

October 7, 2010

Mr. Peter Trinkler  
551 Grove Street East  
Barrie, ON  
L4M 5Z5

Dear Mr. Trinkler:

Thank you for your letter dated September 30, 2010, where you raise some concerns with the Source Water Protection Planning process. While I will do my best to try and address your concerns as best I can, I would also be more than happy to discuss these issues with you.

As you know, the Source Water Protection program was initiated as a result of the tragedy in Walkerton in 2000. Justice Dennis O'Connor, in his two Walkerton reports, outlined the causes of the tragedy and made a series of recommendations meant to address the gaps inherent in the system that the tragedy brought to light.

The Source Water Protection Program, intended to prevent the overuse and contamination of drinking water in the first place, is the last of his recommendations to be implemented. We are one of 19 Source Protection Regions following the timelines and processes that have been set by the Ministry of Environment in the *Clean Water Act* and associated regulations. Our requirement under that legislation is to have Source Protection Plans completed by 2012.

We have, for several years, been trying to engage the public in our program. Despite attempts to encourage interest through advertising, media releases, hosting several open houses, attending fairs and festivals, distributing mailings and door to door canvassing, our program has, so far, received little public interest.

As a requirement under the Clean Water Act, we have recently distributed letters to property owners in proximity of a municipal source of drinking water. Our intent was to advise them that certain activities, if present, could represent a threat to drinking water. The letter was therefore sent to many landowners because of their property's location in relation to a municipal source of drinking water and not because of any specific activities.

There has been no visit to your home. The information we have, including the roll number, consists of existing records such as Municipal Property Assessment Information, and was collected from municipal and provincial partners in this process.

In residential settings, septic systems and underground storage of fuel oil represent the primary concerns and potential risks to water quality. In the absence of those activities, residents were contacted in an effort to inform them that they live in one of these vulnerable areas for two reasons. If you attempt to change the zoning of your property in the future to some land use that would be a threat to water quality, there may be conditions or restrictions, so we wanted to engage you now. We also wanted to let you know that you live in a vulnerable area, and encourage you to be cautious with household chemical use and storage.

Over the coming twelve to eighteen months, the local Source Protection Committee will be contemplating strategies to manage existing risks to drinking water and prevent new ones from being established in the vulnerable areas identified. These policies will constitute the Source Protection Plan, which is required by the province by late 2012.

When the letter was written, it was with the knowledge that our attempts to engage the public over the past three years have received little response. We thus made a sincere attempt to opt for stronger wording to raise public awareness about something that is about to impact landowners. Unfortunately, our attempt was interpreted unfavourably in some instances. For the most part, upon explaining the purpose to those that enquired about our letter, the program was better understood, and the goals - preventing the overuse and contamination of drinking water supplies - supported.

The past few weeks of consultations with the public have provided us with valuable insight and lessons learned. When we seek to consult on our source protection plans in early 2012, we hope to use this experience to inform that process.

Regards,



Don Goodyear,  
Director, Source Water Protection

cc: Lynn Dollin, Chair, South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region  
Susan Jagminas, Communications Specialist

September 18, 2010,

Lynn Dollin,  
Chair,  
Source Protection Committee.  
South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region,

RE: Notice of "Significant Threat"

Dear Ms. Dollin:

As residents and property owners of a number of properties in the Town of Penetanguishene and the Township of Tiny, We wish to go on record concerning the apparent manner in which your organization appears to be undertaking the task you have taken on. We will not comment on technical matters, as these will be addressed separately and directed to your technical representatives. However, having received a warning of this matter from a friend whose permanent residence is closer to your base of operations on September 10<sup>th</sup>, and then receiving a number of letters ourselves on Monday, September 13<sup>th</sup>, we have entered into a crash course in educating ourselves on the issues.

We, as well as a number of our neighbours who also received your letter, have talked to different members of your staff and have been given misleading, wrong or offensive responses. One of my neighbours was told essentially that, in a home that is probably worth more than half a million dollars, he could not be trusted to maintain his own septic system and might be pouring gasoline down his own well.

We have reviewed your "Program Oversight and Mission Statement" and our brief experience would appear to indicate that what is occurring is, in fact, exactly the opposite of the "open, transparent" consultative process suggested. For example, we, and obviously many other property owners, received a letter on Monday, September 13<sup>th</sup> which was, in the opinion of the two lawyers I consulted, quasi-legal and could potentially seriously impact individual's rights and property values. The envelope did not give any indication that it was from any recognizable government organization. In fact, we have spoken to people who received it and, thinking it was promotional junk mail from a water softener or purification company, threw it into their recycling bin, without opening it. This, surely, was a probable outcome, given the minimal or total lack of notice by your organization of any form of announcement or media coverage of what you were doing or how it would impact property owners. Of all of the people I have talked to, most know about Walkerton, but no one knew about your organization or what you were doing.

