

**FINAL**  
**O.S.P.E. LAND DRAINAGE COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**Tuesday, January 20th, 2015**  
**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; Tim Oliver; John Kuntze; Michael Gerrits
- 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); Tom Hoggarth, D.F.O. (Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada)
- 1.3 Absent Members: Art Groenveld, M.T.O. (Ministry of Transportation Ontario); Jeremy Downe, O.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)
- 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 Gerard Rood, seconded by John Kuntze, that the latest agenda as prepared by the chairman be accepted. Carried.

**3.0 Minutes of Last Meeting**

- 3.1 John Kuntze moved to accept the revised October 23, 2014 L.D.C. meeting minutes as circulated and seconded by Jeff Dickson. 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 As regards Item 4.6 of the last meeting, Tim Oliver advised that the December meeting of the Drain Action Working Group (D.A.W.G.) was cancelled.
- 4.2 Tim Oliver noted that Item 14.5 regarding D.F.O. review exemption for replacement culverts had not been finally addressed. Tom Hoggarth advised that his workload had not permitted

moving ahead on this and another meeting of D.A.W.G. would be scheduled soon. **Action by Tom.**

- 4.3 Tony Peralta advised the Committee that the presentation on bridge assessments as per Item 4.9 had been done and notes were made. Gerard suggested that Sid Vander Veen be approached about the next step. **Action by Tony.**
- 4.4 Item 12.11 regarding posting of the original Todgham method paper on the L.D.C. web site was discussed. Jeff Dickson suggested that a disclaimer be added to the start of the paper noting the references in the paper are to the older version of the Drainage Act. The Ed Dries paper on the Todgham method is currently posted on the web site. Jeff noted that the Todgham paper is very thick and does a full assessment analysis. He will provide Pat Shaver with a copy. **Action by Jeff.**
- 4.5 Tony asked about Item 15.4 regarding M.T.O. Shared Use request. The item will be discussed under new business if Art Groenveld arrives later.

## **5.0 Correspondence**

- 5.1 Tony Peralta discussed correspondence received since the last meeting. In November he was contacted by Conrad Strang of Ottawa about how to become a drainage engineer. Tony responded to him with general information.
- 5.2 Lee Weissling of O.S.P.E. notified Tony that Glenn Watson will be the future liaison member for them as Kristian Kennedy had left the organization.
- 5.3 Tony noted that Pat Shaver had sent out information on the conference and this could be discussed later.
- 5.4 John Kuntze brought up the email sent out by Sid Vander Veen regarding use of P.Eng. stamps. Several members said that they had responded to Sid. Tim Oliver said that Sid has seen drainage reports without a seal. Tony observed that the engineer needs to sign and date the stamp. Jeff stated that he prepares a stamp with signature and date, scans it and then inserts it into the report and plans for the project. He suggested that disclaimers should be included on reports and plans, especially PDF versions as they can be widely distributed and edited. There have been instances of people doing cut and paste of report parts. He recommends that all practitioners should include text in the report and a note on the plans regarding 3rd party liability for any information used outside the scope of the project that the report and plans were prepared for.

## **6.0 Liaison Report – O.S.P.E. – Glenn Watson**

- 6.1 Glenn Watson was not available and there was no report.

**7.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry - Jeremy Downe**

7.1 Jeremy was not present and no report was provided by M.N.R.F. Tim Oliver noted that M.N.R.F. has not budgeted for a liaison person. The Committee will continue to circulate them so that the liaison is maintained.

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

8.1 Art was expected to attend this meeting but has not arrived and there was no report.

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

9.1 Davin reported that Conservation Ontario is preparing a webinar for January 29th, with Frank Jonkman. Information is available at “DSAO.net”. Davin will present a webinar on D.A.R.T. (Drainage Act Regulations Team) from 1:30 to 3:30 on February 10th.

