

**Date:** Monday, May 17, 2004

**Present: Municipality:** Reeve Eleanor Harrison  
Deputy-Reeve Tom Gardner  
Councillor Kerry Lock  
Councillor Jim Hicks  
Councillor Diane Griffin  
Administrator/Clerk, Gerald Bain

**MOE:** Ian Parrott, Supervisor, Waste EAAB  
Mohsen Keyvani, Senior Waste Evaluator - EAAB  
Andrew Mobberley, Waste Evaluator- EAAB  
Gary Muloin, Senior Environmental Officer - MOE Peterborough District Office

**SGS Lakefield:** Mike Lord, Project Manager  
Heather Watson, Senior Environmental Planner

**Grace and Associates:** Thomas Grace

**Minute Taker:** Heather Watson

**Re: MOE Consultation Meeting, May 13, 2004**

**Township of Algonquin Highlands**

**SGS Lakefield Research Reference No. 10279-005**

---

## *Purpose of Meeting*

Ian Parrott, Supervisor of the Certificate of Approvals Review Section- Waste with the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) of the Ministry of Environment requested the meeting, to discuss the status of an application by the Township of Algonquin Highlands for a hauled sewage lagoon facility at Pine Springs. Given the extent of interest and concern raised by the public, the MOE was anxious to determine the progress of the municipality's recently initiated Class Environmental Assessment process. As recently appointed lead consultant for the project, SGS Lakefield Research was asked to present a report to the Ministry on behalf of the Township.

The meeting commenced at 1:15 p.m. at the Township of Algonquin Council Chambers.

Reeve Harrison (RH) welcomed everyone, introduced Members of Council for the Township of Algonquin Highlands (TAH) and requested introductions.



Ian Parrott (IP) introduced MOE staff.

Mike Lord (ML) provided some background to the current project and introduced Heather Watson (HW) as Senior Environmental Planner for the project.

HW presented information respecting the MOE EA process, the role of public consultation and identification of alternatives and selection of design options, and invited the group to engage in discussion about the proposal, as outlined.

Thomas Grace (TG) provided a description of the site, initial proposal and site selection process.

IP asked whether the proposal is to be phased, noting that the initial approach involved construction of a transfer station with trash tank with on-site spreading, and evolved into a proposed system involving a trash tank, 2 storage lagoons and a trench disposal system for the effluent. ML responded that it was difficult to comment upon the specifics for the design at this stage in the Class EA process. ML inquired as to whether the existing file could remain open and be amended as further information becomes available. IP responded that the file could be left open, without any problem. An application for an amendment to the C of A for the existing landfill will also be required.

There was discussion about the definition of 'treated sewage' and requirements for 'treatment' prior to disposal of hauled sewage. Mohsen Keyvani (MK) offered an explanation, noting that the level of treatment depends on a number of factors, including the type of sewage being considered and the proposed method of disposal.

There was a lengthy discussion surrounding requirements for MOE District approval of hauled sewage disposal on private property versus requirements for a Class Environmental Assessment for disposal at public landfill facilities. IP explained the EAAB process. Gary Muloin (GM) also provided some explanation of the approvals process at the District level. IP inquired as to whether there is currently regional technical support staff working with the file (hydrogeologists and surface water specialists). GM stated that the file had not been forwarded to the MOE technical support team at Kingston, to date.

ML raised the possibility of severing the proposed Pine Springs Lagoon area from the Pine Springs Landfill area as a possible means for simplifying approvals. The difficulty would arise in the amendment to the C of A for the landfill, because the area is identified as an attenuation zone. The general feeling was that, given the intense public scrutiny of the proposal, any perceived short-cuts will likely result in further concerns being raised.

A detailed discussion of MOE legislation involving OWRA and Section 30 EPA approvals, relative to the intended disposal of the treated effluent. Solids may be disposed of in the landfill site as per current legislation. Release of the treated effluent is considered under the OWRA. There was a discussion about the relevance of



the 1500 population and requirements for approvals. It was noted that the 1500 population requirements comes into play for Part V EPA applications but not for OWRA applications.

