

KLCOA 2020 Spring Meeting Questions/Suggestions/Comments and Responses		
	Submitted by	Question or Comment
1.	Ted Brown	We could certainly use more of the No Wake Markers in Little Kennisis just past the first bridge. Boats entering from the big lake get too close to the west shore and either pick up speed too soon or stand in their boats and plough through the water. This causes not only waves on the dock but more importantly damage to the natural shoreline.
	KLCOA Response	<p>The KLCOA did deploy No Wake Makers (NWM) for the first time in 2019 in the BB Islands and Cabin Island channels and reports from the shoreline residents and others have been positive regarding slowing boat traffic. Recognizing that the KLCOA uses volunteers to manage NWMs, we decided that the markers could not be deployed in deep water (greater than ~25ft) due to the weight of the anchors and chain being too hard to manage. The other criterion for NWM deployment is that they cannot interfere with navigation. The areas on both side of the first bridge would be pushing the limits for both of these requirements. The channel is already narrow on both sides of the bridge. We considered this location for NWM but abandoned the idea for these reasons.</p> <p>We believe that the best approach is to educate boaters on our lakes to follow safe boating practices and exhibit good boating etiquette when operating their craft close to shorelines. The KLCOA has been active in this area but there clearly more to be done. The KLCOA has information on our website including a Boaters Code of Conduct. We are also actively pursuing safe boating programs that are being implemented in other jurisdictions such as those from Safe Quiet Lakes (https://safequiet.ca).</p> <p>Perhaps updated signage on the first bridge indicating a No Wake Zone would work. We would be happy to pursue this or other options.</p>
2.	Daryl Ball	Given the current situation at Kennisis where Bell is maxed out, would it make sense for the KLCOA to explore alternatives to incentivize other service providers? Or alternatively get some fibre around the lake. Could this be done as a shared initiative with Redstone?
	KLCOA Response	<p>The need for better access to high speed Internet in our area is well recognized. Right now, we know that all of the service providers are evaluating and preparing responses to a large Request for Proposals (RFP) issued just last month by EORN (Eastern Ontario Regional Network). EORN is managing a pool of funding (literally tens of millions of dollars) contributed by the federal, provincial and local governments to expand service throughout all of eastern Ontario. Each telecommunications provider will have their own approach and the EORN evaluation criteria is largely based on the degree to which coverage can be improved.</p> <p>We understand fibre runs along Hwy 118, including into West Guilford. Running it north from there to reach our lakes will be a very expensive proposition. It seems that today the providers are less focused on installing that kind of infrastructure and looking to better leverage wireless services to reach more remote areas.</p>

		<p>We know that the Kennisis/Redstone area has a significant population, especially during the summer, and expect the carriers will look at that as both a substantial business opportunity and a chance to score well on the EORN evaluation criteria. We imagine their engineering teams will be devoted to developing proposal response content that will increase their chances of accessing the tens of millions EORN has available.</p> <p>Later this fall we will learn the results of the RFP process. Until then we believe the best approach is to wait and see the result. Should that not work out as we hope then the pursuit of alternatives will be timely and appropriate.</p>
3.	Chris Snyder	I've noticed multiple flights today from an amphibian airplane near my cottage. Today alone, I counted 6 flights right off the end of my dock. Is there any bylaw in place to restrict these frivolous flights? They are deafening and frankly, unsafe due to the proximity of boaters.
	KLCOA Response	<p>There are no regulations regarding float planes.</p> <p>We asked a float plane pilot to comment on float plane etiquette and were informed that in flight school to obtain your float endorsement, your instructor teaches the etiquette of lake take offs and landings. Unless it is an emergency situation a plane should not take off or land near the shore, try not to take off or land close to residences and avoid all boat traffic. Boats have the right of way. Taxiing to the center of the lake for take-off, and taxiing in, from the centre of the lake after landing is the best option. The pilot also commented that some motorboats and especially jet skis think it is fun to race a float plane causing danger for both the pilot and the boaters. Buzzing cottages and docks is rude, not unlike boat and jet ski traffic doing the exact same thing.</p> <p>We were also informed that if you think the float plane is engaging in dangerous actions, you can call the OPP and report call sign (can usually be seen on the side of the plane or under the wing); activity; place; time and date.</p>
4.	Tony Lepine	For the financial report, it would be nice to know what the reserve is and what the bank account balance is.
	KLCOA Response	We currently have \$23,000 in the General Reserve (separate bank account) which has been built up over a number of years. In addition, we had approximately \$12,000 in our chequing account on December 31, 2019. This does allow us to manage an occasional deficit as we have done in the 2020 budget.
5.	Dave Deikman and Melanie Colpitts	We would like to propose a change to the 10km per hour boat speed limit 100 feet from shoreline. Boats at 10kph or slightly less speed cause great damage with their wake to the shoreline, especially wake boards that plow through the water at or just below 10kph. 10 kph. is at a

