

**RECORD OF A MEETING OF THE NORTH BAY-MATTAWA
SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE
4:00 PM, THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 2010**

Held at the President's Boardroom of Nipissing University, 100 College Drive, North Bay

1. Attendance. Meeting Called to Order at 4:14 PM

S P C	Staff and Liaisons	Regrets
Barbara Groves, Chair	Sue Miller, Manager DWSP	Ian Kilgour, SPC
Lucy Emmott (4:25 PM)	Rob Pringle, Source Protection Planner	George Stivrins, SPC
Dennis MacDonald	Sue Buckle, Communications Advisor	Laurier Therrien. SPC
John MacLachlan	Neil Gervais, MOE Liaison	Chuck Poltz (NBPSDHU Liaison)
George Onley		
Maurice Schlosser		
Roy Warriner		

2. Callander Bay Intake Technical Study review discussion

Specific comments of concern:

- George Onley commented that the wording describing the IPZ-2 Boundary "The IPZ-2 boundary is reduced..." George was confused as to the interpretation of the use of "reduced" in the sense that the boundary over land differs from the over-water calculations.
- Information gaps (section 9) need to be worded effectively – so that the public might know how the gaps will be filled with future work.
- Use of the word "Concern" and bold text – those areas of the report will be the focus in the eyes of the public. Especially in Section 7.1 "lack of long-term raw water quality data precludes a confident assessment of general water quality conditions and identification of potential changes in raw water quality over time"
 - o This sampling data should be publicly available. Need to identify the data gap and a resolution quickly.
- Neil wanted to confirm Callander's participation in the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program. He suggested contacting Cam Adams, MOE inspector (completed, confirmed)
- Agricultural identification: still old data being used, therefore the mapping needs to be marked as such, and work to update as much data as possible.
- Other mapping issues for the phosphorous contribution: Barb notes some areas which were not included: a golf course and trailer parks.
- Wildlife – if agriculture is being addressed, why are we not considering production of waste of wild creatures, which are more likely to be within the water courses?

Related comments (doesn't affect the report):

- What is the impact of a lower water level in the Bay on the total fecal coliform count once the lagoons are released? Could this year be a concern?

3. Comments from MOE - Neil

Neil’s comments related to timelines. In his conversations in the past week, he discovered that there are a number of other extensions being requested, and none of them have any requests for extended consultation. He wants the committee to understand that getting the extra time for consultation may not happen.

Identified data gaps should be accompanied by a work plan showing how those data gaps will be analyzed. This work plan should be included in the Assessment Report and the resulting work be incorporated in an update to the Assessment Report in 2011.

Neil suggested MOE pre-screen the Assessment Report before submission however this may not be feasible due to timelines.

4. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

A business dinner was held after the meeting. The meeting was followed by the event “Walkerton – From Infamy to Excellence: The Cost of Getting it Wrong” which ran from 7 PM to 9 PM.

Original signed by:

Barbara Groves, Chair

Original signed by:

Sue Miller, Project Manager