



LAKE SIMCOE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (LSEMS)

LSEMS WORKING GROUP

April 13, 2007 – 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Jackson's Landing
Jackson's Point, ON

MINUTES

Members Present:

Anne Neary, Co-Chair	Ministry of the Environment
Peter Waring, Co-Chair	Ministry of Natural Resources
Elizabeth Janz*	Ministry of the Environment
Ed Beach	Federation of Agriculture, Durham Region/Chair, LSEMS CAC
Wes Brown	Federation of Anglers and Hunters/Member LSEMS CAC
Annabel Slaight	Ladies of the Lake / The WAVE
Goody Gerner	Ladies of the Lake
John Gilbank	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition
Marvin Geist	Greater Toronto Home Builders' Association-UDI
Jessica Annis*	Greater Toronto Home Builders' Association-UDI
D. Gayle Wood	Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority/Chair. LSEMS SC
Kimberley MacKenzie*	Lake Simcoe Conservation Foundation
Karen Antonio-Hadcock*	Regional Municipality of York
Stew Patterson	City of Barrie
Chris Strand	Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada

*-indicates alternate

Others Present:

Karen Wianecki	Planning Solutions
Gina Casey	Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

Regrets:

Michael Bunn	Barrie Chamber of Commerce
M. Walters*	Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority
Debby Beatty	Lake Simcoe Conservation Foundation
Barb Jeffrey	Regional Municipality of York
Richard Forward	City of Barrie
Gareth Goodchild*	Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada

1. Welcome and Introductions

Co-Chair Anne Neary extended thanks to John Gilbank for providing the meeting room on the shores of Lake Simcoe.

Anne requested roundtable introductions.

2. **Agenda**

RESOLVED BY CONSENSUS THAT the agenda for the April 13, 2007, meeting of the LSEMS Working Group be received as presented.

3. **Minutes**

The action items included in the minutes were reviewed as noted in the minutes.

(a) **Proposed Key Messages**

The Proposed Key Message document as circulated with the agenda was reviewed.

Anne Neary reminded the Working Group that the purpose of the Key Messages document is to ensure that all Members are delivering the same consistent and accurate messages as they pertain to the work of LSEMS and the Working Group.

Action:	Revise first paragraph to include First Nations and Federal Government as partners. Revise second paragraph to indicate ...has worked 16 years ... Revise fourth paragraph to add ...reviewing governance options and the comments received in response to the One Voice Action Plan.
---------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Responsibility: Gina Casey (completed and included with these minutes.)

(b) **Who Does What Chart**

Members were reminded to review this chart and provide comments to Gina.

Action:	Provide comments regarding the Who Does What Chart to Gina by Friday, April 20 th .
---------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Responsibility: All Members

(c) **Summary of Comments – One Voice Action Plan**

Action:	Will be included as a discussion item on a future Working Group Meeting Agenda.
---------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Responsibility: Co-Chairs

(d) Observer Status

Further to the request put forward at the last meeting of the Working Group, Co-Chair Anne Neary advised that following a discussion with the Steering Committee it has been decided that members of the LSEMS Steering Committee will be welcomed as observers at the meetings of the LSEMS Working Group.

Ms. Betty Papa, Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal was welcomed at this meeting as an observer.

(e) Membership of John Gilbank

Member John Gilbank addressed the Working Group advising that his decision to run for political office will not impact his work on this Committee. John reminded the Working Group that he is one of the founders of this Working Group and is fully committed to both this Group and the Lake.

RESOLVED BY CONSENSUS THAT the minutes of the April 2nd, 2007, meeting of the LSEMS Working Group be approved by consensus.

4. Meeting Purpose and Objectives

Karen Wianecki, Facilitator, provided an overview of the meeting purpose and objectives. Specifically, Karen indicated that this meeting would provide participants with an opportunity to learn about the nine selected governance models and to collectively discuss the evaluation criteria against which each model will be evaluated.

5. Governance Template

A governance template as been prepared by Karen Wianecki was included with this agenda which provides the framework to be used in the review of each model.

The Governance Structure and Funding Comparison Summary was handed out at the meeting and Members were asked to update it while the individual presentations were being made. These can then be provided to Gina for compilation.

Action:	Complete the Governance Structure and Funding Comparison Summary and submit to Gina.
---------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Responsibility:	All Members
-----------------	-------------

6. Review of Governance Models

It was decided by consensus that the teams tasked with researching one of the nine(9) models chosen for review will make their presentations first in order for the Working Group to determine if the nine(9) models will all be evaluated further or if there is an opportunity to shortlist the models.