9.2 He noted that there is a lot of variation between the various Conservation Authorities.

9.3 There are problems with the notification form and they are trying to address S.C.R.’s (Standard Compliance Requirement). There are some concerns with drains and their branches. They are planning on having other examples and are working with Brett Ruck. Tom Hoggarth asked that they let D.F.O. know and keep Jenn Thomas in the loop. **Action by Davin.**

9.4 Davin elaborated that they are using “quick parts” in Word to simplify the form. It would be similar to the Operational Statements used in the past. There would be one S.C.R. for each activity that is proposed. They are currently testing the form and hope to reduce the submissions from 5 or 6 sheets down to 2 or 3 sheets. They have found that some people are modifying the form but they shouldn’t so that it is a standard form. They may have to revert to a PDF format and are looking at how to make the form better.

9.5 Jeff Dickson observed that the PDF format is often used for forms to keep them standard. A drawback is that the file cannot be saved. You can only print the populated form and not save it. This requires all information to be updated with each application. M.O.E. has similar forms. He suggested that Excel sheets are easier to work with since only certain cells need to be locked. John Kuntze noted that some forms can be saved if Adobe Acrobat Pro is used to do the form. Davin said that they would continue with Word for now and look at improving them.

9.6 Davin is helping with training courses through Sid Vander Veen. He will do a presentation on the Conservation Authority Act and review alternative drain maintenance techniques.

9.7 John Kuntze advised that D.A.R.T. is creating a form management team. The D.S.A.O. web site currently has 2 versions of the form. D.F.O., M.N.R.F. and O.M.A.F.R.A. with Conservation Ontario are looking at establishing a method for control of the form.

- 9.8 Tom Hoggarth stated that he was also going to discuss the form. They need some changes to the form to reflect the new Fisheries Act requirements and reduce legal risks. He believes that this should be sorted out now and they are trying to get 1 form that will satisfy all stakeholders. He believes that this is under control.
- 9.9 John Kuntze said that the endangered species section was not working and was being taken off the form. Tom suggested that M.N.R.F. may not want them on the form and this may simplify it. Tom will talk to Jenn Thomas about the form. He noted that the form has to be sent out to all 3 agencies. The applicant needs to get a response from each of the 3 groups and not just proceed on a single response.

#### **10.0 Liaison Report – Fisheries and Oceans Canada - Thomas Hoggarth**

- 10.1 Tom advised the members that D.F.O. has new people especially in the Triage Group. If anyone has difficulties, he asked that they contact him or Jenn Thomas and they will arrange to sort things out. He said not to wait but seek help from them if there are any questions or concerns. He noted that their response time is good again with a time frame of 4-6 weeks for a simple application. He further noted that the initial response may state that the application has been sent for review to a biologist, in which case the applicant will need to wait for a further response from the biologist before they can proceed.
- 10.2 The D.A.W.G. (Drain Action Working Group) has been fairly active. They will keep it going again. The “do not send list” is pretty well complete. The D.A.W.G. committee has to provide their response on it which Tom will review. He expects to get the list out once he has reviewed their input. They are standardizing with the M.N.R.F. process and are hoping that D.S.A.O. will help out. Jeff Dickson suggested that the information could be linked to the L.D.C. website so that engineers will have the info too. Tom stated that once the list is accepted by D.A.W.G. he will get it out to D.S.A.O. and the L.D.C.
- 10.3 Tom went on to advise that they are working to update the old Guidance Documents to the Fisheries Act. They are putting together individual Fact Sheets for each drain type. The Fact Sheet for “F” type drains is done and at D.A.W.G.
- 10.4 Jenn Thomas is still working on the drain mapping. She is working with the Drainage Superintendents across Ontario. The project is coming along very well with mostly line work improvements. Once these are good the classifications system can be overlaid. There is no fixed target date but steady progress is being made.
- 10.5 John Kuntze stated that seminars on endangered species are coming out. Tom Hoggarth noted that in the past reviews of the Fisheries Act and Endangered Species Act impacts were done separately. A system has just been put into place for a 1 window approach. If you submit to Fisheries you will get back responses on both fish and endangered species. You just have to submit to the Triage Group and D.F.O. will respond to both aspects.