Further, mailing of notices of this nature, post-dated in our case from Newmarket on September 9<sup>th</sup> and received by us and we assume everyone affected in our area on September 13<sup>th</sup> at the earliest with an RSVP by September 15<sup>th</sup> for a SINGLE public meeting on September 25<sup>th</sup> is totally unacceptable and an affront to your own Program Oversight and Mission Statements. A single meeting for all of Huronia scheduled for four (4) hours on a Saturday, in the middle of a municipal election and in the waning days

of summer when most people, not recognizing the impact it will have on them, will be boating or golfing, is either naïve or callously calculated to minimize response and input.

It is our understanding that individual presentations were made to each municipality, and we are unaware at this time, if these were open to the public or whether the public would have had any opportunity to question your representatives. However, we intend to determine this.

Surely, given the complexity of the technical issues and the large number of affected sites, the affected property owners deserve, at the very least, the same treatment as given to individual councils – a meeting held in each municipality.

Also, your notice gives until October 8<sup>th</sup> for comments. Given the highly technical information and the volume of your assessment reports, this is ludicrous. On receipt of your notice and after one day of our own research, we contacted a hydrogeologist. He is one of the few probably who is not conflicted by working on your reports and he advised that a review and proper comments on your assessment, as it relates to our interest, would be impossible by October 8<sup>th</sup>.

We were advised in our initial contact with your organization that these very compressed and inadequate time lines were being dictated by the Ministry of the Environment and (our emphasis of your organization's stance) WERE WRITTEN IN STONE. We do not accept this, as again, referencing the tone of your Program Oversight and Mission Statement, the process should surely determine the time line, not the other way around.

As a municipal politician who, no doubt, has participated in the "growth management" and "smart growth" efforts of the Province, you are well aware that provincially imposed deadlines are not written in stone. Also, in that case, vague lines on large scale maps, population numbers twenty or thirty years in the future, and broad motherhood statements have significantly less impact than a notice stating "your property may be designated as a "significant threat" (your quotations) to drinking water."

We also wish to comment on the "Private and Confidential" nature of the notice. We do not accept the notice on this basis as the recipient and the impacted party to whom the possible negative implications are directed. We would also question the motive in providing the notice on this basis as we can only assume it was intended to discourage similarly affected parties from consulting each other and co-ordinating responses or seeking outside advice. This, of course, raises a myriad of issues, particularly relating to anyone affected who is now in the process of buying or selling their home or property.

In summary, a cynical person would ask how the generous, fair and open process outlined in your Program Oversight and Mission statements is served by a quasi-legal notice delivered by a program with little or no prior public media exposure, with one public meeting for a large geographic area, on highly technical subjects, with little or no hard science, and with extremely short notice and response time.

Also, a review of your "Budget" estimates in Table 3 of the Draft Terms of Reference on line indicates an expenditure of almost 18.5 million dollars with any category related to "Communications Initiatives" or

“Information Management” left blank. We should, therefore, not be surprised as former civil servants ourselves that dealing with the pesky, questioning public is a low or nil priority.

It appears more that the Oversight and Mission statements should read, don't tell them what's coming, discourage them from organizing or questioning, give them as little time as possible to consult their own technical or legal expertise, push hard deadlines and hand them a fait accompli. This, of course, is entirely consistent with the outrageous DISCLAIMER on page (i) of the Draft Assessment Report.

*“It should be noted that, where an activity has been classified as a significant threat in error, the forthcoming policy in the Source Protection Plan will not apply. Similarly, if a significant threat activity has been omitted in error, the forthcoming policy in the Source Protection Plan will apply.”*

If the civil servants in Walkerton who caused the tragedy had followed this philosophy, they would probably still be pumping water or retired now on OMERS pensions.

Walkerton was a tragedy, but it was not the fault of the people of Walkerton. They were the victims. As we recall, it was also not the failure of the system, either technically, or a failure of the regulations. It was the failure of the civil servants or bureaucrats who the citizens of Walkerton relied upon. We strongly suspect that current legislation and regulations are in place that, if used and enforced properly, would provide substantially, if not all, the protection required. The outcome of your exercise is probably the expenditure of many millions of dollars locally and hundreds of millions provincially on consultants and advisors and the creation of a whole new bureaucracy that, in order to justify themselves, will not materially increase our protection, but further complicate the everyday lives of citizen and substantially increase the cost of our water supply. We ask that, at the very least, you revisit your Oversight and Mission statements and

- hold more meetings, at least one in each municipality,
- invite media participation, and explain what you are doing and why,
- involve the municipalities who own the water sources, **together** with affected parties,
- provide all technical information and allow sufficient time for affected parties to obtain independent advice,
- Conduct **actual** research where conclusions with significant impacts are now being reached based on highly theoretical and questionable models (i.e. ModFlow)
- be open to altering your findings, if justified,
- and consider all economic impacts, for example, the development of new source areas when too many properties are impacted or moving to a higher level of treatment when the cost of doing so are less than the economic impacts on affect parties.

We believe the manner in which this has suddenly impacted our lives and the time we have had to spend educating ourselves on this matter, warrants a response.

Yours truly,

H.E. (Ted) Phelps

Nancy Phelps

cc. Garfield Dunlop, M.P.P.

