

**FINAL**  
**O.S.P.E. LAND DRAINAGE COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**June 1, 2012**  
**O.M.A.F.R.A. Building, 1 Stone Road West, Room 403**  
**Guelph, Ontario**

**1.0 Attendance and Call to Order**

Members Present: Tom Marentette, Chairman; Gerard Rood, Secretary; Bill Dietrich; Tim Oliver; Tom Pridham, John Kuntze

Liaison Members Present: Sid Vander Veen, OMAFRA; Davin Heinbuck, Conservation Authorities (ABCA); Kristian Kennedy, O.S.P.E. (by conference call); Pat Shaver, Office of Open Learning, University of Guelph (arrived 1:00 p.m.)

Absent Members: Art Groenveld, MTO; Edwina McGroddy, O.S.P.E.; Tom Hoggarth, Fisheries and Oceans Canada; Jeremy Downe, MNR

Chairman Tom Marentette called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

**2.0 Approval of Agenda**

Motion by John Kuntze, seconded by Bill Dietrich, that the agenda as prepared by the Chairman be accepted. Carried.

**3.0 Minutes of Last Meeting**

Tim Oliver pointed out a typographical error in the last sentence of Item 7.9 suggesting that an extra “to” should be removed. Motion by John Kuntze, seconded by Tom Pridham that the updated minutes of the January 19, 2012 meeting of the O.S.P.E. Land Drainage Committee be accepted. Carried. Final documents are to be sent to Pat Shaver by Gerard Rood for posting to the LDC web site.

**4.0 Business Arising From the Minutes**

- 4.1 Tim Oliver suggested that Sid Vander Veen may have updates on some of the on-going items. Sid said that he would provide information in the Liaison Reports.
- 4.2 Bill Dietrich asked if Tom Pridham and Tom Marentette had been able to follow up with proposed leaders for the training course to be conducted this fall. Tom M. stated that he had contacted Ed Dries and circulated the response by email. He plans to discuss this with the conference information at the end of the agenda. Tom P. had not spoken with Andy McBride pending the response from Ed Dries.

## **5.0 Correspondence**

- 5.1 Gerard Rood advised that the letter from the LDC that had been prepared with the help of Sid Vander Veen was sent to Bev Shipley, M.P. regarding the Fisheries Act review. No return correspondence has been received.
- 5.2 John Kuntze expressed his appreciation to Kristian Kennedy for the Ottawa article that he had forwarded to the LDC members. Kristian noted that the article had caught his attention after seeing the letter sent to Bev Shipley and he can send out the link again if others are interested.
- 5.3 Tim Oliver discussed the proposed changes to the Fisheries Act relative to his participation in a webinar by the Waterkeeper Alliance. The presentation did not address habitat but did touch on Section 35 and the proposed amendments bring attention to the changes that might arise from the government legislation. The focus appeared to be more on large industrial development getting more approvals and dealing with less red tape. There was very little reference to drainage work or discussion on agricultural matters.
- 5.4 Sid Vander Veen said that he has been sending out links because other views can be important to understanding what is going on. The links provide a variety of viewpoints on the Fisheries Act topic and how there may and may not be political agendas at work.

## **6.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Natural Resources**

Jeremy Downe

- 6.1 Tom Marentette advised the LDC that no report was provided by M.N.R. Sid stated that he had hoped for some information or an update from M.N.R.

## **7.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Transportation Ontario**

Art Groenveld

- 7.1 Tom Marentette reported that no information had been received from MTO.

## **8.0 Liaison Report – Conservation Authorities Report**

Davin Heinbuck

- 8.1 Drainage Act and Section 28 Regulations Team (DART) – Davin reported that the DART Protocol (Municipal Drain Maintenance documents) had been posted to the EBR (Environmental Bill of Rights) web site for comment. He noted that a number of comments had been received and were reviewed last Monday. Respondents included Ducks Unlimited, the OFA, Gerard Rood and numerous Conservation Authorities. Sid stated that they were able to get through the comments and established a consensus.
- 8.2 Sid said that he attended a CA drainage forum in February for the CA's and farm groups in south central Ontario. He presented on the Drainage Act and Peter Waring from Kawartha

Conservation presented on the Conservation Authorities Act. Property owners and farm groups expressed concerns over the CA's involvement in drain maintenance and private ditch cleanouts. The CA's in attendance were open to improving procedures and relationships but one of the CA's where farmers had encountered problems was not in attendance.