- 10.6 Tim Oliver asked if all reports should be submitted to the Triage Group. For instance, would a branch drain off a Type “F” drain go to the Triage Group? Tom responded that yes the submission should be made to the Triage Group and they will evaluate and respond. He went on to note that provisions should be made for sediment and erosion control. A branch into a natural water body requires D.F.O. input and a response.
- 10.7 Tom stated that there is some confusion. “D” or “E” drains require site specific review, but may not need an Authorization if for example the work is only a spot cleanout. If there is S.A.R. there is more complexity.
- 10.8 Tom clarified that Lisa Wren was never a D.F.O. employee. She is called in to help when needed on the basis of casual help.
- 10.9 Tony Peralta stated that Lisa had told them that culvert replacements and small extensions do not require review. Tom explained that the “do not submit” list will clarify this.
- 10.10 Tom observed that the self-assessment on their web site is not much use to the drainage community. He will send out copies of the “do not submit” list to D.S.A.O. and L.D.C. when D.A.W.G. finalizes it. He pointed out that you only need permission if there is a serious impact. Although they used to help out in the past, this is no longer their responsibility. They are providing more information to help people to self-assess their projects.
- 10.11 Tom said that everything goes to their Burlington office. For a site specific review, it may be managed from their Regina office.

#### **11.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs - Sid Vander Veen**

- 11.1 After Sid arrived at 2:45 from his other liaison meetings, he advised the Committee that course brochures were sent out. 25 people have signed up for the Drainage Superintendents course. He will add in people if the training is needed for employment purposes. The course is scheduled for March 2-6. He has all the speakers lined up to do their presentations.
- 11.2 Sid stated that O.M.A.F.R.A. emphasizes government priorities and these currently include phosphorus reduction and climate change. Gerard Rood mentioned that the Southwest Agricultural Conference in Ridgetown at the start of the year had a presentation on phosphorus studies being conducted by O.M.A.F.R.A. and a University of Waterloo professor. Sid noted that phosphorus is still a problem and a challenge. We need to look at what we can do and this might include water detention and use of buffer strips. Sid observed that tile drainage reduces peak flows unless there are surface inlets, with reduced flows resulting in less runoff and migration of materials. He went on to state that Don Lobb says that soils need to be conditioned to improve runoff and material migration.
- 11.3 Tim Oliver commented that the U.S. Federal government has directed funds to the Ag community to address water quality and runoff concerns related to the blue green algae problems.

- 11.4 Davin noted that they are doing a small watershed study in which they are seeing problems when material is moved under heavy storms. It is great to see the Ag community studying this too. Sid observed that the challenge is how to show this is being considered in the preparation of drainage reports. The problems have been recognized and the challenge is how to address them.
- 11.5 Sid went on to advise that their ministry is working on new computer programs that are slowly coming. They want to build an outward portal and need someone to tell them what they should look like and what you want to get out of it. They have talked to the Drainage Superintendents and asked if they would want to submit coordinates for drain work. They need someone to commit to working with them. One option is to just mimic the grant application form and put it on-line, but they would like to broaden it. For example, what would you like to extract from the portal – engineering cost ratios – average channel costs – more tracking options. They want someone to assist them and he noted that the programs that are established would likely be in place for 10 or more years. Sites will be limited to user name and password access.
- 11.6 Jeff Dickson would like to have access to F.C.C. land values. Gerard Rood noted that he still has access and can provide information to the members for their review and possible use in gaining access as well.
- 11.7 Sid pointed out that they Referee decisions posted to the C.A.N.L.I.I. web site. They are picking the ones that may be most helpful to practitioners and other stakeholders. There are separate areas for the Tribunal and the Ontario Court of the Drainage Referee decisions. To date there are 19 decisions posted and they will continue to add more information in the future. The site is searchable and faster results occur when searching within the category of the appeal body.
- 11.8 The Drainage Tribunal is hearing an appeal on a report by Michael Gerrits on February 4th. The appeal relates to Environmental Assessment study versus an Environmental Study.
- 11.9 Regarding A.D.I.P. policies, Sid advised that administrative changes have been sent out. These reflect how things are actually being done at the Ministry. The clause about all work complying to law was generalized to apply to reports and maintenance work. The policy also provides that if any part of a parcel is eligible for grant, the entire parcel is eligible.
- 12.0 Office of Open Learning - University of Guelph - Pat Shaver**
- 12.1 Pat provided an email with an outline of the Conference results. These will be reviewed under new business related to future training and the next conference.

