

**FINAL**  
**O.S.P.E. LAND DRAINAGE COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**Tuesday, January 19th, 2016**  
**Best Western Lamplighter Inn and Conference Centre - Oval Room**  
**London, Ontario**

**1.0 Attendance and Call to Order**

- 1.1 Members Present: Tony Peralta, Chairman; Gerard Rood, Secretary; Jeff Dickson, Vice Chair; John Kuntze; Michael Gerrits; Mark Hernandez
- 1.2 Liaison Members Present: Davin Heinbuck, Conservation Ontario (Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority); Sid Vander Veen, O.M.A.F.R.A. (Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs); Richard Kavanagh, D.F.O. (Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada)
- 1.3 Absent Members: Art Groenveld, M.T.O. (Ministry of Transportation Ontario); Sharon Rew, M.N.R.F. (Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources & Forestry); Lee Weissling, O.S.P.E. (Ontario Society of Professional Engineers); Pat Shaver, Open Learning & Educational Support (University of Guelph); Tom Hoggarth, D.F.O. (Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada)
- 1.4 Chairman Tony Peralta called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m..

**2.0 Approval of Agenda**

- 2.1 The committee reviewed the agenda prepared by Tony Peralta. Motion by Jeff Dickson, seconded by Mark Hernandez, that the latest agenda as prepared by the chairman be accepted. Carried.

**3.0 Minutes of Last Meeting**

- 3.1 Jeff Dickson moved to accept the revised October 22, 2015 L.D.C. meeting minutes as circulated and seconded by Mike Gerrits. Carried
- 3.2 Final documents are to be sent to Pat Shaver by Gerard Rood for posting to the L.D.C. web site. **Action by Gerard.**

**4.0 Business Arising From the Minutes**

- 4.1 Any business will be discussed during the presentation of the various liaison reports.

## 5.0 Correspondence

- 5.1 Mike Gerrits is to report in the future on the final outcome of the Tribunal Decision on his Northern Ontario project on the Darmar-Tamlin Drain.
- 5.2 Tony noted that Pat Shaver had sent out information on the conference. The feedback was generally positive. The details will be discussed in the liaison report.
- 5.3 We received a letter from Bill Mays, Chairman of the Drainage Superintendents Association of Ontario. There is a phosphorus reduction workshop scheduled to be held in the near future; this is related to the Great Lakes Act that the governments have put into place. The group is asking for representatives from different groups including the D.S.A.O., and would like to see a representative from the Land Drainage Committee, or Land Drainage Engineers attend as well. Jeff Dickson noted that Mitch Toulon is the mayor of Huron-Kinloss and is deeply involved in the Great Lakes initiative. Lisa Thompson, a member of provincial parliament is also involved, along with Kevin McKague. Tony noted that this is geared to the Thames River basin. Sid discussed some background that this is a domestic action plan for the whole Great Lakes system. The target at this time is the Thames River watershed and the Leamington area along Lake Erie. The group is to deal with all sorts of different stuff, one specifically is drainage. Drainage engineers need to be around the table as part of the discussions. There is a need for plans to achieve targets that have been set, what is doable as part of the design for the drainage works; their discussions will include natural drainage in addition to municipal drainage works. Tony noted he is only available for only one day of the Great Lakes Conference. Gerard observed that the problem needs to be fixed at the source. Sid questioned if we could be part of the solution. Richard Kavanagh suggested the use of buffer strips to limit the amount of phosphorus that enters the streams or use of other controls that will provide similar reductions. Tony noted that they are working on Lebo Creek in Leamington with Dave Richards to enhance the natural watercourse portions of the stream. He will try to go to the Great Lakes Meeting as the Land Drainage Committee representative.
- 5.4 Tony asked Sid Vander Veen to present his proposal. Sid said that he had been contacted by Ed Delay, and in their discussions wanted to consider providing some drainage history background on the Land Drainage Committee website. A few years ago he went out with Dave McGeorge and they had some interesting discussions about the history of drainage works in the Chatham-Kent area. Sid suggests that we need some history of drains and locations of files; they would like to have a drainage practitioners summary. The Herb Todgham passing also triggered this idea and we may be able to tap Ed Dries for information on Herb's background and involvement with drainage. The idea is to host it on the website, and capture some of the history of drainage in Ontario so that it is accessible to interested parties. Sid and Ed do not want to write all of these postings up. He suggested that Dave McGeorge could write it up for himself, his father and grandfather. What they are looking for is committee support for this initiative. They would like to have a couple of pages written for each engineer. The suggestion is that the engineers to be posted should have written at least 100 reports, or provided other valuable contributions to Ontario drainage pursuant to the Drainage Act. Jeff Dickson said he had also spoken with Ed Delay and sent him some data, particularly geared to the 40th anniversary conference that will be coming up shortly. Tony noted that there is a manpower problem as well as maintenance of the data in the future. It will be important to dedicate