- 8.3 John Kuntze advised that he attended the same forum. There was representation from Central Lake Ontario but no representative from the Lake Simcoe CA. Most of the concerns and complaints appeared to be with the more urban Conservation Authorities. There was a 5th generation farmer who had been shut down from trimming trees. The meeting was generally open and positive. There were many owners with concerns in attendance. In response to a question from Davin about the meeting being a regional forum, John responded that it was driven by the City of Kawartha Lakes and the Region of York. It was noted that Peter Doris (O.M.A.F.R.A.) was there and Sid felt that the meeting was positive all around. Davin also felt that the forum was a good thing. Sid noted that both Tom Pridham and John Kuntze have difficult projects in the area and that most projects are controversial.
- 8.4 Davin mentioned that he had presented information on the CA Act at the latest Drainage Superintendents course.

## **9.0 Liaison Report – Fisheries and Oceans Canada**

Thomas Hoggarth

- 9.1 Tom Marentette has not been able to contact Thomas Hoggarth at the email address that he has. He was advised that the current address is "Thomas.Hoggarth@dfo-mpo.gc.ca".
- 9.2 Sid Vander Veen said that he had a verbal report from Thomas and an update on DAWG (Drains Action Working Group). There is no report on the Fisheries Act changes that are being proposed. Nothing is expected until directions are clearer. There has been no DAWG meeting for over a year. Thomas has stated that they will not be proceeding on DAWG until the direction on the changes on the Fisheries Act is clear. He expects that DAWG will be important once a decision has been made on the Fisheries Act.
- 9.3 Thomas also told Sid that there are indications that there will be cuts in D.F.O. staffing. They are currently waiting for announcements. D.F.O. may end up with a skeleton staff and limited resources to deal with matters. Thomas noted that D.F.O. has sometimes put conditions on certificates that they review but don't always follow through. The new provisions of the Fisheries Act could make conditions more enforceable and permit projects to be shut down if conditions are not being met. Sid advised that the discussions with Thomas had occurred this week.
- 9.4 Davin Heinbuck stated that their Bio Rep told them that 7 positions had been cut and most staff was shifted to new positions. Tom Marentette said that he was told by Rick Kerlick that

their staff had to re-apply for their positions. He thinks that D.F.O. has different perspectives on some matters now and that big changes are expected on July 1st.

- 9.5 Davin Heinbuck noted that they do more review in-house and have less input from their D.F.O. Bio Rep. His CA has a review fee for new reports whereas the original agreement was no charge for D.F.O. reviews. He stated that the policy varies between the CA's and most are trying to work with people in-house.
- 9.6 Bill Dietrich asked if the Ausable Bayfield CA is continuing the reviews for D.F.O. He believes that dealing locally is the best procedure. Davin said that they have a budget for dealing with agricultural drainage and they do between 12 and 20 new reports per year with varying complexities. They are currently not dealing with the maintenance side of agricultural drainage.
- 9.7 John Kuntze asked if once the D.F.O. changes will the current agreements cease and will the CA lose their mandate. Davin noted that they have other regulations that have to be followed. They may get signing powers with the changes. He said that it sounds like there will be less D.F.O. involvement with drains. Some "D" and "E" class drains may include D.F.O. input. There may be Class Authorizations established.
- 9.8 John Kuntze prefers to deal with just the CA's. There are concerns with untrained staff and unnecessary complications when dealing with D.F.O. He has seen some strange requirements for projects.
- 9.9 Davin said that DART has often discussed trying to do more training to avoid the past concerns with "junior unmentored staff". They are hoping for more training through DART or DAWG. They know that there is fish habitat in drains. Tim Byrne of E.R.C.A. has provided a lot of influence on matters related to this.