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

- 13.1 John advised that the last meetings were focused on an overview of the Conservation Authorities Act and Wetlands Policy. A letter from the Ontario Premier to M.N.R.F. asked them to review this.
- 13.2 Sid Vander Veen observed that they are talking more about use of the Drainage Act for things like beaver dams.
- 13.3 Sid advised that Mike Devos is doing a private bridge and was required to have it pass the regional storm. There is an owner appealing costs for the Environmental Review and claiming that costs should go to the Conservation Authority (C.A.) and not to the drain. Gerard Rood noted that the Drainage Act requires that works meet all the legislative requirements and environmental conditions may not just be due to the Conservation Authority.
- 13.4 Davin Heinbuck mentioned that a recent Referee hearing dealt with a project that had \$300,000 in engineering cost and no work done. The C.A. was billed \$30,000 per Section 6 of the Drainage Act. He noted that the bill goes back to the municipalities that support the C.A. The project involved a wetland area and the Ausable Bayfield C.A. did not oppose. The Referee found that the petition was not valid and the C.A. got the bill. Davin noted that the permitting process lets them control projects. They will ask for information that is needed to issue a permit.
- 13.5 Tony Peralta asked if the environmental appraisal section of the Drainage Act had ever been used. No one was aware of a case. Jeff Dickson noted that Section 83 of the Drainage Act was taken out because of other more restrictive legislation that applies to polluted water.
- 13.6 John Kuntze noted that Kenn Smart had done a Section 40 report in which he assessed M.N.R.F. for cost. M.N.R.F. lost the appeal and had to pay.
- 13.7 John stated that D.A.R.T. is still going on.

**14.0 D.A.W.G. (Drain Action Working Group) Update - Tim Oliver**

- 14.1 Tim reported that there were 4 meetings held so far this year, with one more scheduled for November this year.
- 14.2 A new maintenance project application form is being prepared. It is expected that a position statement for Class E drains will be issued, but mitigation will still have to be done. The impact zone is still important and the drain class has to be documented.
- 14.3 Bill Dietrich asked if the drainage superintendent sets the drain class. Tim responded that this is only for maintenance work. Jenn Thomas of D.F.O. has D.S.A.O. Chapter 6 on stream with completed mapping. She expects that the Chapter 1 mapping will be completed soon.

- 14.4 Tim outlined a list of D.F.O. review exemptions that will include: bridge repairs (above water level), tile repairs, bank repairs, pump repairs and seeding of banks.
- 14.5 They are also considering adding culvert replacement as exempt of D.F.O. review. Tim can summarize his notes on D.A.W.G. and get it out. **Action by Tim**
- 14.6 Sid Vander Veen noted that at the last D.A.W.G. meeting there were some issues with the notification form. There have been version problems and there may be a need for a notifications group. He thinks that O.M.A.F.R.A. can review and release changes to the form. Sid clarified that it is only the notification form that overlaps D.A.R.T. and D.A.W.G.