		<p>speed where a boat is in gear with throttle engaged and moving and as a result very hard to approximate speed as many boat gauges or dials won't or give a reading or give an inaccurate kph reading at that level of speed and so level of speed is open to interpretation of the individual. We would like to propose a change to: idle speed 100 feet from the shore line.</p>
	<p>KLCOA Response</p>	<p>You are correct, in Ontario we have speed limits of 10 km/h within 30 m (98'5") of shore on all waters¹. This limit is in effect whether it is posted or not. There are a few exceptions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -recreational towing while traveling perpendicular from the shore; - rivers less than 100 m (328') wide, as well as canals and buoyed channels; and - waters where another speed limit is set in a schedule to the regulations. <p>Unfortunately, neither the KLCOA nor our local community can impose a more restrictive speed limit. This is regulated by the federal government under the Canada Shipping Act and details are in the Local Authorities Guide- Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations². In order to impose a more restrictive speed limit, this must be done by a government or a municipality, township, parish, county or regional district. In our case, it is very unlikely that Dysart et al or Haliburton County would pursue this option.</p> <p>We believe that the best approach is to educate boaters on our lakes to follow safe boating practices and exhibit good boating etiquette when operating their craft. This is easier said than done. The KLCOA has been active in this area but there clearly more to be done. The KLCOA has information on our website including a Boaters Code of Conduct. We are also actively pursuing safe boating programs that are being implemented in other jurisdictions such as those from Safe Quiet Lakes (https://safequiet.ca).</p> <p>Your idea to change the message about low speeds close to shore is a good one. We can include the concept of "idle speed 100 feet from the shoreline" in our ongoing boating education initiatives.</p> <p>(1) Safe Boating Guide - Safety Tips and Requirements for Pleasure Craft -TP-511e (2) https://www.tc.gc.ca/media/documents/marinesafety/LOCAL_AUTHORITIES__GUIDE_-_ENGLISH_-_ACCESSIBLE_PDF.pdf</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Douglas Lenart</p>	<p>I have a concern that the KLCOA executive is venturing beyond the constitution making charitable donations beyond what is to the benefit of the Kennisis Lake community without any attempt to solicit membership input. I am not debating that the charities chosen are not worthy. And I would suggest the hospital could well be considered to be of direct benefit to the lake community.</p> <p>If in a time of crisis, the broader community wants our support, I would suggest the KLCOA would be much more effective soliciting our members to donate directly than donating membership dues.</p> <p>If the KLCOA feels they need to spend membership dues to avoid generating too much of a surplus, than I suggest that the membership should have a vote.</p> <p>Of course, there is always the option of reducing the membership fee or providing current members a credit for future membership.</p>

