

MISSISSIPPI-RIDEAU SOURCE PROTECTION REGION
Box 599, 3889 Rideau Valley Drive
Manotick, Ontario, K4M 1A5
613-692-3571, 1-800-267-3504

MINUTES

**Mississippi-Rideau
Source Protection Committee**

January 7, 2010

#1/10

Present:	Scott Bryce Carol Dillon Paul Knowles Patricia Larkin Peter McLaren Eleanor Renaud Mary Trudeau	George Braithwaite Richard Fraser Drew Lampman Randy Malcolm Beverly Millar Janet Stavinga (Chair)
	Jean-Guy Albert Alan Arbuckle Mary Wooding	(Medical Officer of Health Liaison) (Source Protection Authority Liaison) (Ministry of the Environment Liaison)
Regrets:	Alex Cullen	Christine Leadman
Staff:	Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	Brian Stratton
SPA Members:	Mark Burnham	(Chair, Mississippi Valley Conservation)
Guests:	Doug Scott Sally McIntyre	(Baird & Associates Consulting) (City of Ottawa)

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

Chair Stavinga welcomed everyone to the meeting. She asked that they observe a moment of silence in honour of Constable Eric Czapnik whose funeral was coinciding with the Committee's meeting. Constable Czapnik was an Ottawa Police Officer killed in the line of duty on December 29, 2009. Councillors Cullen and Leadman were attending his funeral.

a) Agenda Review

Chair Stavinga went over the purpose of the meeting and the agenda.

b) Notice of Proxies

None

c) Adoption of the Agenda

Motion 1-01/10

That the Agenda be adopted.

Carried

d) **Declarations of Interest**

None

e) **Approval of Minutes**

Motion 2-01/10

That the minutes of the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee meeting of December 3, 2009 be approved.

Carried

f) **Status of Action Items**

Mary Wooding gave an update on Action Item #1 (North Simcoe Landfill - Site 41). She informed members that since Simcoe County Council had voted to discontinue construction and all future development of the North Simcoe Landfill Site the excavated area had been backfilled and the site had been substantially restored. Surface grading and seeding will be done in spring 2010. The ministry will continue to monitor the site to ensure the environment is protected.

A member asked if someone could buy the property tomorrow and create a landfill site. Ms. Wooding explained that it will be up to Simcoe County Council to decide what the land is used for in the future.

Ms. Wooding also provided an update on Action Item #4 (Ottawa River Inter-jurisdictional Committee). She clarified that the Minister's letter which proposed "a series of bi-annual meetings with Ontario and Quebec officials and relevant local stakeholders to discuss spills response", meant holding two meetings a year. Mary also informed members that the MOE is currently organizing a meeting for the end of March with representatives from First Nations, Mississippi-Rideau region, Raisin-South Nation region, City of Ottawa and four of seven Ottawa River watersheds in the province of Quebec. The intent of the meeting would be to discuss source protection work to-date on the Ottawa River and how to move an inter-jurisdictional agenda forward. Ms. Wooding will provide more details at the February MRSPC meeting.

A member recommended that the National Capital Commission be invited to attend this meeting. Chair Stavinga explained that this is just an initial preparation meeting, it is not the inaugural meeting of an inter-jurisdictional committee. She noted that there are many important stakeholders that need to be identified and invited to participate in the process once it begins. This is something that MOE is leading and will be part of the March meeting.

Another member shared that he was attending an upcoming meeting of the Renfrew Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association and that that area must be getting involved in source protection as it is on their agenda.

Chair Stavinga reiterated that the meeting being planned for the end of March

is a preliminary planning meeting to identify key stakeholders who should be invited to participate in an Ottawa River Committee. She also apologized for failing to include First Nations in the motion that the Committee passed in August 2008 requesting an Ottawa River inter-jurisdictional committee be formed.

In regards to Action Item #7 (uranium), Chair Stavinga asked Jean-Guy Albert to follow up with his health unit colleagues about the status of materials they were developing to inform private well owners about uranium.