(a) Lake Champlain (Annabel Slaight)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the Lake Champlain Model will be evaluated further.

(b) Chesapeake Bay (Elizabeth Janz)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the Chesapeake Bay Model will be evaluated further.

(c) Lake Winnipeg (Stew Patterson)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the Lake Winnipeg Model will be put aside for further discussion however will not be evaluated in depth. This decision was based on the Lake Winnipeg model being a relatively new model and is considered to be a younger version of LSEMS. However, as Lake Winnipeg was also selected for Federal Funding in the recent budget announcement, there may be some merit in looking at the model in terms of information collection and opportunities from a science and monitoring perspective.

(d) Hamilton Harbour RAP (Jessica Annis)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the Hamilton Harbour RAP Model will be evaluated further.

(e) Niagara Escarpment (Karen Antonio-Hadcock)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the Niagara Escarpment Model will not be evaluated further. This decision was based primarily on the fact that this model does not actively involve stakeholders, is administrative in focus, is land based vs. water based, has no apparent fundraising ability, and further that the Niagara Escarpment Commission administer the Niagara Escarpment Plan which is essentially a Plan that supercedes municipal planning by affording protection to a unique landform feature through a development permit process.

(f) LSEMS – Status Quo (Ed Beach)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the LSEMS Status Quo Model will be evaluated further. It was further discussed and agreed upon by the group that the LSEMS model provides a baseline from which all other models will be assessed.

(g) Greenbelt Foundation (Kimberley MacKenzie)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the Greenbelt Foundation Model will not be evaluated further. This decision was based on this model being land based vs. water based, has no charitable status/no fundraising capabilities, does not have stakeholder involvement, provides funding for projects, missing the science piece. While this option will not be evaluated comprehensively by the Working Group, it was collectively agreed that components of this model may hold promise for LSEMS from an implementation perspective. For this reason, it was agreed that this model will be re-considered in terms of the value it may offer from an implementation perspective.

(h) Rouge Park Alliance (Peter Waring)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the Rouge Park Alliance Model will not be evaluated further. This decision was based on this model being land based vs water based, very site specific with a mandate that is not as complicated as Lake Simcoe (management of a large block of public land as a park). However it is a decision making body that sets program priorities and makes funding allocation decisions. While this option will not be evaluated comprehensively by the Working Group, it was collectively agreed that components of this model may hold promise for LSEM from an implementation perspective. For this reason, it was agreed that this model will be re-considered in terms of the value it may offer from an implementation perspective.

(i) Severn Sound RAP (Gayle Wood)

Based on the information provided and the discussion of the Working Group, it was determined that the Severn Sound RAP Model will not be evaluated further. The Working Group determined that this model mirrors the Hamilton Harbour RAP however as the Hamilton Harbour RAP is a larger RAP, it more closely meets the needs of what this Group is looking for.

Summary:

(A) Further In-Depth Evaluation	(B) Evaluation for Implementation, etc.
Lake Champlain	Lake Winnipeg
Chesapeake Bay	Greenbelt Foundation
Hamilton Harbour RAP	Rouge Park Alliance
LSEMS – Status Quo	

Using the template provided the Working Group evaluated those models listed above under column A (results are attached to these minutes).

As time did not permit the completion of the LSEMS Status Quo evaluation, Gayle Wood agreed to complete the template and forward it to all members for review and comment.

In order to obtain further information related to the models, it was determined that representatives from Lake Champlain, Chesapeake Bay and Hamilton Harbour RAP will be invited to the next meeting of the Working Group.

Action: Complete LSEMS evaluation and forward to all Members for review and comment.

Responsibility: Gayle Wood, Gina Casey

Action: Contact representatives from Lake Champlain, Chesapeake Bay, Hamilton Harbour to invite them to a meeting of the Working Group.

Responsibility: Gayle Wood, Gina Casey

7. Recap, Wrap Up and Where to From Here

Next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for Wednesday, April 25th, 2007
– 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Anne Neary to research meeting location (Resources Road)

Action: Meeting location for April 25th meeting of the Working Group.

Responsibility: Anne Neary

8. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

original signed by:

Anne Neary, Co-Chair

original signed by:

Peter Waring, Co-Chair

Attachments:

1. Proposed Key Messages (revised)
2. Governance Evaluations
3. Governance Model – Rouge Park Alliance