## **10.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs**

Sid Vander Veen

- 10.1 Sid Vander Veen noted that 33 people attended the Drainage Superintendents course. 10 of the people were from engineering firms. Matthew Baird from Crozier Baird Engineers attended the course. His grandfather was Alexander Baird who prepared the original drainage report for the Holland Marsh drain. Triton Engineering from Fergus who are new to drainage had Chris Clark of their firm attend. There was also a representative from CN Rail, Stefan Linder, who attended. Sid noted that CP Rail had sent a representative a few years ago.
- 10.2 Sid did the Clerks and Assessment course in Morrisburg, London and Sudbury with good participation at each.

- 10.3 It appears that Sid has become a popular speaker in the last year. He has provided presentations as follows:
1. January 25 – Municipality of Markstay-Warren (Markstay)
  2. February 6 – Municipality of Bluewater (Varna)
  3. February 8 – Town of Innisfil (Innisfil)
  4. February 10 – Delegation of Finnish drainage industry (Guelph)
  5. February 24 – East Central Drainage Forum (Manvers)
  6. February 25 – East Nipissing & Parry Sound OFA (Powassan)
  7. February 29 – Question Box Panel at ROMA/OGRA Convention (Toronto)
  8. March 20 – Golden Horseshoe Soil & Crop Improvement Association (Ancaster)
  9. March 29 – Chatham-Kent Contractors Training (Chatham)
  10. March 30 – Essex OFA
  11. April 4 – Eastern Valley Soil & Crop Improvement Association (Avonmore)
  12. April 23 – Augusta Township (near Brockville)
  13. May 3 – Association of Municipal Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario – Zone 7 (Sundridge)
  14. May 31 – OFA Member Services Representatives (Alliston)
  15. June 12 - Stewardship Network of Ontario (Toronto)
- 10.4 Sid noted that the forms update project is proceeding. He suggested that members look at the petition form that emphasizes the financial liability of petitioners and requires more owner information to be provided. They are working on passing the required regulations and will post the forms on a central board once things are in place.
- 10.5 Regulation 275 is being updated and deals with the rules for conducting a hearing with the Referee.
- 10.6 Catherine Tiessen is continuing to work on the Environmental Investments report for O.M.A.F.R.A. that was introduced at the second last LDC meeting. A 70% response rate was received. Engineering reports appear to be about 20% environmental cost with approximately 1/3 related to pure environmental concerns and approximately 2/3 related to BMP work. Maintenance works comprise approximately 15% cost related to environmental concerns. The superintendents' time to deal with environmental issues is rising very steeply from 2006 to 2010. Although Catherine is done next week, she is willing to present the report at the next Drainage Engineers Conference. The new intern will be Celeste Howard who will follow through on items that Catherine was unable to complete.
- 10.7 Sid said that O.M.A.F.R.A. would like to know if they should continue to track the environmental costs. Tim Oliver suggested that it could be made part of the Grant Application form. Sid said that they need to know if it is worthwhile to do the tracking. There is some additional work required by the participants. John Kuntze stated that it didn't take very long to extract the information once the reports had been dug out. He is interested in seeing the results of the study. He agrees that it could be added to the Grant Form.
- 10.8 Tim Oliver observed that there were a limited number of projects that were reviewed. Sid stated that there was criteria applied and approximately 80 construction projects were selected. The review provides an indication of what is happening. Davin Heinbuck asked if

there was a disclaimer that covered drains were not included and that skewing of the results was considered. Sid stated that this was the case.

- 10.9 Davin Heinbuck asked about the 1/3 and 2/3 split of the 20% of costs. Sid explained that the 1/3 is works that are not part of BMP's such as buffers and stabilization and that the 1/3 includes things such as fish shocking and salvage, or fish habitat creation. Davin believes that it is important to have accurate numbers so that the CA's or D.F.O. are not getting a bad rap. Sid noted that the review also shows that there are things being done to address concerns and it is not the intent to point fingers at anyone. The intent is to show how positive things can be done when working together.
- 10.10 Tim Oliver suggested that the grant can be an incentive. Perhaps another special program of grants could be considered as had been done in the past when erosion protection works were being emphasized. Sid suggested that the 2/3 portion should not be a societal cost but that there could be arguments made for the 1/3 portion of pure environmental requirements being a cost to be borne by society in general.
- 10.11 Davin Heinbuck noted that the recent very windy days had resulted in some serious erosion along Lake Huron particularly for market garden crops. Some drains were being filled in by the drifting of topsoil and had an appearance similar to what is seen with drifting snow. He noted that drains with buffer strips were not affected by the windstorms and some photos of the erosion were viewed.

## **11.0 Liaison Report – OSPE Update** Kristian Kennedy

- 11.1 Kristian mentioned that he would like to discuss with Sid Vander Veen at a later date the lack of Municipal Drainage Engineers. He noted that this ties into the OSPE advocacy role with OSPE advancing P.Eng. and the profession across Ontario.
- 11.2 Kristian believes that land drainage can be tied into the Environmental Committee and could relate to brownfields, waste water and other environmental concerns. He noted that OSPE has made presentations to M.O.E. and on the energy grid. They have noted increasing opposition to the Green Energy Act and have been active on Infrastructure Ontario. OSPE is providing input on many matters including pre-budget consultations and input during Provincial Budget preparations. OSPE is working to have engineers in each provincial riding meet with MPP's and to attend public meetings and forums as part of the Political Action Network (PAN). This is broadening to Federal MP's and Ministers.
- 11.3 The OSPE Advocate is a weekly newsletter that goes out to members and MPP's at Queens Park. They are always looking for articles and information on drainage would be welcome.
- 11.4 The OSPE monitors the regulations and legislation that are being passed to make sure that the role of engineers is protected. Some regulations just say "qualified person" and it looks like

new categories of professionals are being created. OSPE is trying to make sure that P.Eng.'s are used where required.

- 11.5 Sid Vander Veen was curious about monitoring of regulations and how this fits in with PEO actions. Kristian Kennedy responded that the main PEO concern is adherence to the PE Act. He noted that OSPE has worked jointly with PEO on some concerns.
- 11.6 When asked by Sid if an article to be published has to be written by a P.Eng. and/or member, Kristian responded that it doesn't have to be a P.Eng. who writes the article. He will need to check if the person has to be a member of OSPE. Since a submission would ultimately be an OSPE Land Drainage Committee article, it would not be important who the author is. For example, the Bev Shipley letter could be an interesting article. Kristian suggested that there could be more discussions later about posting articles.
- 11.7 John Kuntze thanked Kristian for his participation as in the early days of the LDC there was very little support. He asked if it were possible to advertise the Drainage Conference and courses through OSPE. Kristian responded that training falls under a different department but he will check with the Manager of Membership and Corporate Development. He asked that John email him with information on the training or courses.
- 11.8 Tom Marentette asked if there was a direct link from the OSPE web site to the LDC web site. Kristian said not at this time. There is currently a major update being done to the OSPE web site and he offered to speak to his manager about posting a link. He noted that OSPE branding and graphics may be a factor.
- 11.9 John Kuntze inquired as to who does the "News" on the OSPE web site. Kristian responded that "Society Notes" is handled by the member services department and has a wider circulation. This would include information on courses that are available. Kristian will check with his supervisors on getting a link to the LDC web site and will follow up later with Sid Vander Veen on the lack of drainage engineers. He will check on the protocol to get the Drainage Conference notice on the OSPE web site. Kristian then left the meeting.

## **12.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (continued)**

Sid Vander Veen

- 12.1 Sid advised that he had some more items to report on including the Design and Construction Guidelines. They have issued a call for proposals but found that the budget was underestimated. The terms of the RFP have been revised and some additional funding arranged. The new RFP will go out soon on MERX due to the value of the project. They are hoping to get guidelines for engineers working under the Act.
- 12.2 John Kuntze suggested that they might want to have a new title for the document. He expects it to be a massive undertaking to put all information into one document. It is not just a re-write of the old Guidelines. Sid agreed that they want to provide a more comprehensive document for the use of new drainage engineers. The Ministry is very much committed to the document and it won't be strictly for engineers working under the Drainage Act.

12.3 Sid noted that the “Constructed Drains BMP” would be proceeding later this month. He asked Davin Heinbuck if he would participate as a representative from CA Ontario is needed. Davin indicated that he would be willing to participate but this would require a formal endorsement. Sid said that he would contact Don Pearson. He went on to say that the new BMP will include things that are collectively agreed upon. This could be a good consensus document. Sid would like to approach Greg Nancekivell again and Bill Dietrich said that he will support Greg participating in the BMP project. Sid noted that Greg has an agricultural point of view and wetlands restoration experience. Davin stated that he would be happy to participate but would need to coordinate the date in late June with his other commitments.

### **13.0 Sub-Committee Report – DAWG Update**

Mike Devos

13.1 As Mike Devos was not in attendance, John Kuntze advised that there was no report.

### **14.0 Sub-Committee Report – DART**

John Kuntze

14.1 John said that the maintenance document was heading for final publication. It will go back on the EBR web site for final review and comments.

14.2 The DART committee will now be getting on with the development of a guideline document for the application of the CA Act to Drainage Act construction/improvement projects. John noted that some people are still complaining about the Drainage Act being archaic and have concerns with old by-laws. He observed that once people get involved they begin to see the positives and Ducks Unlimited has been a good example.

### **15.0 Office of Open Learning - University of Guelph**

Pat Shaver

15.1 Pat presented the 2011 income statement and noted that there was a good surplus. She noted that the honorarium from the cost of training had not been paid out. There were 7 instructors last year. A new value could be set if the LDC wants to revise it. Sid Vander Veen suggested that the moneys be left for now and possibly used for this year’s trainers. Pat suggested that the extra funds could be used for printing costs to avoid University concerns with copyright issues.

15.2 Tom Marentette suggested that it would be good to keep the money for speakers. Sid noted that the teachers this year could spend significant time to prepare and to develop the material needed. Sid can arrange for any photocopies of material that may be needed. Bill Dietrich prefers that the \$1,440.00 for honorariums be left with the LDC. Pat Shaver suggested that this may require a bank account to be set up that will likely require at least 2 signers. John Kuntze suggested that someone could volunteer to manage the funds. Pat pointed out that any money transferred from the University would be taxable unless there is a separate account. She also noted that the surplus amount would be absorbed if it is left sitting for too long. John

said that his preference was to leave the funds for now and Pat indicated that they can hold the money until this fall and use it for paying the final speakers or to cover printing costs if someone does the printing and bills the University.

- 15.3 Sid prefers that the money be used for speakers. Pat stated that the \$4,020.00 would be split 80% to the LDC and 20% to the University. She suggested that the honorarium could be increased to reduce the positive balance. She has the next two months to finalize the budget. She noted that amounts under \$30,000.00 per year are not subject to HST. Pat could add a line to the budget for Committee expenses and prepare a template for mileage, parking and meals with a cap of \$0.50 per kilometre for mileage. Bill Dietrich has an OSPE form for expenses that could be used as the template. If one person picked up the cost of the meals, they could submit the cost for compensation. Tom Pridham suggested that \$2,500.00 could be budgeted for mileage and \$500.00 for meals. Pat will set the rate for mileage based on current University guidelines likely at \$0.45 per km. An expense sheet would have to be submitted with the person's name and mileage and the University will send out cheques. She can include an item for printing expenses in the budget that could be re-allocated later.
- 15.4 Pat noted that dates have been booked for this year and next year's meeting and conference. This year the schedule is October 18th and 19th because the Holiday Inn was booked the following week.
- 15.5 The training course has been posted on the web site and refers to assessments, allowances and design considerations as topics. She can send an invitation to the participants of the first course and then open up registration to the public after September 1st. Total enrollment was discussed and Sid suggested that getting as many as 40 participants might require the Committee to provide enough support to the trainers. Pat suggested that the wording can be changed to indicate limited enrollment. She was contacted by Golder Associates who asked if the training was a pre-requisite to becoming a drainage engineer. She advised Golder that the training course was just a review program.
- 15.6 A list of topic suggestions for the 2012 Conference was provided by Pat Shaver and reviewed. Sid Vander Veen indicated that he would like to see the 2 stage drain presentation from Notre Dame. Travel distance could be a concern so Pat suggested that a Skype presentation might be able to be arranged, but these are always risky due to potential technical problems. Tom Marentette suggested that Turbo meeting or other software could be used for this. Sid suggested that the Notre Dame researcher be invited and a video conference could be suggested as an alternative if there are travel or time concerns. Davin Heinbuck stated that they had recently conducted a very successful video conference presentation. Sid noted that the 2 stage drain can remove a lot of nutrients and greatly improve water quality based on the research to date. Davin offered to get contacts for setting up a Notre Dame presentation.
- 15.7 Sid said that he could coordinate a presentation on Environmental Investments by Catherine Tiessen.
- 15.8 Another topic of recent interest has been the "duty to consult" as related to First Nations interests. Tom Marentette said that they had a speaker from their Ottawa office do a

- presentation on this very recently. John Kuntze noted that Aboriginal/First Nations people are requiring the consultation but no Ministry will tell them how to do it. Tom M. will try to find out more information on “duty to consult”.
- 15.9 Sid suggested that another good topic could be Ontario Heritage Act impacts on drainage. Brigian Barlow, Drainage Superintendent for the Town of Lakeshore, had to deal with this for a project on the Puce River Drain along a cemetery.
- 15.10 Another topic suggested by Sid was “assessed versus pay”. The drainage engineer should not worry about who pays and just focus on who should be assessed. There are tenant agreements, franchise agreements, Bell and Union Gas agreements and other factors that can come into play. Sid would be prepared to present on this topic if he were asked.
- 15.11 A final topic of interest could be effective sediment control techniques. John Kuntze noted that sediment control during construction can be very important and not always handled well. Perhaps a CA person could do a presentation on this topic. Tom Marentette agreed that it would be very helpful to have some standard details or a handbook to guide this work. John suggested that we need the information that is out there pulled together for easier reference. The theoretical information is not needed but more so the practical aspect of how to control sediment. He observed that erosion control blankets may be an up and coming method. Sid Vander Veen suggested that a Contractor such as Harry Reinders of R&M Construction might do a good presentation on this. It was suggested that Harry could do a case study and provide photos. Tom Pridham offered to contact Harry about doing this for the Conference.
- 15.12 John Kuntze suggested that Bill Dietrich could do a case study of his Exeter drainage diversion project for the Conference. Bill explained some of the details of the project but suggested that they wait 1 year until the project is completely finalized. He noted that their office has been involved in some wetland projects that could be used for a case study. A project done in Norfolk might be a good candidate and could be presented by Peter Bryan Pulham or an M.N.R. course trainer along with Greg Nancekivell from Bill’s office. Sid checked and noted that the last wetland presentation was done in 2002.
- 15.13 Davin Heinbuck had to excuse himself from the meeting at 3:00 p.m. but will check on the Notre Dame presentation and advise Pat Shaver and Sid Vander Veen.
- 15.14 It was established that Sid would contact Catherine Tiessen about doing a presentation and he will do the “assess versus pay” topic. Tom Marentette will check on the “duty to consult” topic. Tom Pridham stated that he is willing to do the Glen Cairn project as a case study for diversion of flows around the town. Sid suggested that the Heritage Act topic be left for now and that we focus on the “duty to consult” topic. Pat Shaver indicated that she need to know the order of the presentations. Bill Dietrich will check with Greg Nancekivell on who he wants to work with for the presentation on wetlands. Pat will email out the list of topics and presenters and needs to hear from everyone by July 15th as she is gone during the month of August. Pat left the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

## 16.0 Training Course

- 16.1 Sid Vander Veen noted that there are 2 excellent papers to work from that can be a good starting point for the proposed training session this year. Tom Marentette noted that Ed Dries had declined to be a presenter for this year's course. Tom Pridham said that he had not spoken with Andy McBride yet. Bill Dietrich indicated that he did not want to present but was prepared to assist. John Kuntze also stated that he does not have the time to prepare a full presentation but suggested that Ken Smart might be prepared to do it if there was some remuneration. He is not sure how much Ken might want to do and John could do a spread sheet example as part of the presentation.
- 16.2 Sid suggested that the last 2 sessions could be dropped from this year and done next year. Bill Dietrich believes that an example is needed with construction cost estimates. The required information could be provided to each roundtable and they could be asked to do an assessment. Tim Oliver suggested that we could almost do sample studies as a guide. Tom Marentette believes that only one study should be presented and the participants told how the report did the allowances and assessments. We could then go to each table and ask how they attacked the project.
- 16.3 John Kuntze suggested that we could have 3 engineers present 3 different drains and explain them. We could then switch to workshop mode and have each table discuss the projects. Sid noted that he goes through 2 examples of how to do assessments at his course and this seems to work well. John believes that a worked example is needed at the beginning. The work groups could then do their calculations. He noted that they do all their assessments electronically now but he still has old forms that were used in the past and could provide copies for the workshop. The participants would need some paper worksheets but a laptop spreadsheet would help. The examples would have to be simple drains to reduce the time needed for doing calculations.
- 16.4 Bill Dietrich believes the training session needs to teach the principles of assessment and not get bogged down in calculations. The 1980 course was done to train engineers and might have some information. It was noted that John Spriet did a presentation in 1980 on damages, allowances and assessments. Sid said that Ed Dries did a report for the Drainage Superintendents course with references to the applicable Drainage Act sections. Sid often directs new engineers to the assessments paper. A table session can help new people to understand that they need to be able to explain their decision so that others can understand. Sid could talk about the sections of the Act that apply but someone else needs to discuss the methodology. John Kuntze stated that Ken Smart or he could do that if he can find a suitable project. Sid asked if John would be prepared to share his spreadsheet and John responded that this is not a problem as he has shared them before. He noted that the sheets are constantly updated.
- 16.5 Tim Oliver suggested that doing 3 presentations and then conducting a question and answer period may work the best. Doing 3 case studies may be easier and everyone gets the same input. Tim and John are both prepared to do a case study with a Q & A period if Sid does the description of the Drainage Act sections.

- 16.6 Tim noted that sometimes maintenance clauses are not included in older reports. John suggested that the session could focus just on allowances and assessments and not the Design Considerations and estimating.
- 16.7 Sid Vander Veen asked if 1 hour per person would be enough time for presenting a case study. The consensus was that it would be adequate. Sid suggested that he could do a brief overview of design considerations and estimating the project and then discuss the applicable sections of the Drainage Act. John Kuntze observed that it would be easier to find a drain example than to create a sample project. Sid proposed that the take home binder from the session would include copies of the Todgham & Case paper, the Dries and McCready paper and other references.
- 16.8 John Kuntze suggested that case studies take out the names of owners and just show the roll numbers and a made up name for the Municipality. John offered to do a tile drain project example. Tim Oliver will do an open drain with bridges. Bill Dietrich said that he could do a drain enclosure example. Each presenter will do a breakdown of costs by section and how the assessment is derived.
- 16.9 John suggested that a panel discussion may be worthwhile. Tom Pridham suggested that it would be better to have a Q & A at the end of each presentation while the details were fresh in the mind of the participants. It was established that Sid will do a 45 minute introduction and then John, Tim and Bill will each do a 45 minute presentation and 15 minute Q & A. Tom Marentette will do the closing remarks for the training session. The session will go from 12:30 to 5:00 p.m. with a break.
- 16.10 John Kuntze suggested that we consider having Ed Dries back next year to provide an overview of what is needed in a complete engineer's report.

### **17.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the LDC will be Thursday October 18th at the Holiday Inn Conference location from 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. prior to the training session.

### **18.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. Moved by Sid Vander Veen and seconded by John Kuntze. Carried

---

Tom Marentette, Chairman

Gerard Rood, Secretary