## **15.0 New Business**

- 15.1 The 2014 Conference summary was reviewed. Gerard Rood noted that requests for more case studies popped up frequently.
- 15.2 Tony suggested that the stress handling session be left out in the future and that people with display booths each be given 5 minutes to discuss their purpose for attending. Jeff Dickson agreed with them kicking off the Conference.
- 15.3 Tony pointed out several comments on audio improvements. Gerard suggested that the Committee approach Pat Shaver to see what she can arrange. He also suggested that Tony could invite people with questions to come to his location and use his microphone. **Action by Pat Shaver**
- 15.4 It was suggested by Tony that the Committee consider one less presentation at the next Conference and that this be discussed at the June meeting. **Action by Committee**
- 15.5 Tim Oliver stated that the Committee needs to discuss doing a training course. Tony asked about the status of the new Design Guidelines. John Kuntze replied that Kenn Smart has to finish them off and then O.M.A.F.R.A. will review and publish them. John noted that Pat Shaver has mentioned questions on the next Drainage Engineers course. Sid Vander Veen advised that the Guidelines won't be done by next October. Part A would be ready and training could be done on that portion, but we won't have a finished product to work with. The L.D.C. will have to decide if we should wait. Mike Gerrits thinks that Part A would be big enough on its own to do a training session.
- 15.6 Tony Peralta mentioned Item 9 of the Conference questionnaire related to workshops. He suggested that we consider doing a workshop this year and offer training the following year. This would avoid the risk of a mish mash session on Part A of the Guidelines and more complete presentations on the last 2 sections. Sid observed that the previous training was mostly related to Part A. Part B of the new Guidelines is climate change, hydrology, etcetera.
- 15.7 Tony commented that questionnaire respondents want something effective. Sid suggested that we could do a better job on other legislation and that perhaps Tom Hoggarth and Davin

Heinbuck might be able to help in this regard. The Committee might want to redesign the training courses to be more effective. It appeared to Tony that some comments suggested that attendees want to be spoon fed. Sid stated that we could provide a checklist of procedures under the Drainage Act.

- 15.8 Newbury Weirs were brought up as something to be presented in the future. Tom Hoggarth said that they are okay, but do you need them in drains. They are good for the aquatic system and could be used if weirs are needed. He observed that typically the D.F.O. doesn't require their use but D.F.O. will ask for pools.
- 15.9 Sid Vander Veen proposed that a workshop outlining tools for your tool box be considered. Many people need an approach to be presented for approvals. Tom agreed and said that he would be happy to help out. He suggested that for grade control you can use riffles. They have a technical guy who can present the theory and design method for riffles. Davin indicated that he could help too. He suggested that this could be done like the alternatives presented at the O.M.A.F.R.A. training sessions. Gerard Rood said that a workshop on alternatives could spark some interest by drainage practitioners.
- 15.10 Sid suggested that Brad Fairley might be able to present a natural drainage design "light". Davin commented that water does not want to flow straight. It would be helpful to explore natural design concepts for drains that may have originally been watercourses. Sid also agreed that it is better to work with nature.
- 15.11 Tom Hoggarth stated that natural design takes more area to construct, and suggested that one can combine hard structure with natural curve design. Gerard commented that there are many options that could be introduced and elaborated upon to encourage their use.
- 15.12 It was asked by Jeff Dickson if we need to do a survey to determine interest in courses or do we just go to a workshop. He believes that we could start revamping the course now for presentation in 2016. This could be undertaken concurrent with the workshop idea for this year. Sid recommended that we start planning for the next 4 years.
- 15.13 Sid noted that he was looking at the question on Section 65. Jeff suggested that we could give a subject, discuss it and then break into groups. Sid commented that we could do lectures or lecture workshops. John Kuntze has found it better to do case studies and answer questions. He suggested that the 3rd training session be split in half so that there is more time to cover all the topics. He confirmed that the 2nd training session was all about assessments.
- 15.14 It was stated by Sid Vander Veen that he likes going lighter on theory and focus more on the practical aspects.
- 15.15 Tom Hoggarth advised that they have a person working on restoration methods for drains. They could circulate this to engineers for input such as what specifications would be applied. D.F.O. doesn't want to present stuff that is not practical. They would prefer to present a dozen or so offsetting options and have engineers advise if they are practical and useful.