	KLCOA Response	<p>The KLCOA has acknowledged the importance of supporting and investing in the Kennisis Lake community, which included an annual donation to the Haliburton Highlands Health Services. Each year, a number of our members have to access the ER department for everything from minor cuts requiring stitches, to major events including heart attacks and strokes.</p> <p>In addition, many of our members rely on the vitality of the broader Haliburton community for goods and services. 2020 has been an unprecedented year as a result of COVID-19. Many in the community immediately lost their jobs and the local food banks saw a substantial increase in usage. The lake associations in Haliburton County were challenged to make a donation in support of the food banks. We rose immediately to the challenge and donated \$1000 to the Haliburton 4C Food Bank and another \$1000 to Sirch Community Kitchen.</p> <p>KLCOA is fortunate that approximately 20% of our revenue is generated from advertising, giving us some flexibility to support additional programs as the need arises. We will be discussing our donations approach at our next Board Meeting.</p>
7.	Douglas Lenart	<p>I believe the County of Haliburton Shoreline Preservation Bylaw is flawed and the KLCOA should pull their endorsement for this bylaw. I am a strong believer that a natural shoreline is critical to lake health. However, this bylaw and to a much lesser extent the Dysart tree bylaw are effectively a tree tax. Those with mostly natural shorelines are burdened with permits and approvals while trying to manage a safe and healthy forest to the waters edge while those with lawns and flowers suffer no burden. The end result of the bylaw will be a slow deforestation of the buffer zone. Why would anyone in there right mind allow a tree to establish itself close to their cottage if they know that tree might cost them thousands of dollars to remove should it become unsound, sick or suffer storm damage. I have seen the adverse impact of a tree bylaw in our winter home which was primarily in a forested area. Since the tree bylaw took effect, large tree species are only removed, not planted once the owner realizes that \$50.00 tree they planted costs them more than \$1000 to remove. As trees succumb to disease and old age, they are removed and not replaced. When trees are planted they are typically the shorter smaller ornamental species which typically have short life spans.</p> <p>How are you ever going to convince property owners with lawns or clear cut understudy to plant long life large tree species knowing the burden just that one tree will carry.</p> <p>If the goal of the bylaw is to make sure that there is a healthy natural forest covering the maximum amount of the property possible, than the bylaw should focus on rewarding those with appropriate forest coverage and penalizing those that do not have forest coverage. With many of our tree species under threat from invasive diseases, we should be encouraging active forest management and tree planting, not discouraging it with administration and taxation.</p>
	KLCOA Response	<p>As a property owner on our Lake, you are acutely aware of the need to protect our water quality. As a shoreline community, there are three main things that are within our control that will impact the quality of our water:</p> <p>1) Control of septic system nutrients entering our lakes – There is a Dysart By-law and program addressing this.</p>

2) Shoreline protection to counteract the nutrient loading from septic systems – Existing and proposed Haliburton County By-law and program,

3) Eliminate the use of fertilizers and pesticides (There are currently no active programs to address these issues in either Haliburton or Dysart. Some provincial regulations are in place but are very weak for shoreline waterfront controls).

In 2015 and 2016, we saw septic caused nutrient spikes in Little K (MOECC water quality tests and confirmation) which prompted our focused action on both septic system maintenance and shoreline protection. These have been reported at our GMs and AGMs. The KLCOA letter to Haliburton County to support the Shoreline Preservation by-law was intended to do two things:

- Support the County on their commitment to rigorous public consultation
- Support the County in implementing an improved Shoreline Preservation Bylaw as one of the critical elements for protecting our water quality.

The KLCOA has been reporting our advocacy for stronger shoreline vegetation protections and reporting it publicly in the AGMs, GMs and publishing the meeting presentations for years. All of this is on the KLCOA website and has been widely distributed in our e-blasts. The KLCOA has been very transparent on these topics. We are supported by the CHA who have documented the need for shoreline protection with a science-based approach.

The KLCOA advocacy for natural shorelines and stronger shoreline vegetation protection has had significant support from the community. Here are some of the facts about the proposed by-law:

This is a DRAFT Haliburton County By-law. Changes to the shoreline protection by-law have been under discussion in public meetings since 2017, at approximately 20 sessions according to Haliburton County Councillors tracking the process. This is not a new discussion. If you compare the 2011 Haliburton County, Shoreline Tree Preservation By-law (#3505 2011) and the proposed Shoreline Preservation By-law the rules affecting waterfront residential properties have not changed substantially except for including native vegetation rather than just trees:

- Exactly the same area is covered – 30m back from the water (high water mark is clearly defined in the new draft)
- The basic by-law exemptions are exactly the same (owner can remove all vegetation):
 - 5m exemption from all new buildings, 3m for rebuilds
 - 5m wide (that's >16 feet) path to the water
 - 5m driveway
- Tree and vegetation trimming following good arboricultural practice, removal of hazard trees etc.

The one thing that has changed, is the proposed requirement for a Site Alteration Plan Permit Application, only if one is planning to ask for an exception that is not already in the by-law. A permit is not needed if you work within the by-law and there are many exemptions. The Site Alteration Plan is not a new concept, many other jurisdictions, including our neighbours in Lake of Bays (LoB), have had this process in place for many years (>10) for shorelines and are now proposing to expand the process for all Site Alterations. According to the LoB Planner, the process has removed the subjectivity of approvals and with their commitment to a 35 day turn around, both owners and contractors can keep projects moving without unplanned delays due to permitting.