Motion 3-01/10

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee receive the following report for information.

Carried

g) Correspondence

None

2.0 Assessment Report Development

Ms. Casgrain-Robertson reminded members that the Committee is being asked to review the preliminary draft Ottawa River Surface Water studies and their summaries and consider approving them as draft for public consultation. This would allow staff to work with City of Ottawa staff to share the studies and summaries with interested stakeholders and the public and solicit comments. Two open houses would be held near Britannia and Lemieux Island to share the draft study findings with local residents and get their feedback. Comments would be compiled and shared with the Committee at their May meeting along with a preliminary draft Surface Water chapter for the Assessment Report. The staff report would indicate which comments were addressed in the preliminary draft Chapter and which are still outstanding, a rationale and options for addressing them.

Chair Stavinga noted that the Ottawa River study was led by City of Ottawa staff and she introduced Sally McIntyre, Program Manager of Environmental Programs for the City of Ottawa.

Brian Stratton introduced Doug Scott from Baird and Associates Consulting. Mr. Scott presented the preliminary draft findings of the Britannia and Lemieux Island intake protection zone studies.

A member asked if the occasional detection of benzene, toluene, xylene (BTX) below Ontario drinking water standards could be coming from storm sewer outlets. Mr. Scott responded that boats and storm sewers were likely sources.

A member asked if Chalk River was able to refine their estimate of how much tritium was released during their December 1988 spill. The member noted that the current estimate is anywhere from 200 to 800 x 10¹² bq which means

the detection of tritium at the Britannia water treatment plant could have been the result of a spill of only 200×10^{12} bq. Mr. Scott responded that Chalk River never provided a narrower range for the spill volume.

A member asked why there are fewer storm sewer outlets on the Quebec side of the Ottawa River. Mr. Scott responded that there is less development in that area than in Ottawa.

A member noted that the model factored in wind and asked if it factored in river depth. Mr. Scott confirmed that it did.

A member noted that the model showed 15 minute intervals within IPZ-2. They asked if different levels of risk would be assigned within these intervals such as a higher level of risk 15 minutes from the intake compared to 120 minutes from the intake (two hour time of travel is the outer boundary of IPZ-2). The member thought that the provincial Technical Rules required Committees to treat IPZ-2 as a homogenous zone and assign one vulnerability score to the whole area. Mr. Scott confirmed that within IPZ-2 a water treatment plant operator's reaction time varies from minutes up to two hours. Chair Stavinga confirmed that the Technical Rules require a single vulnerability score for all of IPZ-2.

Another member clarified that while IPZ-2 must be looked at as a single zone, the Technical Rules do not preclude the Committee from treating the entire zone as if it were only minutes from the intake since part of it is.

A member asked how 7.9 was calculated for imperviousness. Mr. Scott responded that it was linearly distributed between 0% and 80%.

A member asked how far the Lemieux Island intake was from Quebec. Mr. Scott responded that he thought it was approximately 300 metres.

A member asked if there were any chemicals at the water treatment plant that could pose a risk to source water. Mr. Scott explained that most of the Lemieux Island water treatment plant falls within IPZ-1 and Chair Stavinga noted that that zone is automatically given a vulnerability score of 10 (the highest). Dillon Consulting is working on a threats and issues inventory for the surface water intakes and they will be looking at potential threats associated with the water treatment plant. The results of this study will be presented to the Committee this spring.

A member highlighted that the source vulnerability factor of 0.9 for IPZ-2 was determined using a methodology that gave 1/3 weighting to the fact that no drinking water issues had been detected in the past (no chemicals or pathogens had been detected in Britannia or Lemieux Island's source water above provincial drinking water standards). They pointed out that if heavier weighting was given to the distance and depth of the intake from shore, a source vulnerability factor of 1.0 would have resulted. Mr. Scott explained that in the absence of the Technical Rules dictating how to determine the source vulnerability factor, Baird used their professional judgment and assigned equal weighting to the three considerations resulting in 1/3 weighting. The member responded that the methodology was therefore arbitrary.