**Contact information:**

Ted and Nancy Phelps  
Box 5168,  
Penetanguishene, ON.  
L9M 2G3

Telephone: 705-549-9375  
Fax: 705-549-1824  
Email: [copelandwoods@yahoo.com](mailto:copelandwoods@yahoo.com)

Lynn Interim Response FW Significant Threat - Source Water Protection..txt

From: Don Goodyear  
Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2010 9:13 AM  
To: Angela Bishop  
Subject: FW: Significant Threat - Source Water Protection.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lynn Dollin [mailto:ldollin@innisfil.ca]  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2010 2:51 PM  
To: Fincham Nancy  
Cc: Garfield Dunlop; Don Goodyear; Susan Jagminas  
Subject: RE: Significant Threat - Source Water Protection.

Mr. and Mrs. Phelps

Thank you for your email sent on Monday. I wanted to acknowledge receipt and to let you know that the input that you have provided is valuable and we are reviewing your comments and drafting a response which we will be sent as soon as possible. As I'm sure you are aware, we are busy preparing for five public open houses, the first of which is tomorrow (Saturday) in Midland from 1 to 5 pm. We have been, and will continue to solicit comments and engage the public and the municipalities as we have been doing since our last series of open houses when we consulted for the terms of reference.

I would encourage you to attend one of our open houses to both gather further information about the legislation, to have your questions answered, and to voice any concerns.

Sincerely,

Lynn Dollin

Chair  
South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe  
Source Protection Committee

---

From: Fincham Nancy [copelandwoods@yahoo.com]  
Sent: September-20-10 10:00 AM  
To: Lynn Dollin  
Cc: Garfield Dunlop  
Subject: Significant Threat - Source Water Protection.

Please find attached our response to receiving a letter from Source Water Protection regarding a significant threat. We would appreciate a response as soon as possible.

Ted and Nancy Phelps

September 28, 2010.

Lynn Dollin, Chair,  
Source Protection Committee

Thank you for your acknowledgement of our email of September 20<sup>th</sup> and we will be most interested to receive your more detailed response. We, as well as a number of our neighbours, attended the session at Midland on September 25<sup>th</sup>.

At that session, we were given a colourful double sided hand-out titled "The South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region Consultations", giving the format for the sessions and again referring to the RSVP by September 15, 2010. Why was this not included with the mailing of September 3<sup>rd</sup> as it certainly would have been of great assistance to the affected property owners?

Also, we note that Clause 15(2)(a) of Ontario Regulation 287/07 requires you to "publish a notice described in subsection (3) ..... As no property owners we have spoken to in this area were aware of the matter prior to receiving the "significant threat" letter on September 13<sup>th</sup>, could you please advise where this notice or these notices were published and when.

Having reviewed in a very cursory fashion the contents and recent revisions to Ontario Regulation 287/07, we have some sympathy for your role, given the apparent micro-management by the Province.

A prompt response to these two questions would be appreciated.

Yours truly,

Ted and Nancy Phelps

cc. Garfield Dunlop, M.P.P.



October 4, 2010

Mr. and Mrs. Phelps  
Box 5168  
Penetanguishene, Ontario  
L9M 2G3

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Phelps:

Thank you for your letter dated September 28 in which you asked some questions about our advertising around the Open Houses. Let me respond to these two questions while we are drafting a response to your letter dated September 18<sup>th</sup> which we will send to you shortly.

The agenda that you received upon arrival at the open house in Midland was not included in the mailing to landowners as it had not been finalized in time for the distribution of the letter. It was, however, posted on our website shortly after the letters were distributed.

As to the notice publicizing the Open Houses, we published in a total of 17 local newspapers during the period September 2 to September 8, reaching a circulation of over 325,000 residents. The papers advertised in were as follows: Alliston Herald, Barrie Advance, Brock Citizen, Collingwood Connection, Newmarket Era Banner, Georgina Advocate, Kawartha Lakes this Week, Midland Penetang Mirror, Muskoka Weekender, Port Perry Star, Uxbridge Times Journal, Innisfil Scope, King Sentinel, Orillia Packet & Times, Bradford Times, Orangeville Citizen, Haliburton Echo.

We appreciate your interest in the program and thank you for your questions and your comments.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "L. Dollin".

Lynn Dollin, Chair  
South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region

cc: Garfield Dunlop, MPP, Simcoe North  
Keith Sherman, Executive Director, Severn Sound Environmental Association  
Don Goodyear, Director, Source Water Protection, South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region  
Susan Jagminas, Communications Specialist

October 6, 2010

Mr. and Mrs. Phelps  
Box 5168  
Penetanguishene, Ontario  
L9M 2G3

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Phelps:

Thank you for your letter of September 18 where you raise a number concerns with the source water protection planning process. While I will do my best to try and address your concerns as best I can, I would also be more than happy to discuss these issues with you in person.

As you know, Source Water Protection planning began as a result of the tragedy in Walkerton in 2000. Justice Dennis O'Connor, in his two Walkerton reports, outlined the causes of the tragedy and made a series of recommendations meant to address the gaps inherent in the system that the tragedy brought to light.

The Source Water Protection Program is the last of his recommendations to be implemented. The scope of this program is enormous and our timeline is taking place over several years - across the province. We are only one of 19 Source Protection Regions following timelines that have been set by the Ministry of Environment. Our requirement is to have Source Protection Plans completed by 2012.

We have, for several years, been trying to engage the public in our program. Despite repeated attempts to encourage interest through advertising, media releases, hosting several open houses, attending fairs and festivals, distributing mailings and door to door canvassing, our program has, so far, received little public interest.

As a requirement under the Clean Water Act, we have recently distributed letters to property owners in proximity of a municipal source of drinking water. Our intent was to advise them that certain activities, only if present, could represent a threat to drinking water. The letter was therefore sent to landowners because of their property's location in relation to a municipal source of drinking water and not because of any specific activities.

cont'd...

...2

When the letter was written, it was with the knowledge that our attempts to engage the public over the past three years have received little response. We thus made a sincere attempt to opt for stronger wording to raise public awareness about something that is about to impact landowners. Unfortunately, our attempt was interpreted unfavourably in some instances. For the most part, upon explaining our purpose to those that enquired about our letter, our explanation was understood and accepted.

The past few weeks of consultations with the public have provided us with valuable insight and lessons learned. When we seek to consult on our source protection plans in early 2012, we hope to use this experience to inform the decisions we make in the future.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'L. Dollin', is positioned above the typed name.

Lynn Dollin, Chair  
South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region

cc: Garfield Dunlop, MPP, Simcoe North  
Keith Sherman, Executive Director, Severn Sound Environmental Association  
Don Goodyear, Director, Source Water Protection, South Georgian Bay Lake  
Simcoe Source Protection Region  
Susan Jagminas, Communications Specialist



**Staff Report Number:** SPC -10-2010-02  
**Agenda Item Number:** 02-SPC-10/2010

---

**TO:** South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe  
Source Protection Committee

**FROM:** Don Goodyear  
Director, Source Water Protection

**DATE:** October 21, 2010

**SUBJECT:** Comments received regarding the Draft Proposed  
Assessment Reports and associated revisions.

**RECOMMENDATION:** THAT staff report SPC-10-2010-02 be received for information  
AND FURTHER THAT the Source Protection Committee  
provide direction to staff regarding the revised reports and  
the issuance of the three Proposed Assessment Reports for  
the second stage of consultation.

---

**Purpose of Staff Report:**

The purpose of this Staff Report is to provide the Source Protection Committee with a summary of the comments received regarding the Draft Proposed Assessment Reports for the three Source Protection Areas (SPAs) within the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe (SGBLS) Region, and the revisions completed as a function of those comments. Additionally, this report is to seek endorsement from the Source Protection Committee to proceed with the second phase of public consultation.

**Background:**

The Draft Proposed Assessment Reports represent the technical foundation for the forthcoming Source Protection Plans. They describe and map the vulnerable areas across the region (wellhead protection areas, intake protection zones, significant recharge areas, and highly vulnerable aquifer areas), assess the existing and potential threats to municipal drinking water quality, and summarize water quantity stresses.

The reports were developed using information from technical assessments completed by a series of consulting firms and Source Protection staff. All of the original reports and the Assessment Report chapters have been subjected to some form of peer review. Wellhead Protection Area assessments were peer reviewed by an independent consulting firm to confirm that the work was defensible and meets the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) technical rules. The water budget reports and significant recharge

area mapping was peer reviewed by a group of hydrogeologists and engineers as a requirement of the Ministry of Natural Resources, again to confirm defensibility and conformance to provincial guidelines. The remaining products and all of the Assessment Report chapters were reviewed by the Technical Working Group and Source Protection staff.

Despite the efforts of the professionals that undertook the Assessment Report work and those that reviewed it, a number of comments were provided from a variety of sources during the public consultation period. Comments were received from;

- Members of the public
- One Source Protection Authority
- Several municipal partners, and
- Provincial technical reviewers


While the comments are numerous, for the most part they are editorial in nature or requesting additional supporting information. Very few require technical revisions. The comments, along with staff suggestions to address them, are summarized in the Table entitled "Draft proposed Assessment Report consultation feedback tracking\_SPC" (previously circulated).

Prior to and during the October meeting, staff are seeking feedback and direction from the Technical Working Group and Source Protection Committee regarding revisions stemming from the tabulated comments.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that staff report SPC-10-2010-02 be received for information AND FURTHER THAT the Source Protection Committee provide direction to staff regarding the revised reports and the issuance of the three Proposed Assessment Reports for the second stage of public consultation.

**Prepared by:**   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Don Goodyear  
Director, Source Water Protection

  
**Recommended by:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Lynn Dollin  
Chair, SPC



**Staff Report Number:** SPC -10-2010-03  
**Agenda Item Number:** 03-SPC-10-2010

---

**TO:** South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee

**FROM:** Don Goodyear  
Director, Source Water Protection

**DATE:** October 21, 2010

**SUBJECT:** Review of the Working Groups supporting the Source Protection Committee.

**RECOMMENDATION:** THAT staff report SPC-10-2010-03 be received for information AND FURTHER THAT the Source Protection Committee provide direction to staff regarding the composition and function of the various working groups.

---

**Purpose of Staff Report:**

The purpose of this Staff Report is to provide a summary of the existing working groups that support the Source Protection Committee (SPC), and to seek feedback and direction on the future form and function of those groups.

**Background:**

There are currently four working groups that provide support and advice to the SPC.

- The Communications Working Group
- The Planning Working Group
- The Municipal Working Group, and
- The Technical Working Group.

These working groups all delve into details associated with components of the Source Protection Program that would be difficult to address at the full committee level. Each working group also provides recommendations for consideration of the SPC. There are differences in the composition of the various working groups that are described in the attached table “Working Group Summary”.

As the program transitions from a technical focus to the development of the Source Protection Plan, it has been suggested that the SPC re-examines each working group to confirm that each is working efficiently and composed of the appropriate membership.

For reference, also attached are the staff reports relative to the formation of some working groups, and an excerpt from the program Terms of Reference specific to the development of Source Protection Plans.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that staff report SPC-10-2010-03 be received for information AND FURTHER THAT the Source Protection Committee provide direction to staff regarding the composition and function of the various working groups.

Attachments: Working Group Summary  
Staff Report from



**Prepared by:** \_\_\_\_\_

Don Goodyear  
Director, Source Water Protection



**Recommended by:** \_\_\_\_\_

Lynn Dollin  
Chair, SPC

Working Group Summary  
October 21, 2010

	Chair	Composition	Function	Meeting Frequency
Communications Working Group	SWP Staff	Communications staff from each SPA, 8 SPC members, SPC chair	This group prepares communications workplans, develops and reviews communications products, and provides advice to the SPC regarding program communications efforts and priorities. Much of the work this group considers is prepared by staff, although they are occasionally supported by contractors (e.g. programmer for revisions to the web site, facilitator for the Open Houses and Municipal Workshops).	Quarterly.  Occasionally supplemented with additional meetings as required
Planning Working Group	None – professional facilitator / planner	Planning staff from each SPA, 6 SPC members, SPC chair, 8 municipal staff.	This group originally provided advice to the SPC regarding the draft Source Protection Plan regulation (fall 2009). Since then, the group has completed a jurisdictional review and proposed criteria to evaluate policies for the Source Protection Plans. Their function is to develop policy options for consideration of the SPC as a whole with the assistance of a facilitator and some support staff (e.g. it is anticipated that subject experts will be required as policies around certain threats are considered, but consulting support is not expected to be required).	Bi-Monthly to date
Municipal Working Group	SPC member	2 staff from lead SPA, 7 SPC members, SPC chair, 5 municipal staff.	This group reviews communications products that are targeted to municipalities (e.g. municipal workshop content), and that could affect municipalities (e.g. threat letters sent to landowners). They provide advice to the SPC regarding approaches to effectively engage the municipalities in the region.	Quarterly.  Occasional meetings are deferred.
Technical Working Group	SPC member	Technical staff from each SPA (8 in total, 1 voting member per SPA), 8 SPC members, SPC chair	This group was formed to devote the attention required to review the significant volume of technical product developed for the Assessment Reports. The group provides general and technical comments on draft materials, and advice to the Source Protection Committee regarding the approaches followed and material required to complete (and update) the Assessment Reports. The materials reviewed by this group were completed by consultants under contract to the SPAs, consultants under contract to municipalities, and/or developed directly by SWP staff.	Initially met monthly. Increased to bi-weekly recently to address the AR materials.

## The Work Plan to Complete the Source Protection Plan

This section presents the components of the Source Protection Plan, which will be led by the Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching/Black River Source Protection Area with support from the Nottawasaga Valley and Severn Sound Source Protection Areas for the entire Source Protection Region. The Source Protection Plan tasks are conducted following the completion of the Assessment Report. The tasks, estimated costs (rounded to the nearest \$100), start date and estimated completion date are presented below. The estimated costs may need to be revised following the enactment of the Source Protection Plan regulation.

SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN: WATERSHED WIDE TASK DESCRIPTION Assigned Lead: Lakes Simcoe & Couchiching / Black River SPA with support from Severn Sound and Nottawasaga Valley SPAs	Estimated Costs	Start Date & Estimated Completion Date
<p>Coordinating and supporting projects for the source protection plan (SPP). Undertaking administrative support, staffing, management support, and training necessary to provide project coordination for the Source Protection Plan components and direct support to the source protection committee.</p> <p>The SPC operating funds are included in these costs.</p>	\$1,200,000	2009-Oct-1 to 2012-Aug-20
<p>Undertaking communications initiatives for the source protection plan. Consultation on the overall proposed Source Protection Plan meeting the legislative and regulatory requirements on the consultation and submission process as per regulation (Local area engagement, outreach and creation of communications products that support the Source Protection Plan process).</p>	Included in coordination costs above.	
<p>Undertaking an impact assessment to evaluate the social, economic and environmental impacts of proposed policies and risk reduction strategies. This assessment would likely be undertaken by a consultant and working group to evaluate a range of policy options for consideration as well as aid in the selection process of the most appropriate and feasible strategy.</p>	\$ 150,000	
<p><b>Policy development to address existing drinking water threats and risks. A centrally coordinated planning study will be completed to compile and/or develop recommendations regarding best management practices, education initiatives, monitoring strategies, and other means to reduce existing risks identified with due consideration of impacted communities in the Assessment Report. This study will be directed by a planning working group comprised of municipal planners and members of the Source Protection Committee. The working group will consider the number and extent of identified risks relative to proposed risk reduction strategies, as well as forthcoming guidance in Regulation and Directors Rules to ensure that the recommendations included in the Plan can be effectively implemented.</b></p>	\$133,300	

**Staff Report Number:** 2008-02-007-SPC  
**Agenda Item Number:** SPC-02-08 Item 3

---

**TO:** South Georgian Bay  
Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee

**FROM:** Don Goodyear  
Manager, Source Protection Planning

**DATE:** February 28, 2008

**SUBJECT:** Formation of Technical and Municipal Working Groups to support  
the Source Protection Committee

**RECOMMENDATION:** THAT Staff Report No. 2008-02-007-SPC regarding working group  
formation be received for information; and  
FURTHER THAT staff be directed to establish the Technical and  
Municipal groups with interested Source Protection Committee  
Members chairing those groups.

---

## **Purpose of Staff Report:**

The purpose of this Staff Report is to summarize the response from Source Protection Committee members regarding interest in participating on working groups, and to recommend the formation of the Technical and Municipal groups.

## **Background:**

As noted in previous Staff Reports, the Technical Assessment Reports describing the vulnerable areas in the watershed region and the risks to municipal drinking water sources are to be completed by the fall of 2009. Source Protection Plans are to be completed for each Source Protection Area across the Province by the fall of 2012. To assist staff, who are undertaking projects, and the Source Protection Committee, which is directing the completion of the Source Protection Plans, a number of working groups were discussed at the January 2008 Source Protection Committee meeting including;

### **A Technical Working Group**

- To assist with workplanning for remaining technical projects necessary for the Assessment Report and to provide critical input into draft technical products,

A Communications Working Group

- o To help staff keep the public and stakeholders informed regarding the progress of the Source Protection Committee and program,

A Municipal Working Group

- o To keep those municipalities not represented on the Source Protection Committee engaged in the of the Source Protection Plans, and

A Planning Working Group

- o To assist the committee with the development of risk reduction strategies and land use planning policies to be included within the Source Protection Plans.

A number of Source Protection Committee members have endorsed the formation of these groups as resources to the committee, and further expressed interest in participating in one or more of the working groups.

**Issues:**

Short term needs associated with the Terms of Reference development, which has been initiated, include the finalization of a workplan to arrive at Technical Assessment Reports and the Source Protection Plans for each Source Protection Area. This workplan must identify the work to be completed, a cost and schedule estimate, and also identify the lead for each project, which could be either a municipality or the Source Protection Region on behalf of a municipality.

A Technical Working Group would assist staff in ensuring that the workplan developed is appropriate to meet the needs of the *Clean Water Act* and associated regulation and guidance. A Municipal Working Group would assist staff in working with municipalities to establish the lead for each project. Participation on the Technical and Municipal Working Groups by one or more Source Protection Committee member would facilitate a connection between the Source Protection Committee and the Working Groups.

**Summary & Recommendations**

THAT Staff Report No. 2008-02-007-SPC regarding working group formation be received for information; and

FURTHER THAT staff be directed to establish the Technical and Municipal groups with interested Source Protection Committee Members chairing those groups.

**Prepared by:** \_\_\_\_\_

Don Goodyear,  
Manager, Source Protection Planning

**Recommended by:** \_\_\_\_\_

Lynn Dollin,  
Chair, South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe  
Source Protection Committee

## Technical Working Group – Terms of Reference

A sub-committee of the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Region (SGBLR) Source Protection Committee.

**Purpose:** To provide support to the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source (SGBLR) Protection Committee by performing **review, comment** and **advice** functions.

**General:** The science based information used to support the mandate of the Source Protection Committee (SPC) is often complex and uses sophisticated modeling tools to illustrate information and enhance the understanding of scientific assessments.

Policies to protect the sources of municipal drinking water systems are based on best-available science.

While relying on the technical expertise of Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) staff, technical reports are generally “**peer reviewed**” by independent technical experts and consultants to ensure that best practices and best available information is used.

**Methods:** Realizing that much of this work is based on evolving science and is not exact, scientific assumptions tend to be conservative in nature and support the **precautionary principle\*** Through discussion and input from the LSRCA technical support staff, and other partner agency technical consultants, SPC members attempt to understand and relate technical reports to the mandate of the SPC committee. Voting takes place on each motion with each member having one Vote. Partner agencies with more than one representative (Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA), Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA)) are accorded one vote each.

Technical reports once reviewed and endorsed by the Technical Working Group (TWG) are forwarded to the SPC with recommendations. Issues or data gaps that may influence the interpretation or understanding of the reports are highlighted and brought to the attention of the SPC members.

**Meetings:** Technical issues that are raised by members of the public may be reviewed and summarized by the TWG or further discussion by the SPC committee. The technical working group has been meeting since early in 2008. The meetings are generally held monthly, two weeks prior to the Source Protection Committee meetings, in order to facilitate the transfer and reporting of information in a timely manner.

**Membership:**

2008 – 2009 Chair: Larry Slomka, Member, SPC, Public Sector Representative.

Lynn Dollin	Chair of the Source Protection Committee
Alex Millar	Member, SPC, Public Sector Representative.
Dianne Corrigan	Member SPC, Public Sector Representative
John Hemsted	Member SPC, Agriculture Representative.
Stephanie Hobbs	Member, SPC, Public Sector Representative
Tom Kurtz	Member, SPC, Public Sector Representative
Colin Elliot	Member, SPC, Agriculture Representative
Bahar SM	Manager of Engineering, NVCA
Ryan Post	Hydrogeologist, Source Water Protection Coordinator, NVCA
Glenn Switzer	Director, Engineering and Technical Services, NVCA
Mile Walters	Director, Watershed Management, LSRCA
Keith Sherman	Coordinator, SSEA

**Staff**

Don Goodyear	Manager, Source Water Protection
Ben Longstaff	Science and Research Coordinator
Shelly Cuddy	Hydrogeologist
Angela Bishop	Administrative Support

Kate Turner Ministry of Environment, guest and resource person

*\* Precautionary principle as defined at the Rio Conference, Earth Summit in 1992. Principle #15*

“In order to protect the environment, the precautionary principle shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities.

Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.”

*\* Environment Canada*

The precautionary approach / precautionary principle is distinctive within science-based risk management. It recognizes that the absence of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason to postpone decisions when faced with the threat of serious or irreversible harm.

**Staff Report Number:** 2009-06-03-SPC  
**Agenda Item Number:** 03 - SPC – 06/09

---

**TO:** South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe  
Source Protection Committee

**FROM:** Don Goodyear  
Manager, Source Protection Planning

**DATE:** June 25, 2009

**SUBJECT:** Planning Working Group

**RECOMMENDATION:** THAT Staff Report No. 2009-06-03-SPC regarding the  
Planning Working Group be received for information;  
AND THAT Staff be directed to form and initiate the group.

---

**Purpose of Staff Report:**

The purpose of this Staff Report is to seek input on the formation, composition and role of a planning working group to support the Source Protection Committee (SPC) throughout the formation of the Source Protection Plan.

**Background:**

The SPC is currently supported by three working groups; Technical, Communications and Municipal. It has been recognized that, as the program transitions from technical assessment to Source Protection Plan development, there is a need to form a working group with policy expertise to provide advice to the SPC.

The need for this group has been accelerated through an opportunity to provide input on the forthcoming Source Protection Plan regulation over the next three months. The Ministry of the Environment has drafted a discussion paper on Source Protection Plans, and will be posting the document to the Environmental Bill Registry in the immediate future. The province has requested that SPCs develop a set of mock policies ('a dry run') as a means of evaluating the content of the discussion paper, and providing constructive advice regarding the forthcoming regulation.

Initiating the planning working group made up of SPC members and municipal and Conservation Authority planning staff is a means to take advantage both of the opportunity to influence the Source Protection Plan regulation and the considerable policy expertise around the watershed region.

The working group would be responsible for two short term tasks:

- Reviewing the Clean Water Act, the discussion paper on the Source Protection Plan, and existing legislation to provide the SPC with advice at the August and September meetings to complete the 'dry run' policy exercise and comment on the discussion paper
- Researching other jurisdictions to compile a set of examples of water-resource related policies that municipalities undertaking Official Plan reviews could reference prior to the completion of Source Protection Plans

A brief summary of the proposed Planning Working Group is attached to this report.

**Issues:**

None identified.

**Summary and Recommendations:**

THAT Staff Report No. 2009-06-03-SPC regarding the Planning Working Group be received for information and that staff be directed to form and initiate the working group per the attached summary.



**Prepared by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Don Goodyear  
Manager – Source Protection Planning



**Recommended by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lynn Dollin  
Chair, Source Protection Committee

## Planning Working Group

<b>Purpose:</b>	To provide support to the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee (SPC) by providing <b>policy expertise</b> and <b>advice</b> .
<b>Description:</b>	<p>The range of policy options available to mitigate existing risks to drinking water and prevent future risks from occurring has been expanded by the Clean Water Act. In order to ensure that the Source Protection Plan is practical, effective, and can be implemented across a diverse region, a working group of planning experts is proposed.</p> <p>It is anticipated that this group would research existing policy options relative to water resource management from various jurisdictions, review all relevant provincial regulations and guidance material, and develop policy options for the SPC to consider for the Source Protection Plan.</p>
<b>Meetings:</b>	It is intended that the planning working group would meet monthly, with additional sessions as required to address specific milestones (e.g., provincial 'dry run' planning exercise).
<b>Composition:</b>	<p>In order for the group to be effective, ideally it should be no more than 12 members, plus a facilitator / chair.</p> <p>Facilitator: Planning Staff or Consultant (ex-officio member)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Members from the SPC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ At least one member from each sector is desired (preferably with a mix of members that are currently involved in working groups to provide continuity and members that are not involved in working groups to bring a fresh perspective), to a maximum of 5 SPC representatives</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Planning staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A maximum of 8 staff from municipalities, Conservation Authorities, and the province</li> <li>○ Representation from: urban municipalities, rural municipalities, groundwater systems, and lake-based systems</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Technical staff to support policy discussion as required (but not act as regular members of the working group)</li> </ul>