We would encourage the community to engage in the public consultation on the proposed Shoreline Preservation by-law. If interested, anyone can request to be notified for upcoming meetings or updates. As you are aware many of these initiatives have been deferred due to the current pandemic.

		Keep checking the Haliburton County website and the KLCOA e-blasts and website for updates.
8.	Donna-Lynn Doucette	1. Budget: In reviewing the budget, I didn't see a line for the recent donations to local food bank charities that totaled 5K. Did I miss something?
	KLCOA Response	We have, in the 2020 budget, earmarked \$1,000 for Community support. In light of the hardship many Haliburton residents are facing with COVID-19, the Board made a decision in April to contribute \$1,000 to SIRCH and a further \$1,000 to the 4C's food bank; a total of \$2,000. Due to COVID-19 the KLCOA has also put 3 new initiatives on hold until 2021 freeing up an additional \$4300. These initiatives are the Lake Map Update (\$1000), History Book (\$1300) and the second phase of the Abandoned Dock Program (\$2000).
9.	Donna-Lynn Doucette	2. Shoreline health Natural Shoreline 30m back from the lake to maintain healthy water quality/ Keep a naturalized shoreline (30m vegetative buffer zone). Shoreline Health 75% of our shoreline should be in a natural state for a minimum of 30 m (100 feet) back from high water, otherwise water quality will degrade over time. Water quality is what determines our property values and our enjoyment on the lake. I have seen this statement several places in this report. Is this the KLCOA position on this? I believe 66 feet back is a number most people would be more comfortable with and you would get more support from both members and non members in supporting this. In following up with politicians and others, about this arbitrary number of 100 feet/ 30 metres, no one could provide evidence that this had to be the number to protect the shoreline. It seemed to just be adapted as the right number without any evidenced based information. I believe in shoreline protection but I also wonder if we are ready to look at excessive wake in Little K and close to shorelines elsewhere which are a lot more damaging?
	KLCOA Response	Great question. The recommendation for 75% of our shoreline to be in a natural state for a minimum of 30 m (100 feet) back from high water is indeed to promote lake health and maintain our excellent water quality. This is not a KLCOA position but rather the recommendation from upper tier organizations such as FOCA ¹ and the CHA ² that use evidenced based science to educate shoreline property owners and local governments. The specific recommendation is from the report "How Much Habitat is Enough? A Framework for Guiding Habitat Rehabilitation in Great Lakes Areas of Concern" (Environment Canada, 2004). These recommendations are only guidelines and are often specific to a particular terrain. The "75% for 30m back" does reflect the general notion that leaving native plants intact or rehabilitating shorelines on this area will benefit our lakes by providing adequate uptake of nutrients from our septic systems, reduce erosion and provide natural habitat for all the critters that inhabit our shorelines. For the shoreline wake query, see the response to questions 1 and 5. 1) Federation of Ontario Cottage Associations

		2) Coalition of Haliburton Property Owners Associations
10.	Donna-Lynn Doucette	<p>3. Septic Inspection:</p> <p>The resolution also committed to completing the remaining 112 properties in the Kennisis Lakes area in 2020 with fees assessed for non-compliance. A pump out by a septage hauler and a report on the condition of the tank will be required within 30 days following the inspection. Septage haulers are not required to be certified as inspectors. This is NOT a Type 4 inspection that requires a concurrent inspection and pump-out with the certified inspector looking at the empty tank. It does however give some comfort to know that the remainder of our Lake is being covered in the interest of protecting our water quality</p> <p>mayor's letter: The remaining 112 properties will receive an order from Dysart. They will still be required to have a pump out but it can be done up to one month after the inspection</p> <p>It was my understanding that the remaining 112 properties would need inspection but I was surprised to read in the Mayor's letter that they can get an inspection and then a pump out following the inspection? Wouldn't it make sense to do the pump out and then the inspection after? What if you don't see the damage until you pump out but it was missed?</p> <p>It is great that they will all have to pump out and all have an inspection but I am not sure it will be what is needed to find issues with the remaining 112.</p> <p>Am I missing something?</p>
	KLCOA Response	<p>Yes, it would make sense to do the pump out and inspection at the same time and we encourage all of the remaining 112 properties to do that. We believe you will still be allowed to use one of the certified inspectors on the list to do your level 4 inspection although we suggest you check that with Dysart first.</p> <p>If the pump-out is done at a separate time, the septage hauler is required to provide a report to Dysart on the condition of the tank. This will hopefully catch some of the obvious problems but may miss some of the less obvious ones such as slow leaks from cracks that may not be visible without a hose down and close inspection by certified inspector.</p> <p>As both an inspection and pump-out are required it would make the most sense to have them done at the same time to get the most value and best results.</p>
11.	Donna-Lynn Doucette	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to do this. I wonder if a ZOOM meeting may work for the fall AGM- seems most people know how to use these platforms now and maybe if we are saving money due to non completion of many of the activities being cancelled we can invest in this platform as the free one is limited to 40 people and 40 minutes but the paid one would allow us to try to connect-one issue is internet in the area- so maybe it would be worthwhile to test the free platform with some committees to see if it is worth it....quality of internet etc.</p> <p>Have a great summer!</p>