- 15.16 It was commented by Tony Peralta that this would be good for all practitioners. Tom noted that approvals are easier if a proponent shows that thought has been given to project and offsets and mitigation measures are incorporated. Gerard believes it is good to expose information to all practitioners. This could be especially timely given all the S.A.R., E.S.A. and Fisheries changes. Tony observed that projects usually work if you give some mitigation and offsets.
- 15.17 It was suggested by John Kuntze that the workshop could maybe present options and then get feedback. The workshop could give the whole gamut and then perhaps rate the options at the end of the workshop. Tom Hoggarth stated that he would be okay with that approach. Attendees could break into workgroups to discuss and rate the options. He would like some prescreening of what they would present at the workshop.
- 15.18 Jeff Dickson asked if Davin Heinbuck and Tom Hoggarth would take on a presentation in October. He asked if Davin thought that this was viable. Davin replied that he would be at the L.D.C. meeting anyway and could help with a workshop afterwards.
- 15.19 Sid Vander Veen wanted some clarifications on the course and suggested that it could go from 12:30 to 5:00 or 5:30. The course should be targeted to engineers, technicians and technologists. Drainage Superintendents would have to decide if it would be of value to them.
- 15.20 As an option, Sid suggested that a presentation could be done on wetland restoration drain projects. Dave Richards could talk on this subject.
- 15.21 Based on the discussions, Jeff Dickson suggested that instead of a course this year that we do a workshop. We could polish the drainage courses in the meantime using the Guidelines when completed and consider having 5 years of courses. Tony Peralta suggested that we have something different every 5th year. A workshop could complete the cycle and the training courses could start over again.
- 15.22 It was asked by Sid Vander Veen if there would be interest in this. Jeff commented that he thought that there would be. It might help Drainage Superintendents with Conservation Authority approvals.
- 15.23 Tom Hoggarth proposed an outline for the workshop:
- 15.23.1. There would be a short blurb on the legislation
  - 15.23.2. Provide a general outline of B.M.P.'s (Best Management Practices)
  - 15.23.3. Discuss habitat features
- 15.24 Tom will talk to their Species at Risk people. D.F.O. can bring 3 topics to the workshop. Sid asked if there would cross sections, specifications and details provided. Tom thinks so. They have a staff member working on fact sheets that could be a resource. They could likely use up approximately 1.5 hours. **Action by Tom Hoggarth**
- 15.25 Davin Heinbuck indicated that he could possibly do a 45 minute presentation. **Action by Davin Heinbuck**

- 15.26 It was noted by Sid Vander Veen that he would like a wetland restoration presentation. Tom Hoggarth suggested that 2 stage drains could be another separate topic.
- 15.27 Jeff Dickson observed that we could easily fill 4 hours of presentations. He wondered who at M.N.R.F. could present. Sid said that he would go to Dave Richards and set up someone. Dave presented at the Drainage Superintendents course. **Action by Sid Vander Veen**
- 15.28 It was asked by Jeff if Tom and Davin could provide information in the next 2-3 weeks. Davin stated that he would like to include a case study.
- 15.29 Jeff noted that we have 6 committee members that could be split into 3 groups of 2. Each group could analyze how to do courses relative to the Guidelines. Information could be put on the web site. John Kuntze recommended that training session 3 needs to be split.
- 15.30 John suggested that we could have case studies to show how the workshop items are applied. Beaver Creek project would be a good example. The training workshop needs to show how and where offsets and mitigation are applied. Tom Hoggarth suggested that D.F.O. could present information first. Then an engineer could present a case study. Jeff suggested that we plan on a presentation on Thursday and have a suitable case study presented on Friday. Tom observed that we would need engineers to find suitable examples or case studies.
- 15.31 It was asked by Tony Peralta if D.F.O. items can be streamlined for practical use. Tom suggested that they can explain the biological needs of fish, but an engineer should stand up and show how this is applied. Tony observed that there is a need to coordinate biology to the engineering. Tom commented that we need to pull both aspects together at the workshops. He can start by just presenting the tools. We then need an engineer to present which method is best to use for a given tool.
- 15.32 Tom Hoggarth advised that he will have information by March 31st and will forward it to the Committee in early April for discussion and how to bring engineering into it. John Kuntze wanted to know if we just present options at the workshop and then respond later. He commented that Friday needs to be set up for a range of things. The workshop on Thursday can be a focused presentation. Sid Vander Veen agreed that Thursday should be focused on information for engineers and that Friday is wide open for other drainage stakeholders. Tony expressed concerns with splitting information presentations and that it won't be remembered that next year.
- 15.33 It was suggested by Tom that a wish list be presented and that we have breakout sessions to get feedback. Tony observed that our next meeting is in June. Tom stated that they can have a rough draft by that meeting. Jeff Dickson commented that we need input from Davin Heinbuck and we need something from M.N.R.F. Davin stated that they will discuss measures that deal with water quality.
- 15.34 Sid Vander Veen proposed that we could do a webex conference call before June. Tom said that he was okay with that. It was proposed that the web conference be scheduled for May 4th