Mr. Stratton explained some editorial changes that had been made to the study summary prior to the meeting:

- 814,000 people are serviced by the Britannia and Lemieux Island water treatment plants – this updated population figure was used in the study summary but it differs from an older figure used in the technical report by Baird. This change does not impact the modeling or study results; and
- Some maps will be revised so IPZ delineations are easier to distinguish (make water portion of an IPZ the same colour as the IPZ rather than the river). Members were given a copy of a revised map in their blue folder.

In light of 814,000 people being serviced by the City of Ottawa intakes, a member raised concerns about the IPZ mapping being made public because of how it could be used to contaminate the source water supplying the Britannia and Lemieux Island water treatment plants in an attempt to threaten public safety. The member suggested that a copy of the study and summary be provided to the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) so they know what information is being made public and when. The member will provide staff with contact information for CSIS.

A member asked if the City of Ottawa educates people about storm sewers and what they do on their property can affect water quality in the Ottawa River. Sally McIntyre (City of Ottawa) informed members that the City has a “sewer use program” that educates property owners about what they can and can not release into sewers. Other strategies have included “poop and scoop” programs to reduce the amount of pet feces washed into sewers, and yellow fish painted in front of sewer inlets to remind people what goes into the sewer can end up in the river. Currently the City is looking to enhance public education about sewers and new strategies are included in the Ottawa River Action Plan that was proposed in the fall.

A member asked if Pinecrest Creek flowed year round and if there were development pressures along it or adequate development setbacks. Ms. McIntyre confirmed that the creek is substantial and flows most or all of the year. She said the City of Ottawa was looking at the Pinecrest/Westboro area to determine how the City could mitigate existing impacts on stormwater such as retrofitting existing homes. The City would like to reduce significant urban pollution that exists in that area. The member asked if the end of the creek where it discharges into the Ottawa River was naturalized, such as cattails. Another member confirmed that it was.

A member noted that provincial drinking water standards play an important role in how things are measured. The tritium spill at Chalk River did not result in a “drinking water issue” because the amount detected at the Britannia intake did not exceed the provincial standard. It did however exceed the American drinking water standard for tritium. The member questioned if provincial drinking water standards were appropriate and if they were up to date. They recommended that the Committee request a review of all drinking water standards and ensure that they are reviewed and compared to

international standards on a regular basis. Mary Wooding, MOE liaison, told the Committee that drinking water standards are regularly reviewed but that each standard takes years of study to review. She was unsure where the tritium standard was in the review cycle. Ms. Wooding will give an update at the February meeting about how drinking water standards are reviewed and the status of the tritium standard.

A member asked if drinking water standards are based on long-term or short-term exposure, and high concentration or low concentration exposure. Ms. Wooding will include this in her February update, she thought it may vary depending on the parameter.

A member asked if either the Britannia or Lemieux Island water treatment plant could temporarily service the city if the other plant shut down. Jean-Guy Albert, Medical Officer of Health liaison, informed members that sometimes one plant is shut down for a short period of time for maintenance and the other plant will temporarily service the city with reduced water pressure. It is only done for short periods of time and he was not sure how long one plant could service the city.

The member suggested that if the Committee was trying to protect public health the two Ottawa surface water systems should be studied together not separately because if one plant goes down the other system could be more vulnerable than originally thought. Another member argued that it was a luxury that Ottawa had two systems that could independently service the city temporarily if the other plant was shut down. They felt having more than one plant serving the same area would lower the vulnerability of the system if anything.

A member asked if Baird's model was run using the water treatment plants' full capacity. Mr. Scott thought the model was run at the plants' "rate of capacity" but he will confirm that for the Committee.

Chair Stavinga asked if other water users along the Ottawa River could impact the operational capacity of the City of Ottawa plants, for example if a hydro operation upstream were to cause the flow in the river to decrease. A member informed the Committee that the rate of flow in the river would affect the Fleet Street pumping station because it runs off the hydraulic head but decreased river flow would not impact the intakes.

A member stated that because of the short distance between the intakes, if there is source water contamination at Britannia it is going to be a contamination issue for Lemieux Island as well. It is therefore a moot point in terms of source water protection to discuss the ability of one plant to service the city temporarily. Mr. Scott clarified that in high flow conditions a spill near Britannia would reach Lemieux Island within three hours.

A member raised concern about the fact that the water treatment plants cannot treat tritium. The member wanted to know how the Committee was going to deal with this issue in light of the fact that if Chalk River reports a tritium spill the City cannot treat it if it gets into their drinking water system. Chair Stavinga suggested that staff improve the wording in the study

summary to:

- Acknowledge that the Committee is pushing for the establishment of an Ottawa River inter-jurisdictional committee to address issues in the province of Quebec; and
- Clarify next steps through the threats and issues inventory that may identify Chalk River as the source of a drinking water issue for the City of Ottawa.

Chair Stavinga offered to draft a motion about the current Ontario drinking water standard for tritium. Chair Stavinga recommended the Committee consider it at their March meeting which would give her time to work on the motion with concerned Committee members and give Ms. Wooding an opportunity to provide Committee members with an update about drinking water standards at the February meeting. Chair Stavinga noted that there was a committee recommending that Ontario lower its tritium drinking water standard.

Chair Stavinga drew the focus of the discussion toward approving the studies and their summaries as draft for public consultation. She reiterated that the Committee was not being asked to approve the study findings or their methodologies. Like the Committee did with the groundwater studies, they are being asked to approve the findings as draft for public consultation so staff and members can share them with a larger audience and hold open houses with local residents, to get feedback from stakeholders, interested parties and the public at large. Chair Stavinga impressed upon members that she felt it was very important that draft results be made public at this time, despite some members concerns, so that public comments about the studies could be collected and documented in a transparent way. This will allow the Committee to move forward in the coming months by working together to find ways to address identified concerns. She encouraged members to take this opportunity to articulate any concerns they have with the studies so that they could be noted in the minutes and attributed to specific members if desired.

A member articulated that they had no problem with the numerical modeling and that they had confidence in the delineation of the travel time zones and sewersheds. The member does have a concern with the generic approach taken to determine the source vulnerability factor (determined to be 0.9 rather than 1.0). The member feels the methodology is not maximally precautionary. IPZ-2 is minutes up to two hours from the intake and the provincial Technical Rules are general and broad enough to allow the Committee to develop a methodology that does not rely on a weighted approach. The weighted approach is an arbitrary policy decision made by the consultants that impacts the final vulnerability score (it is currently an 8 and it could be a 9). The member stated there is no requirement to string these factors together in an algorithm, nor equally weight them or rely on linear distribution or relative measure between two extremes. They do not feel the methodology presented is justified. The member noted that this is the same concern they had with the preliminary draft findings presented for the Perth, Carleton Place and Smiths Falls intakes at the Committee's May, 2009 meeting.

The member also raised concern about climate change not being factored in as that could impact the delineation of IPZ-2. They were also concerned about the inherent policy decision that was made for IPZ-3 to only look at chemical extreme events. They argued there could be other types of extreme events that should be considered, such as floods.

A member felt the above comments were very valuable and should be discussed in detail in Chapter 8 (Other Topics for Additional Research) of the Assessment Report. The member recognized that this was the first cut at source protection planning in Ontario, but he feels it is incumbent upon the Committee to point out flaws and weaknesses that can be corrected by the province for future rounds of source protection planning. They stated that while they accept that the province has a set amount of funding and a timeframe to complete the first round of Source Protection Plans, they feel it is important that the Committee identify the need to amend the Technical Rules to allow for a range of vulnerability scores within IPZ-2. the member noted that it was unrealistic to amend Technical Rules this late in the process to affect the first round of Assessment Reports but stated that while the work of the Committee is taking a positive step toward protecting source water, there is more that can be done the next time around.

Mr. Scott explained to members that the source vulnerability factor of 0.9 was determined by factoring together (using equal weighting) the occurrence of past drinking water issues, the distance from shore of the intakes and the depth of the intakes. A member remarked that the Committee should not rely on whether or not there were documented drinking water issues in the past as a determinant of future problems. Mr. Scott stated that Baird considered the three factors outlined in the Technical Rules and found that the City of Ottawa intakes are far from shore and deep in the river which makes them well protected.

A member stated a flaw of the Technical Rules is ending the intake protection zone study at the Source Protection Region boundary. They felt Committees should be able to look at the scientific boundary of an intake protection zone, not its political boundary.

A member reminded the Committee that society has limited resources. If there were infinite resources source water could be kept so pristine there would be no need to treat water for consumption. It is important to remember that committees with different mandates would divide resources differently. A transportation committee would protect source water by building safer roads and railways to reduce the risk of spills, a committee of water treatment plant operators would invest resources in better water treatment. The province has looked at the big picture and set out a defined scope and funding level for source water protection. The member feels the Committee should spend less time criticizing the limitations of the Technical Rules and focus on what they can achieve within them. They stated if you look at the IPZ-2 vulnerability scoring from the opposite perspective, you are determining a score that is appropriate for an area 15 minutes from the intake and applying it all the way out to the two hour time of travel mark. This is a very conservative approach. The member also noted that the provincial Technical Rules state the source

vulnerability factor can be 0.9 or 1.0. They felt if you compare the Ottawa River to other rivers in the watershed that are supplying water treatment plants, like the Tay River in Perth which has very low flow, you can not justify a source vulnerability score of 1.0 for both. If the Tay River is a 1.0 then the Ottawa has to be a 0.9.

A member pointed out that there is nothing in the Technical Rules that says you must weight equally the occurrence of past drinking water issues, depth of intake and distance from shore of intake. If you reduce the weighting of historical issues you produce a source vulnerability score of 1.0 for the Ottawa intakes. Relying on the occurrence of past issues is problematic as another member previously noted.

Ms. McIntyre addressed the Committee and informed them that City of Ottawa staff has accepted the Baird studies and the Manager of Drinking Water Services is comfortable with the findings and methodologies. That said, she completely understands the concerns and issues being raised by the Committee. In IPZ-2 it is more likely, based on the current planning framework, that systemic chronic contamination event would occur rather than an extreme event like an industrial spill. She reminded the Committee that what they will accomplish through their Source Protection Plan is adding an incremental increase to the protection of source water on top of an already significant regulatory framework. The City of Ottawa has an emergency response plan to deal with a large spill.

A member stated they are also concerned with the vulnerability scoring because critical areas seem subjective. This is supposed to be a scientific process and the technical reports are about to enter the public domain. There could be significant debate about the methodology and the Committee needs to be prepared to deal with that.

Chair Stavinga reminded members that they are not endorsing or approving how the studies were done or the results. They are simply allowing the draft results to be posted publically so that interested stakeholders and the public can look at the studies, review the methodologies and findings and share their comments and concerns with the Committee. All feedback received from the public will be compiled by staff and presented to the Committee when they are reviewing and considering a preliminary draft version of the surface water Assessment Report chapter. Chair Stavinga reiterated to members that she felt it was important that the draft findings of these studies be released to the public so a larger debate could take place in a publically transparent manner.

A member asked how the proximity of rapids and the resulting mixing of water were dealt with in the model. Mr. Scott explained that mixing by rapids can be a positive, when contaminants get mixed and diluted, or a negative, when a floating contaminant gets mixed and drawn down to the intake. It is therefore a wash in the model.

A member asked if the motion could be revised to include "whereas statements" to document the concerns raised by some Committee members. Chair Stavinga encouraged the Committee to approve the motion as is but to direct staff to include concerns raised by the Committee in the table that will

list all the comments received from the public once the studies are posted and open houses are held.

A member noted that JF Sabourin's parameters for the inland river surface water studies included rainfall but that does not seem to be listed for the Ottawa River intake studies. Mr. Scott pointed out that the study summary prepared by staff quotes the Technical Rules verbatim and rainfall is not identified in the Technical Rules. It is considered under #3 as a factor of runoff.

A member asked how the Committee would defend the methodology during the public consultation period. Ms. Casgrain-Robertson reminded members that they would not be defending the methodologies or study findings because they are not being asked to approve them at this time. She emphasized that the Committee was being asked to approve the study findings as draft for public consultation to allow staff and members to share the draft results with a larger audience and solicit public comments and feedback. These comments will be compiled and presented to the Committee at their May meeting and they will be asked to consider approving the study findings for inclusion in the draft Assessment Report. If the Committee chooses to approve the findings at their May meeting then they will need to explain why they supported the methodologies and findings should someone ask.

A member felt both sides of the methodology debate need to be presented during the public consultation period because technical information is not always immediately obvious to people. The difference between a source vulnerability score of 0.9 and 1.0 needs to be clearly presented so the public can weigh in on some of the key issues.

Alan Arbuckle, Source Protection Authority liaison, asked how it could be made easy for the public to provide comments on key issues and areas of concern, especially if they are unable to attend the open houses. Chair Stavinga expressed her interest in sharing the draft results with experts in the federal government and academia. Ms. Casgrain-Robertson noted that a comment form was produced for the groundwater studies for use on the web site and at open houses. The form will be redesigned for use with the surface water studies and can include pointed questions to get feedback on key issues. Areas of concern and key issues can also be identified and discussed at the open houses.

A member remarked that the methodology is not perfect and while they hope it will improve in the future it is time to move forward with the Ottawa River studies.

Mary Trudeau stated she felt strongly that the Committee is responsible for ensuring that technical work is completed to their satisfaction before allowing it to go through public consultation. Consequently the member indicated she would dissent when the motion was called.

Chair Stavinga recommended that the motion be revised to replace the word "approve" with "receive".

Motion 4-01/10

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee receive the following studies and their summaries as *draft* for public consultation:

- Britannia and Lemieux Island Surface Water Studies

Carried with member Mary Trudeau dissenting

3.0 Assessment Report Due Date Extension

Brian Stratton explained that staff submitted a draft letter to the Ministry of the Environment requesting our Assessment Report submission due date be extended to September 21, 2010. He noted our current due date is February 5, 2010. He pointed members to the draft extension request letter in their agenda package and walked them through the Assessment Report timeline developed by staff that shows a proposed Assessment Report can be submitted to the Ministry by September 21, 2010.

A member asked if the timeline meant a change to the Committee's meeting schedule which currently shows no meeting in August. Ms. Casgrain-Robertson explained the meeting schedule will be revised to cancel the July meeting and replace it with a meeting on August 12. This revised meeting schedule will be subject to Committee approval.

A member asked when the Ottawa River open houses will take place. Ms. Casgrain-Robertson informed members that she will begin working with City of Ottawa staff to confirm open houses dates as soon as possible. The member wondered if there was a legislative timeframe for the open houses. Ms. Casgrain-Robertson clarified that the open houses the Committee has been hosting to present draft findings to the public prior to including them in a draft Assessment Report go above the legislative public consultation requirements. The legislation only requires that one open house be held once the draft Assessment Report is posted.

Motion 5-01/10

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approve the following Assessment Report extension request and submit it to the Ministry of the Environment for approval.

Carried

4.0 Well Aware Program

Ms. Casgrain-Robertson reminded members that at their December meeting Patricia Larkin requested that the Committee submit a letter of support for the Well Aware program to the Minister of the Environment. Members were directed to the draft letter Ms. Larkin prepared which was in the agenda package. Ms. Casgrain-Robertson informed members that the letter was discussed at a recent meeting of the Rideau Valley Rural Clean Water

Program Steering Committee. They felt the letter should be expanded to highlight the effectiveness of other programs like Well Aware, such as Conservation Authority run clean water programs, and the need for sustainable long-term provincial funding to tackle the proper construction, maintenance and abandonment of private wells.