	KLCOA Response	Our KLCOA bylaws and the regulations for not-for-profit organizations require us to hold our AGM as a meeting allowing members the opportunity to ask questions and discuss before any voting is done. We already have a platform that will allow us to do this on the assumption that we will need to hold a virtual meeting for our AGM.
12.	Peter and Pat Smith	<p>Many thanks for providing us with a virtual spring KLCOA meeting, for going to the trouble to prepare and post the reports you would otherwise have delivered there. It was sad not to be able to attend in person, in part to greet and see friends we have not seen for months. But this, too, is a challenge we are learning to deal with.</p> <p>Thank you also to all of the directors of KLCOA for all of the hard work you do year-round for the benefit of Big and Little Kennis Lakes and all of us who live here, long-term or seasonally. The KLCOA is such a strong lake association, constantly monitoring news and issues for matters of importance to us as a community, looking always to educate us all on topics that impact the quality of our lake and our lives here, and taking on new initiatives while maintaining important programs. With best wishes, Peter Smith and Pat McCann-Smith</p> <p>We have two comments arising from the reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We urge you to adjust the budget for fireworks to the level of the last few years – that is, around \$2,500. There will be enough variability in the revenues for this unusual year, and the displays in past years at their price point have been excellent.
	KLCOA Response	For 2020 we have budgeted to spend approximately \$3,000 on the physical fireworks plus a further \$1,100 on special event insurance. The \$3000 is the budget amount recommended to us by our pyrotechnics expert. In the last few years, we were not required to buy the special event insurance and the actual physical cost of fireworks was in the \$2,400 range. We are currently obtaining quotes on the special event insurance and are very close to finalizing a much more favourable rate. At this point, we will need permission (license) from Dysart to hold the event on August 1 due to current restrictions on group gatherings. We will continue to monitor and keep the membership informed.
13.	Peter and Pat Smith	We hope that you will continue to approach the short term rental matter with a view only to education of the community at large and potential and present renters, but not to develop a position or to advocate for regulation at the municipal level. As you have noted, many of us rent to a few others for a few weeks a year to assist with expenses and to permit families who have fond memories of cottaging here to return for a week or two, always bearing in mind their responsibilities to the lake and its close proximity, as well as to neighbors in terms of behavior and respect. We have people who have rented here in the past who are now owners on the lake and members of the KLCOA; we have had excellent experience with our renters who have been returning for years now, and our experience is, no doubt, a result of vigilant screening and then a discussion as well as written acknowledgement of the terms of their brief occupancy, and the reasons for the rules

		<p>established. There are already noise by-laws and “load” provisions in place by way of the septic approvals for the number of bedrooms in a cottage, and concerns about this can be reported to the municipality for further action. Many of the factors enumerated by those who expressed concern in your survey could as easily arise from owners of cottage properties and their families, friends and non-paying guests as it could from renters. It would be ill-advised for a municipality already short-staffed to take on some responsibility for invigilating renter situations, and to add staff to do so would add to the tax burden and/or require an extremely prohibitive fee payable by renters that would encourage an “underground” rental market that is likely to involve the least responsible renters.</p>
	<p>KLCOA Response</p>	<p>As you have noted, many on our lakes rent their cottage out for a few weeks a year to assist with expenses. This can permit families who have fond memories of cottaging here to return for a week or two, or new families to experience the lake for the first time. As you say, there are returning renters that eventually become owners and an integral part of our community.</p> <p>Part of the KLCOA’s responsibility is to listen to our members. