

BONNECHERE RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)
FINAL Minutes of Meeting #9 – January 17, 2007
Bonnechere Valley Township Office, Eganville

Attendees:

SAC: Don Pouliot, Murray Bimm, Murray Borer, Steve Munger, Lucy King

Algonquins of Pikwàkanagàn: Jan Leroux

MNR: Michael Radford, Joanna Samson, Tom Giesler, Al Hyde

Waterpower Producers: Peter Boldt (RPG), Janusz Rydel (Multistream Power Corp.), Frank Scheer (Eganville Generation Corporation)

Regrets:

Niall McArdle, Ross Campbell, Aurel Boucher, Kevin O'Connor, Andreas Vornweg

1. Housekeeping Items

1.1 Introductions

- Al Hyde, Acting District Manager, Pembroke District
- Tom Giesler, Senior Integrated Land & Water Specialist, Pembroke District

1.2 Housekeeping

Steve passed around a number of pictures of ice push in the spring to demonstrate that there is more than one kind of ice push.

1.3 Review of Agenda

Michael went through the agenda and indicated to the SAC that there are two things to consider during the amendment discussion:

- 1) Type: 3 different types of amendments outlined in the WMP (Administrative, Minor, & Major) and there is a different process associated with each, primarily in terms of public consultation requirements.
- 2) Amendment recommendation: accept, accept with modifications, or reject.

It was explained that a number of MNR staff went through each amendment to ensure understanding of what was being proposed. A smaller group subsequently met with Peter to ensure understanding of both parties.

2. Review & Approval of Minutes of Meeting #7 – September 27, 2006

Page 3, 2nd bullet point. Correction ...Staying at 170.8 – 170.9 masl...

Minutes approved by all with the one change noted above.

3. Operations Update – Power Producers

Janusz Rydel

- Strange winter, experiencing big jumps in water flows for unknown reasons
- Worried about being in a non-compliance situation
- Noticing a lot of dirt and debris/vegetation getting caught in the last few days

Frank Scheer

- high water is a blessing but also a concern
- hasn't seen the debris, nor spike/jumps that Janusz has encountered
- concerned about the gains freezing

Peter Boldt – RPG

- With the increase flow in water, the debris on the bottom gets washed down in a mass. We are getting this now because we are wide open.
- No shoreline problems to date
- If & when we start drilling – volunteers will be needed
- In talking with George Comfort, 5 years of data will be very beneficial for understanding the local factors

4. RPG Amendment Package

Peter went through a power point presentation to highlight the various amendments

Amendment #1: Reporting System

- Best that could be done at the time
- Need to understand what are the actual needs
 - o What does the general public want to see? Need to see? Currently the website is being used, showing a weekly average. Is this still satisfactory?
 - o In terms of Compliance Issues: The current spreadsheet is set up on average values. This should change to reflect a value for every day. i.e. Day 312 is always 312 every year. The WMP never went to this level of understanding. Once established, what do we use for reporting? I.e. high & low, 24 hour avg, combination of 3 readings.

Steve: Other legislation specifies the frequency of measurements. Shouldn't we be aiming to achieve consistency across all plans?

Joanna: Appendix J of the Water Management Planning Guidelines outlines differences from plan to plan, based on scope. For instance you likely wouldn't use a daily average on peaking system that can fluctuate 1 m in an hour.

Michael summarized:

Proposal:

Part 1. MNR/RPG to develop a max & min value for each day of the year that we both agree to. This would be added to in an appendix to the WMP.

Part 2. For compliance purposes, the reporting would be based on a daily average as opposed to a high & low reading.

Murray Borer: During the Planning Process, the understanding was that crossing the line is crossing the line. However, if due diligence was observed and the operator did their best, then no enforcement action would be taken.

Steve: Lines are averages. Could do a statistical approach, standard deviation within it, or would this just make things more complicated.

The discussion turned to what would be the overall impact of using a daily average for compliance reporting. Peter explained that we may be talking millimetres as the fluctuation is over 14 square miles of lake. There won't be much that can happen in a day.

Some concerns was also voiced in terms of what is presented to the public on the website. The website will still show the same chart, however, if people request additional information in terms of levels & flows, Peter indicated that it will be made available.

Mike R. – PART 1: develop a max & min value for each day. Does everyone agree?

The report structure will satisfy the compliance portion of the plan so there is no confusion/interpretation.

Lucy: Yes, more information is a good thing. Not violating original intent.

Murray Borer: Yes. Consider it a low level change.