someone to managing this information if it is a project that we move ahead with. Sid suggested starting with a half dozen engineers and this may spark a response. He suggested that Tony could do a summary for Nick Peralta. If only 2 engineers are to be posted it won't be done. Sid commented that Matt Baird's great grandfather did a lot of work under the drainage Act. Will be important for someone to make contacts with people who could provide information relative to that drainage background. He noted that the Ontario Land Surveyors group also has some summaries available that might be able to be utilized on the Land Drainage Committee website. It was suggested that Henry Venameer could do a bunch of outlines of drainage engineers. Sid suggested that we review ideas and suggest any changes to the proposed postings of historical drainage engineer information. It may be possible to do a few per year with maximum 2-page bios for engineers that are selected to be posted on the website. He further suggests that if someone questions the engineers posted to the website that we could ask them to provide information for other engineers that may be qualified to have their bios posted to the website as well. John Kuntze noted that many Municipalities have hall of fame information. Sid suggested that we don't call it ``Hall of Fame``. The description should just provide where the drainage engineer worked and where his files are located. Mike Gerrits has Jim Monteith records in their office and also the records for Jim Monteith's father. Tony noted that William Settington records are saved at the Crozier Baird office. Gerard suggested using the term "Drainage Pioneers". Sid observed that some of the engineers are younger. Gerard questioned how many hits are on the Land Drainage Committee website and if this would be a worthwhile proposition. Davin suggested "Recognition of Service" as a title for the drainage engineer bios. John suggested starting with deceased members and then adding on current practioners later on. It will be important to have someone to moderate and set up the information similar to what Wikipedia does. He questioned whether Ed Delay would do the moderation works. Sid strongly suggested tapping certain people while they are still available to provide history and information. John noted that Colonel Archibald should be included and that he spawned several other practioners that might also be considered for the website. He believes that the committee could support this initiative. He further advised that he doesn't have time himself to do this type of work. Tony questioned how to proceed. Jeff suggested contacting people before connections are deceased and that we do a list to start.

- 5.5 It was suggested that Mark Hernandez could investigate the McGeorge family including William, Dave and Don McGeorge as well as their grandfather; also Herb Todgham and Ed Dries. Gerard volunteered to contact Matthew Baird about getting a report bio for Alex Baird and William Settington; and would look into background for J.J. Newman and George McCubbin, who have often cropped up in the history for drainage works in the Essex county area. Tony will research C.G.R. Armstrong and his son Maurice. Jeff and John suggested that James House should be researched as a candidate. Sid will look into Phil McNeely and Andy Graham and possibly Howard Gibson and C.D. Bowman. John can look into Fred Ure and his son out of the Woodstock area. Mark Hernandez will investigate Ed LaFontaine as a candidate. Jeff will look into getting a history for Andy McBride. Mike will look into Jim Monteith. In the future, consideration will be given to Henry Uederstadt, Tony Devos and Andy Spriet. It was suggested that we recruit people to provide bios if they are interested in having them posted on the website. **Action by Committee Members.**

**6.0 Liaison Report – O.S.P.E. – Lee Weissling**

6.1 Tony Peralta spoke with Lee Weissling and there is no new information.

**7.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry – Sharon Rew**

7.1 Tony advised that he had contacted Jeremy Downes and was directed to send our committee information to Sharon Rew at the M.N.R.F. **Action by Gerard.**

**8.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Transportation Ontario - Art Groenveld**

8.1 Art Groenveld had called Tony and because of back problems was unable to attend this meeting.

**9.0 Liaison Report – Conservation Ontario - Davin Heinbuck**

9.1 Davin noted that there was nothing from Conservation Ontario.

9.2 The C.A.'s and policies have been discussed with regards to culvert sizing. He is aware of 3 design storms that are typically used being the 1:100, 1:250 and hurricane Hazel storm event. He noted that ever C.A. has different standards; some issue permits for works to control what is being installed; some C.A.'s are not involved in the bridge sizing process at all.