which is a Monday and the conference be set for 1:00 p.m. Sid said that he would book the webex for 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. and will contact M.N.R.F. for this when he gets in touch with them for the Drainage Superintendents course. **Action by Sid Vander Veen**

15.35 Sid advised that Committee that he has the room booked for the course or workshop to held on Thursday in October. He will send out a notice for the May 4th webex. He uses this communication method frequently and it is helpful because everyone in looking at the same screen. Sid stated that he can book our October meeting at O.M.A.F.R.A. offices so there is easy access to the workshop. The room will be booked for October 22nd so we can meet at 9:30 a.m. and the workshop will be after lunch. **Action by Sid Vander Veen**

15.36 Changes to legislation were discussed as per the email sent out by Sid Vander Veen. All parties now have to deal with accessibility legislation, the protection of privacy act, and changes to the Public Utilities Act. The latter can impact drainage directly.

15.37 Jeff Dickson observed that it is important to have disclaimers on reports. Sid noted that both sides of the equation are affected. You have protection of privacy but there is also the freedom of information act. Sid therefore suggested that a presentation could be done at the Conference. Gerard highlighted the exposure to the A.O.D.A. (Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act) since all public bodies have been required to meet targets dates in the past and this impacts the companies providing services to them. Sid proposed that we just have 10 minute presentations on each topic. We may need to line up a lawyer or there may be a Municipal Clerk who could present on this since they need to know about this legislation. **Action by L.D.C.**

15.38 There was discussion on the Municipal Procurement Policy review. Tony Peralta stated that Greg Nancekivell of D.S.A.O. has asked that the Committee provide a representative. Sid noted that the D.S.A.O. review is more geared to maintenance works and not to procurement of engineering services. Jeff Dickson stated that he would be willing to be the representative and will talk to Greg Nancekivell. Tony said that he is also interested in this if it is too much work for Jeff. **Action by Jeff Dickson**

15.39 John Kuntze asked Sid Vander Veen about the letter that he sent out on engineering stamps. Sid explained that the Tribunal had asked the Ministry for help. They had found some improper use of stamps and some drainage reports were submitted without signatures and stamps. The Ministry sent out a letter to all practitioners to remind them of the legislative requirements.

## **16.0 Next Meeting**

16.1 The next meeting of the L.D.C. will be Friday June 5th, 2015 at the O.M.A.F.R.A. offices on Stone Road in Guelph.

16.2 Sid will book the usual conference room number 403 for the Committee meeting. **Action by Sid Vander Veen.**

**17.0 Adjournment**

17.1 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:45 p.m. Moved by Jeff Dickson and seconded by Gerard Rood. Carried

---

Tony Peralta, Chairman

Gerard Rood, Secretary