IP explained that there have been several written requests from the public for a “bump up” to an Individual EA from the Class EA now underway. The requests for a bump up were written prior to the commencement of the Class EA by the municipality. In addition, the number of letters received by his office concerning this proposal is unusually high. The letters raise a variety of issues, and highlight the need to undertake a Class EA for the project. IP’s comment was that in undertaking the Class EA, the municipality is now following the proper process for evaluation of both the alternatives and the design options, as required by the Province. Provided that the municipality and SGS Lakefield ‘do their homework’ effectively and thoroughly, most of the issues raised in connection with the bump-up request will be revisited and concerns addressed. It is important that the required public consultation and technical review of impacts, as outlined in the Class EA, be undertaken and that the entire process be well documented. The more complete the ESA, the more information the Minister will have available to her in determining whether a ‘bump up’ is necessary. It is possible for the Minister to decide that the work, completed on behalf of the municipality by its consultants, is sufficient to address concerns raised by the public and that no greater purpose would be served in requiring the municipality to undertake an Individual EA for the project.

Deputy Reeve Gardner asked if the location of the landfill in the adjoining municipality of Minden Hills is problematic. IP recommended that a letter should be obtained from the municipality indicating their acceptance of the proposal to construct a hauled sewage facility at Pine Springs. RH noted that the two municipalities share the day and the cost of Household Hazardous Waste Days, at separate locations.

#### Public Information Meetings

The scheduling of the public information meetings was discussed and it was agreed that scheduling meetings during the summer was important, to ensure that the seasonal residents would be able to take part. Meeting Number Two was subsequently scheduled for Saturday June 12, 2004 from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm, with a brief presentation to be given by SGS Lakefield at 10:15. The meeting is to be held at the Stanhope Fire Fighters Community Centre. The third meeting is tentatively scheduled for late August of 2004.

#### Proximity to Provincially Significant Wetland

Councilor Hicks raised concerns with the proximity of the Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW). The location of the PSW and adjacent lands (120 m) relative to the proposed lagoons was discussed. It was noted that, in keeping with Section 2.4 of the Provincial Policy Statement, no development or site



alteration is permitted within the wetland, and further, it will be necessary for the TAH to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on the PSW as a result of the proposed works on the adjacent lands.

Gerald Bain (GB) provided a sketch identifying the location of the site relative to the wetland, and adjacent lands. IP provided some information about the requirements for meeting reasonable use guidelines at the property boundary, relative the protection of the wetland.

Paul Heaven (PH) of Glenside Ecological Services Limited will be assisting the study team in determining the exact location of those lands, which are adjacent to the proposed site, and in determining whether any impact is anticipated on the wetland.

#### Burnside Associates Technical Review (for Kushog Lake Property Owners Association)

RH provided the MOE, SGSL and TGGGA with copies of a letter and report from R.J. Burnside and Associates, on behalf of the ***Kushog Lake Property Owners Association (KLPOA)***. RH explained that copies of the letter and report were sent to MOE/SGSL and TGGGA, by the KLPOA. It was noted that the Burnside Report is a review and critique of the TGGGA *2003 Hydrogeological and Soil Assessment – Application for Hauled Sewage Lagoon* document written in support of the Pine Springs Sewage Lagoon. IP suggested that it would be important to provide a detailed response to the Burnside Report and to address all the issues raised therein. TG noted that the TGGGA report had not been prepared in the context of a Class EA and as a result it did not contain the detailed information expected in an EA document.

RH noted that she has had detailed discussions with the Chair of the KLPOA (Wayne Black) and is of the opinion that the Association is not necessarily opposed to the development of a facility at Pine Springs, but is concerned that the project move forward through the Class EA process, to ensure that all matters have been appropriately addressed. It was also noted that there is a difference of opinion between those cottagers who are most vocal opponents, and the Executive of the Association. It was also noted that a group of 53-55 cottagers have been vocal in their concerns, but that the association has a membership of approximately 300. It is hoped that through the process of completing the Class EA and providing detailed documentation of the process most, if not all, of the concerns raised by Burnside and Associates will be addressed.

The Township's consultants (SGS Lakefield with technical assistance from and Grace & Associates) will prepare a response to the concerns raised by R.J. Burnside, in their letter and will follow-up by scheduling a meeting with R.J. Burnside Associates, to discuss any outstanding concerns.



The formal meeting ended at approximately 3:30.

#### Site Visit

MOE officials, Members of Council and Township consultants proceeded to the Pine Springs site, to ensure everyone's familiarity with the site. TG provided a detailed explanation of the proposal, indicating the proposed location for the lagoons, the location of existing groundwater monitoring stations, and overall topography. The remoteness of the site was also highlighted.