

Moved by Dennis MacDonald, seconded by Doug Brydges (Resolution 52-01).

**Carried**

e) Approval of Minutes of November 14, 2014 SPC Meeting

**Motion** to approve Minutes as circulated.

Moved by John MacLachlan, seconded by Dennis MacDonald (Resolution 52-02).

**Carried**

f) Correspondence - none

**2. Chairs Remarks**

The SPC Chair provided a general overview of what has occurred since the last meeting in November 2014. His review noted the adoption of the Source Protection Plan that occurred in March 2015 as well as work that has gone on working towards the implementation of the policies. A specific example of implementation addressed was the Restore Your Shore program which would be discussed in further detail later in the meeting.

**3. Source Protection Planning and Implementation**

A detailed report had been provided in the meeting package that included a summary table listing each policy, implementing body, tool, whether it was mandatory, deadline for implementation, monitoring policy, and a checklist of which municipalities/agencies were affected by each. The text portion of the report described the progress on implementation of each policy.

All municipalities have implemented the Land Use Planning policies to the extent possible; some are awaiting approval from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Implementation of Education and Outreach policies is well underway as it is for most Specified Action policies. Based on presentations made by MOECC to SPC Chairs and Project Managers recently in Toronto, most ministries are ahead of schedule on the implementation of Prescribed Instrument policies. Challenges remain on implementation of the ICA policies which carry ongoing responsibilities. The scope and funding of those have yet to be determined in consultation with the municipalities affected.

With respect to the results of Mandatory Maintenance Inspections (MMI) of septic systems in the Callander ICA, four failed beds have been identified and replaced to date. However there are many old systems that owners would like to replace but cannot afford to. It is believed that loan guarantees could be effective. One member said that installation of tile drainage on farms used to be facilitated by loans that were registered on title; payments were made alongside taxes. Something similar might work for replacement of old septic systems.

#### **4. Amendments to Ontario Regulation 288/07 (Source Protection Committees)**

Changes have been made to the Source Protection Committees Regulation (O. Reg. 288/07). The Source Protection Authority (SP Authority) now needs to set the terms of SPC members and determine a plan for rotation all members by the end of 2019. Current members may reapply. The SP Authority also has the option of reducing the size of the SPC and restoring it when the workload warrants. Input from SPC members is being requested prior to recommendations being prepared for the SP Authority in January.

**Action Item** → Members were asked to email in their perspectives before January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2016 on

- committee size,
- length of term, and
- method to determine order of rotation of positions.

An email prompting the SPC members will be sent out as a reminder.

Concern was expressed over the possibility of losing too much “institutional knowledge” about the program if the committee size was reduced by three and then another three were replaced. The need for a process to orient new members was also identified.

#### **5. ICA Education and Outreach/ Restore Your Shore**

The Communications Manager from the NBMCA presented on Restore Your Shore, an education and outreach program that begins the implementation of policy ICA1 to encourage landowners to take action to reduce phosphorus loading. The presentation described how decisions to implement the program were made, how the principles of community based social marketing were applied, and the results. Targets for participation were exceeded and staff are looking for funding to continue next year. The approach that was developed provides a useful template to address similar water quality problems outside of the ICA.

#### **6. ICA Research and Monitoring of the Issue**

Policies ICA3 and ICA4 require ongoing research and monitoring to reduce blue-green algae blooms in Callander Bay. A detailed report was included in the meeting package and reviewed by the Project Manager regarding:

- the requirement to set up a working committee
- 2013 field investigations of threat activities in the ICA,
- Mandatory Maintenance Inspections of septic systems,
- Investigations of causes and mitigation of erosion and runoff,
- Conditions in Callander Bay,
- Continuing direct inputs into Callander Bay, and
- Next steps.

Dr. April James at Nipissing University has been working in partnership with NBMCA on related research for several years and has recently submitted a proposal to continue for the next five years. With the financial support requested, she could take on a series of graduate students to complete some of the research identified by the working committee. That would go a long way toward implementation of the research and monitoring policies.

The research and monitoring program still needs to be developed by the working committee and that will determine the cost. It is likely additional funds would be required beyond what Professor James is proposing if the blue green algae problem is to be successfully addressed. NBMCA has been able to conduct monitoring for several years but has no specific source of funding to continue. Further, NBMCA does not have the capacity to conduct the type of research required.

The SPC Chair asked members of the SPC to lend support in informing municipalities that this research is “value for money” research and worth investing in. In response, a SPC member was concerned with the timing of the funding request as many operational budgets are completed for the municipalities. It was pointed out that the research is a multi-year initiative and could be reconsidered in the budgeting process in the future.

## **7. Energy East Pipeline Conversion (North Bay IPZ-3)**

In February of 2015, MOECC approved the addition of oil pipelines as a local threat. The Assessment Report now needs to be updated to include oil pipelines. Whether a threat is low, moderate or significant is determined by multiplying the hazard score of the activity by the vulnerability of the area where it occurs. When that is done for the proposed oil pipeline in the Trout Lake watershed, the threat is below the minimum threshold. This is inconsistent with the findings of a study undertaken by TransCanada Pipeline that identified two locations in the IPZ-3 where a spill could result in crude oil reaching the area above the intake. In view of this, it was recommended that we review the vulnerability scoring to ensure it is appropriate in all locations. The process used would be consistent with current Technical Rules and available scientific findings.

Concerns were raised that changing the vulnerability scoring could undermine public confidence in the original scientific process that is fundamental to Source Protection planning. It could be viewed as an attempt to achieve a desired outcome. Conversely, it was expressed that the purpose of making any revisions would be to recognize that changes to the threats have come about even after the SP Plan was sent away for approval and these threats need to be examined now. Extensive discussion followed.

**Motion** The vulnerability scoring in IPZ-3 be reviewed to acknowledge the risk of product from the proposed converted pipeline reaching the intake in the event of a spill.

Moved by Randy McLaren, seconded by Lucy Emmott (Resolution 52-03)

**Carried**

**Action Item** → For the next SPC meeting, additional information should be made available on how pipeline threats were addressed by other SP Areas.

The Committee directed the Project Manager to advise on recommended policy changes if the review requires it.

It was suggested that an operational procedure should be put in place to address new local threats in the future to avoid any controversy.

#### **8. Project Manager's Report**

Important dates associated with milestone events in the future were provided. In addition, the need to update the Assessment Report to include new local threats will be necessary.

#### **9. New Business and Wrap-up**

The next meeting will be at the call of the Chair, expected in February or March 2016.

#### **10. Adjourn**

**Motion** to adjourn the meeting at 11:40 am.

Moved by Maurice Schlosser, seconded by Dennis MacDonald (Resolution 52-04)

**Carried**

---

Jeff Celentano, SPC Chair

---

Sue Miller, Project Manager