9.3 He noted that A.B.C.A. (Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority) enclosures require permits. Gerard observed that E.R.C.A. (Essex Region Conservation Authority) uses 1:100 year for design requirements. Sid asked why the changes in sizing standards have not been questioned. Tony observed that it is mostly in sensitive areas that are key. Standards appear to be more aggressive now than in the past. The C.A. may insist on more stringent standards than the engineer would recommend. Gerard commented that there are tables in the Guidelines for Design Standards to design bridges. Sid commented that the table information is being included in the new Design Guidelines that are being prepared at this time.

9.4 Sid noted that Mike Devos has questioned the St. Clair C.A. regarding their standards; there appeared to be a sudden change in standards with no consultation. Jeff commented that it appears each individual C.A. is taking their own initiative. Tony commented that they appear to be using Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act as their justification. Sid commented that an access to a subdivision for the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority was obliged to provide a design up to the regional storm, even though it was only a local road and is normally required to only have a 1:25 year storm. John observed that road bridges are usually built with a sag so that they can be overtopped in exceptional storm events.

9.5 Sid suggested that the C.A.'s should accept the road design standards. Gerard observed that there is concern with downstream impacts if all upstream bridges and culverts are made larger than they have been in the past. Davin suggested that perhaps D.A.R.T. could have a look at

this and this needs to be discussed. Jeff suggested that Sid can express concerns for grants for these much larger capacity designs and that the normal standard for O.M.A.F.R.A. is a 2-year storm design for agricultural bridges that are grantable.

- 9.6 Tony indicated that the current standards seem to be “like or better”; a lot of old bridges are concrete clear span structures that were the only solution at the time the bridges were needed and constructed. Now the C.A. seems to be wanting the same standard even though it was not a flow determination that established the sizing. Gerard suggested that the C.A. should accept where flows overtop the bridges and roadways for extreme storm events and maintain the previous design standards for sizing as set out in the Guidelines.
- 9.7 Davin noted that where there is a dwelling or livestock access required, the standard is bumped up for their C.A. Sid commented that A.B.C.A. deals differently than the standard C.A. response to culvert and bridge sizing. The question is whether it is an acceptable risk; we cannot protect ourselves from everything; the cost to increase design standard becomes prohibitive. Jeff suggested that we need to get the message back to the C.A.’s.
- 9.8 Davin suggested that this has to be brought up with M.N.R.F. when they sit down at the table to discuss working with drainage projects under the Drainage Act. John will check with their bridge design guys to see what standards they are being obliged to design to. Mike observed that the M.T.O. uses 1:10 year on minor roads. Sid commented that some C.A.’s no longer accept old 1:10 year sizing. He questioned if it is reasonable to use that design standard. John noted that the bigger sizes to protect upstream lands affects downstream design that has to assume the upstream is washed out. Tony noted that C.A. involvement can quash development if 1:100 year access is not there. Davin observed that there are different standards for different areas; most private accesses are still corrugated steel pipe installations.
- 9.9 He went on to advise that Conservation Ontario has approved him to attend the drainage superintendents course and provide input and training for the attendees..

## **10.0 Liaison Report – Fisheries and Oceans Canada – Richard Kavanagh**

- 10.1 Richard advised that since the last D.A.W.G. meeting D.F.O. has been doing B.M.P. guidance documents. They are getting close to finishing them but a few more revisions are required. They are also working on a culvert replacement guide with the key issue being the length of the culvert which can be affected by the drain grade. D.F.O. is trying to work this out, make revisions and take back to D.A.W.G.
- 10.2 They are looking at earlier involvement with drainage reports so that feedback is provided sooner. They are looking at a notification form that would be submitted to the Triage group. This would result in a quicker response and they would only bump up a project to review when needed. He observed that they will not be able to attend on-site meetings due to limited staff, distance and number of meetings.