Steve: Yes

Murray Bimm: Yes

Don: Yes

Jan: Who will make up the chart? A: MNR & RPG

Mike R: PART 2: change to a daily average in terms of compliance. Does everyone agree?

Murray Borer: Yes. Don't think that the PAC would have objected to a daily average, dealing with a small headpond, not much impact if any.

Lucy: Yes

Don: Yes

Murray Bimm: Yes

Steve: Yes

Jan: Yes

Amendment #3: "Hat" on Round Lake

Peter:

- This amendment would be to extend the "hat" back on Round Lake. This is something that both Nick Paroschy and Paul Moreau had indicated during the planning process.
- The thinking during planning was to try to satisfy the PAC by relinquishing some of the control areas
- 2.5 to 3 years and historically, it's been there so we should have used this from the beginning.

Don: Agrees to the hat. Moving it over will capture the spring freshet better. However, the RLPOA would like to see it moved to the left but not extended to result in less erosion.

Peter: We can't do that because then there will be no capture area. We need the capture area to be able to keep the flows going in the river during the summer.

Don (Association): For Discussion. If trout box is not an issue, could you contain the flood conditions of the freshet? If you were to draw-down earlier, below the line, you would never exceed the upper limit.

- 1) upper and lower limits aren't a part of the same season – fairly consistent year to year
- 2) Amend the trout box – without the box, it makes this a non-issue, and you wouldn't even need this amendment.

So you would solve your problem for numbers, however, if your amendment to remove the bottom of the trout box goes through then this amendment is not necessary.

NOTE: Historical data does not reflect this. There have been years where the level has been drawn down the lower limit and it still exceeded the License of Occupation.

Mike R – Does everyone agree to this amendment to extend the hat earlier?

Murray Borer: OK. We originally wanted it smaller – to take it to summer levels ASAP to lessen erosion.

Steve: OK

Don: Hold off on commenting. Would like to speak to the RLPOA first.

Lucy: OK

Murray Bimm: OK

Jan: OK

Amendment #4: Change to upper limits of Renfrew, Douglas & Eganville

Changes to Eganville & Douglas Operating Regimes would need to be proposed by Eganville Generation Corporation and Multistream Inc., not RPG.

Changes to the upper limit of Renfrew (to the 3rd week in July) will be rolled in with Amendment #6.

Amendment #6: Changes to the Upper Limit at Renfrew

- Amendment #4 is included here
- Joanna handed out a graph of Renfrew and what the proposed changes would look like.

3 parts to the ORIGINAL amendment

1. (Amend #4): extend hat to 3rd week in July
2. Extend hat back to week 1 (at 111.19)
3. At week 40 to week 52, raise upper limit to 110.86

After discussion with MNR the proposal has changed to the following

1. Amend #4 – not necessary, freshet does not extend to 3rd week in July

2. Extend upper limit from Weeks 1 to week 11 to 111.19. This would extend the hat back to where the operation was historically.
3. Modify upper limit from week 22 to 52 to be 110.86 to also incorporate historical operations.

Summary: Weeks 1-21; water level is 111.19, Weeks 22-52; Water Level is 110.86

Jan: Are we changing the lines so that RPG is always in compliance?

Peter: Traditionally we've had higher water now with actual drop rates. We have an increased problem with the amount of flow and an increase in the number of cattails going through.

Lucy: Does MNR feel that this amendment will fix the problem?

Mike Radford: When MNR staff met internally to discuss this amendment, our biologist felt that any impacts as a result of this change would be marginal. Our engineer did not view this proposed change as an attempt for RPG to run higher at Renfrew. Our engineer felt that this change made sense. If this amendment is accepted and goes to the public for comment, an explanation of the impacts would accompany it.

Steve: The amendment should define the rationale in terms of ice damage and impact to cattails. This is not reflected in the current wording.

Mike Radford: the wording for the amendment will be crafted by Peter, Joanna and others and will come back to the SAC in an amendment package which will reflect the new wording and the rationale for all amendments.

Mike R.: Recommendation: Does everyone agree to proposed amendment (modified with input from MNR)?

Murray Borer: Yes. Adopt the new regime.

Don: Yes

Steve: Yes, but I would like to see the new wording with Rationale

Murray Bimm: Yes

Lucy: Yes

Jan: Will there be any impact to Golden Lake

Peter: No. This won't affect Golden Lake at all.

5. Agenda & Date of Next Meeting

Agenda: Go through and seek SAC recommendations for the remaining amendments (2, 5, 7 & 8)

Date of Next Meeting:

February 28, 2007 – @ 6pm at the Bonnechere Valley Township Office

ACTION: Frank to Book Township Office

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.