**Staff Report Number:** 2009-08-03-SPC  
**Agenda Item Number:** 03 - SPC – 08/09

---

**TO:** South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe  
Source Protection Committee

**FROM:** Don Goodyear  
Manager, Source Protection Planning

**DATE:** August 27, 2009

**SUBJECT:** Planning Working Group

**RECOMMENDATION:** THAT Staff Report No. 2009-08-03-SPC regarding the Planning Working Group be received for information.

---

**Purpose of Staff Report:**

The purpose of this Staff Report is to provide an update on the formation, composition and direction of the planning working group to support the Source Protection Committee (SPC) throughout the formation of the Source Protection Plan.

**Background:**

It has been recognized that, as the program transitions from technical assessment to Source Protection Plan development, there is a need for a working group with policy expertise to provide advice to the SPC. The need for this group was accelerated through an opportunity to provide input on the forthcoming Source Protection Plan regulation.

Per direction from the SPC at the July meeting, staff issued a call for interest in participating on the planning working group to each municipality in the region. Also per the SPC direction, each sector from the SPC designated two members to participate on the working group. The following is the resultant planning working group composition;

<b>SPC Members:</b>	<b>Public Sector</b>	<b>Economic Development</b>	<b>Municipal</b>
Lynn Dollin, SPC Chair	Bob Duncanson Tom Kurtz	Colin Nisbet Chris Galway	Herb Proudley John Boucher

**Municipal Staff**

Judi Brouse	District Municipality of Muskoka
Wes Crown	Town of Midland
Michael Wynia	Township of Clearwater
Chris Darling	City of Kawartha Lakes
Kathy Brislin	City of Barrie

Mark Head	Regional Municipality of Peel
Rodney Bouchard	Regional Municipality of Peel alternate / technical support
Jane Tousaw	County of Haliburton
Laura Atkins-Paul	Regional Municipality of York
Tamara Kondrachova	Regional Municipality of York alternate / technical support
Nancy Rutherford	Regional Municipality of Durham

This membership is an excellent reflection of the varied nature of the region because the members represent; all watersheds, urban and rural settings, upper tier and local area municipalities, surface water and groundwater sources, and includes members that have jurisdiction in neighbouring Source Water Protection regions.

As indicated in the approved Terms of Reference, the planning working group is to draft policy options and to assess the economic impacts of those various policy options to support the development of the Source Protection Plans in the region. In addition, the working group is responsible for two short term tasks;

- Reviewing the discussion paper on the Source Protection Plan to provide the SPC with advice at the September meeting to comment on the discussion paper, and
- Researching other jurisdictions to compile a set of examples of water-resource related policies that municipalities undertaking Official Plan reviews could reference prior to the completion of Source Protection Plans.

To accomplish the objectives noted above, the Terms of Reference indicates the group will be coordinated and supported by a planning consultant. As a result, staff prepared and issued a Request for Quotations for the provision of 'Planning Policy Expertise and Facilitation Services', which was posted to [www.ourwatershed.ca](http://www.ourwatershed.ca). There were a total of five submissions received, all of which were of very high quality. A review of the submissions was completed by three staff members, and a recommendation taken to the Planning Group at their first meeting on August 14<sup>th</sup>. The group supported the recommendation and a contract is being established with Planning Solutions Inc. to coordinate the Planning Working Group and undertake the required background research.

Due to the fact that Planning Solutions Inc. will be acting in a coordinating role, the working group indicated that there wasn't a need for a formal Chair of the group. As a result, staff will be responsible for agenda and meeting preparation with support from the consultant.

The group agreed to prepare initial responses to the questions posed in the discussion paper prior to their next meeting on Sept 3<sup>rd</sup> (date to be confirmed), and suggested that staff prepare a minimum of four samples settings to consider 'mock policies' within (a wellhead protection area, an intake protection zone, a significant recharge area, and a highly vulnerable aquifer area).

**Issues:**

Working group members indicated that to develop mock policies is difficult in the absence of a complete understanding of the number and types of threats in the region, and without information about appropriate means to mitigate those threats. Staff concurred, and assured the working group members that such information would be available prior to requesting formal Source Protection Plan policy advice.

**Summary and Recommendations:**

THAT Staff Report No. 2009-08-03-SPC regarding the Planning Working Group be received for information.



**Prepared by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Don Goodyear  
Manager – Source Protection Planning



**Recommended by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lynn Dollin  
Chair, Source Protection Committee