Due to the time sensitive nature of the letter (Well Aware's provincial funding ends at the end of February) the Committee decided to simply add the following sentence:

Well Aware also partners with other agencies, such as conservation authorities and health units, to connect people with funding programs to improve or decommission private wells in areas not eligible for funding under the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program.

Over the next couple of months staff will draft a second letter highlighting the achievements and effectiveness of other such programs and calling on the province to provide long-term sustainable funding. This letter will be presented to the Committee for their consideration.

A member asked that the letter of support for the Well Aware program be sent to the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, and the Minister Health and Long-term Care.

A member asked how the Committee could know the effectiveness of the Well Aware program. Patricia Larkin responded that there is a lot of information that demonstrates the effectiveness of the program but she did not have numbers with her.

Motion 6-01/10

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approve the attached letter of support for the Well Aware program and submit it to Minister Gerretsen, Minister Dombrowsky, and Minister Matthews as amended.

Carried

5.0 Community Outreach

Ms. Casgrain Robertson reported on the success of the Eastern Ontario provincial Ministries "staff-to-staff" day held in Kingston on December 4. She informed members that it was well attended, the presentations were well received and participants indicated that they found the day informative and worthwhile. The day seemed to generate increased interest in local source protection efforts which is important as regional and district ministry staff will play a key role in implementation some source protection policies through provincial instruments. Chair Stavinga added that source water staff did an outstanding job with their presentations and the five Eastern Ontario Source Protection Regions came across as well coordinated and collaborative.

Ms. Casgrain-Robertson noted that there is a Quarterly Chairs meeting coming up at the end of January, there are 4 council presentations being organized by the Cataraqui region, and staff will be presenting to the Source Protection Authorities in January and February. Specific dates will be

circulated to the Committee once available.

Patricia Larkin reported that the Rideau Environmental Action League is hosting a discussion day about Smiths Falls' storm water on January 12. Peter McLaren is attending an Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association meeting in Renfrew on January 8 and source water is on the agenda. Eleanor Renaud informed staff that she is preparing the Leeds Ontario Federation of Agriculture newsletter and can include a blurb about source water. Ms. Renaud also informed members about an informative wetland course she attended by the Grenville Land Stewardship Council. She noted that they are willing to provide a condensed version for Source Protection Committees.

Motion 7-01/10

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee receive the following report for information.

Carried

6.0 Other Business

Chair Stavinga informed members that with the tight Assessment Report timeline staff are struggling to get the agenda package out to members two weeks in advance of the meeting. She asked if any members were opposed to returning to the one week window laid out in the Committee's Rules of Procedure. No members were opposed.

Chair Stavinga also informed the Committee that a small editorial sub-committee would be formed to review the first cut of preliminary draft Assessment Report chapters written by staff. She warned that the turn around time for comments would be tight, 24 to 48 hours. Staff would try to work comments received into the version of the Chapter included in the agenda package for the Committee's consideration. Members who were interested were asked to contact Sommer.

Chair Stavinga noted that Alex Cullen has resigned from the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee as he is running for Mayor of Ottawa. Ms. Casgrain-Robertson will work with City staff to fill his seat.

Brian Stratton told members that Mattamy is considering developing a new subdivision in Richmond that would be serviced by a new communal drinking water system like the one that services the King's Park subdivision in Richmond. Should this development take place the new drinking water system would be brought into the Mississippi-Rideau's Terms of Reference and included in the source protection planning process.

7.0 Member Inquiries

None

8.0 Next Meeting

Date: February 4, 2010

Time: 1:00 pm

Location: RVCA, Monterey Boardroom

9.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

.....
Janet Stavinga
Chair

.....
Sommer Casgrain-Robertson
Recording Secretary