- 10.3 They have resurrected the 2002 Guidance Document and Lisa Wren has been tasked to work on updates to comply with the Fisheries Act. Once complete the D.F.O. will take the Guide out to as many people as they can.
- 10.4 D.F.O. is also looking at compliance with the drain classification. They have done some audits on projects and noticed that some drains didn't include required offsets. This is now enforceable and fines and other actions could occur. People need to do offsetting measures or other works that were proposed. It is likely that this will see more action.
- 10.5 Gerard asked about the D.F.O. Rehabilitation Guide. Richard replied that this will be put on the D.F.O. website. He is working with staff to get this updated. They can include the Rehabilitation Guide in their "waves" library. It generally takes 1-1.5 years to post a document. Sid commented that it is more engineering related and suggested that it be put on the L.D.C. website. Richard noted that it was originally designed for the recreational fisheries program and is a general guide. It is useful for engineers for general guidance. The engineer can apply their judgement on the requirements. The Guide is finalized now.
- 10.6 The Agricultural Drainage Guidance Document is the one that Lisa Wren is reviewing and is mostly for maintenance works.
- 10.7 D.F.O. is working with C.A.'s to classify drains and is providing funding. The intent is to reduce the number of non-classified drains. If an engineer is aware of an unrated drain they should approach the C.A. to get it classified before work is done. They have a classification guide that is based on species and not temperature, and on what is actually found in the drain. They are working to review and fine tune it. They may be limited by their budget. Richard noted that it is cheaper if a C.A. does the classification instead of a consultant.
- 11.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs - Sid Vander Veen**
- 11.1 Sid has sent out an A.D.I.P. update to the municipalities and included grant application deadlines.
- 11.2 Information on the O.M.A.F.R.A. courses for this year has gone out.
- 11.3 Sid sent his report to Pat Shaver for the Conference Proceedings.
- 11.4 Jenn Thomas and Dave Balint have been invited to assist with the Drainage Superintendent training. Gary Cooper did the training presentation last year. They still need a speaker on Friday March 4th for the Fisheries Act component of the course. Davin Heinbuck is doing his usual presentation. Registration for the course is close to full already.
- 11.5 Sid is doing four (4) Municipal drainage courses this year. These are posted on the Ridgetown College of Agricultural Technology (R.C.A.T.) web site.

- 11.6 Gord Miller who was the Environmental Commissioner has resigned and the new Commissioner is Diane Saks. She has written in the Municipal World magazine and is a lawyer in Toronto. She has asked Sid for information.
- 11.7 Sid provided a statistics handout for the past year dated January 20, 2016 (see attached). Tile drainage is shown in the first three (3) boxes. Box 2 shows the length of tiles installed. This usually reflects on Municipal drains for improved outlets.
- 11.8 The two bottom boxes were referred to. The big box shows a new record for maintenance work. The average project cost is a new high at \$5,457.00. The bottom box details engineering reports. The total grant paid was \$3.69 million. The average drain cost is now \$157,600.00 which has doubled in the last 10 years from \$76,859.00. Gerard will include Sid's report with the final October minutes. **Action by Gerard Rood.**
- 11.9 Sid commented that prices are going up. Jeff Dickson observed that land values are going up and the number of projects and cost are going up. He sees much larger enterprises that are willing to invest in the improvements
- 11.10 Sid stated that the number of engineers doing reports are going down base on the grant applications. The A.D.I.P. budget was originally \$6M and was bumped up to \$7M. The grant demand is now around \$9.6M. So far the excess has been covered by leftover funds in the Ministry. This may be a concern in the future. Maintenance work and superintendent costs use up almost the entire \$7M budget, so that Municipal drainage projects of \$3.6M are not covered in the budget.
- 11.11 Grant applications are due mid-February. Sid reminded everyone to make sure that the applications are complete. He pointed out that profiles are needed for existing drains that are incorporated into a Municipal drain. He discussed the Farm Property Tax Class Rate is required for grants. People should put the onus on property owners to get the right tax class rate for their lands.

## **12.0 Office of Open Learning - University of Guelph - Pat Shaver**

- 12.1 Pat provided an email with an outline of the Conference results. There were discussions about the report on the convention provided by Pat. The feed back was generally positive; case studies were very favourably rated on the reviews.
- 12.2 The responders also want a non engineering presentation included as part of the convention.
- 12.3 The case study done in the afternoon was well received; there were concerns with the microphone problems and discussions that there was only one screen. The use of a single screen works at courses; you can use the mouse to point so all can see.

- 12.4 It was recommended that Pat be asked to arrange multi screens for the next conference but this will require that all projectors are in sync so that everyone sees that same presentation with the audio portion. **Action by Pat Shaver.**
- 12.5 Jeff Dickson noted that he likes keeping people to the end in the afternoon and then releasing them once all the presentations are done.
- 12.6 There are comments about keeping the training and convention on Thursday and Friday rather than shifting the time of the week for holding these. The key is to wrap up the conference on time so that people can head for home sufficiently early on the Friday afternoon.
- 12.7 The Thursday course feedback was positive. There was a request for a meeting to review the new Design Guidelines that are coming out.

### **13.0 D.A.R.T. (Drainage Act Regulations Team) Update - John Kuntze**

- 13.1 John advised that not much is happening. There is trouble organizing things. He has participated in a couple of tele-conferences. The review of the Wetlands Policy needs to be completed.
- 13.2 He is still involved with an Oxford County project that is in the court of the Drainage Referee now. The farmer was convicted under Provincial Offences Court. The farmer is filing new petitions. The question is whether the C.A. Act or the Drainage Act is more precedent setting or establishing how they work together.

### **14.0 D.A.W.G. (Drain Action Working Group) Update – Mark Hernandez**

- 14.1 Mark will act as the L.D.C. representative for the upcoming meetings.
- 14.2 Tony will notify Jenn Thomas at D.F.O. of this change. **Action by Tony Peralta.**

### **15.0 D.S.A.O. Procurement Update – Jeff Dickson**

- 15.1 Jeff advised that the meeting with the Drainage Superintendents did not occur. He will continue to liaise with them and report to the Committee on any new information.

### **16.0 New Business**

- 16.1 Tony Peralta discussed archiving. He stated that Gerard Rood got a lawyer opinion from a Municipal Clerk. We can use the information as we want. Pat Shaver has pointed out that they never published participant names in the past. Sid commented that old proceedings has a list of participants. Tony stated that Pat can share the information.

- 16.2 John Kuntze observed that the old Drainage Conference proceedings don't have any copyright notice. Tony advised that Pat can publish these on the website.
- 16.3 Tony has copies of proceedings from 1992 to present. Sid has digital scanned copies of 1969 to 1977 inclusive. John has hard copies from 1979 to 1992. Jeff commented that Pat has from 2005 to present in her files. John has 1978 to 2006 but missing 1984 and 1998. Tony said that he had those available. John advised that he has 2 sets of proceedings scanned. Jeff noted that we have every year that is needed. Most are glue bonded and will have to be sliced up for scanning. He reminded everyone that we only need up to the 2004 proceedings.
- 16.4 Tony suggested that we investigate the cost to get them commercially scanned. Mark Hernandez advised that they have students who can do it. Richard Kavanagh recommended making the documents searchable using O.C.R. (Optical Character Recognition) software. Tony commented that we can run O.C.R. afterwards if a clean scan to P.D.F. (Portable Document File) is done.
- 16.5 It was recommended that the 1st page – cover be scanned in colour to match the hard copies of the Proceedings. Copies were distributed to the Committee. John will arrange to scan 1978 to 1982 inclusive and 1984. Jeff will do 1983 to 1987 inclusive excluding 1984. Gerard will do 1988 to 1991. Mark will do 1992 to 1994. Mike will do 1995, 1996, 1997, 1999 and 2000. Tony will do 1998, and 2001 to 2004 inclusive. Everyone is to bring the P.D.F. files on a thumb drive to the June meeting. It was recommended that the file size be reduced using software. The Committee can then check with Pat Shaver on getting the information posted. It was noted that Word 2013 can be used to open P.D.F. files. It was recommended that the “Master” be retained by each person in case a re-scan is needed.
- 16.6 L.D.C. meeting minutes scanning was discussed. Jeff has minutes from October 1973 and others in a box at his office. There are 75 sets of minutes. John commented that he has copies of most of the minutes but would have to locate them. Sid asked Jeff to email him which minutes he is missing. Sid should have from 1991 onwards. Tony asked that hard copies of the meeting minutes be brought to the next meeting for distribution and scanning. **Action by Jeff Dickson, Sid Vander Veen and John Kuntze.**
- 16.7 The status of M.N.R.F. and the E.S.A. were discussed. Tony asked if the L.D.C. can push M.N.R.F. to meet or review the current approach that is being taken. The current requirement is that biological studies are required for any project that might have an E.S.A. impact. These studies can cost more than the preparation of the drainage report. Tony understands that M.N.R.F. wants an expert for each species. Jeff asked if D.A.R.T. has discussed this. John Kuntze stated that it is not part of the scope for D.A.R.T.; there has been some discussion but nothing key. Tony commented that Bill Mays says that their group is looking at banding together to address M.N.R.F. requirements. Mark Hernandez suggested that this needs to be coordinated through D.S.A.O. and that we should approach Bill Mays. Richard Kavanagh asked if engineers can coordinate biological studies between stakeholders. Tony can take this back to Bill Mays and ask for D.S.A.O. to follow up since this is also a big concern for Municipalities.

- 16.8 The 2016 conference was discussed. Pat Shaver has booked the Holiday Inn for the conference. Sid has booked the O.M.A.F.R.A. rooms for the fall L.D.C. meeting and training course.
- 16.9 The June meeting is scheduled for June 10th, 2016 which is the 2nd Friday. The training and conference dates are October 20th and 21st, 2016.
- 16.10 Mark Hernandez said that he is curious about a lot of documents related to climate change and the engineer's responsibilities and liabilities. He thinks that the L.D.C. helps provide consistency in the approach that is used. Sid stated that the Design Guidelines have a chapter on climate change but not specifics. Tony noted that M.T.O. is working on new I.D.F. curves. Gerard suggested that it might be helpful to check with insurers. Jeff Dickson felt that the government should provide information on this. There are cost impacts if higher standards have to be met. He wondered how this would affect O.M.A.F.R.A. grants. John Kuntze commented that climate change is not likely to impact agricultural drainage significantly. The design coefficient used depends on the protection level that is desired and the cost. Mark observed that their offices look at the Risk Assessment Tool from the insurers and he expects that the insurers may feed information down to the Municipalities.
- 16.11 Sid advised that that the Guidelines are light in theory and calculations but include references. They are heavier in assessment and Drainage Act requirements and have a lot of compiled information.
- 16.12 An update on the Design and Construction Guidelines was provided by Sid. Kenn Smart has submitted the final document and the O.M.A.F.R.A. review team is going through it. They did one review and doing a second one for consistency through the whole document. They still need illustrations and figures. A peer review will be done. Although it won't be done by October, it will be useable for training. We should be able to discuss a course in June. John suggested that we can do an overview of the documents and then go into details in the subsequent years.
- 16.13 Sid noted that we need topics for the next conference. John suggested two (2) Drainage Act situations. The first is using Section 65 now that it is combined with Section 66. What can you do now versus what could be done before. He can be the speaker. The second topic is a discussion of a Tribunal decision that a Maintenance Schedule should only be Outlet Liability. This stems from the Little Creek Drain decision. Gerard commented that maintenance work puts the drain back to the original report status and therefore the assessment basis should be the same as set out in the report. John commented that it involved a Section 76 report. Gerard noted that the Tribunal says that their decisions are not precedent setting and that decision can therefore be ignored. Sid agreed with this.
- 16.14 John commented that maintenance schedules are often divvied up. If you are only working on the bottom end is the upstream getting any Benefit. Sid noted that he is doing an assessments course. He uses the Duncan Drain from K. Smart Associates. John believes that more engineers need to hear how it works. Sid points out in the course how the report separates the

affected parcels. John stated that some engineers do schedules by percentages. He has done some reports with both numbers and percentages.

16.15 Sid suggested another topic – Municipal drains and road authorities. M.T.O., Counties and Regions like to do what they want and ignore the drains. Sections 80 and 82 apply to road authorities too. John stated that Waterloo doesn't allow tile drains into road ditches without a drainage report anymore.

16.16 Tony asked about the Road Authority being added to a petition as an owner. Sid advised that there are two (2) forms – one for land owners, the other for road authorities. The road authority can sign as a landowner.

16.17 Tony suggested a presentation on Section 40 reports. Jeff noted that he has done a paper at a D.S.A.O. session with Paul McIntyre.

16.18 Sid stated that O.M.A.F.R.A. has chapters on some of the Sections for possible presentation. The phosphorous situation could be a timely topic to present.

## **17.0 Next Meeting**

17.1 The next meeting of the L.D.C. will be Friday June 10th, 2016 at the O.M.A.F.R.A. offices on Stone Road in Guelph.

17.2 Sid will book the ground floor conference room for the Committee meeting. **Action by Sid Vander Veen.**

## **18.0 Adjournment**

18.1 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:00 p.m. Moved by Gerard Rood and seconded by Jeff Dickson. Carried

---

Tony Peralta, Chairman

Gerard Rood, Secretary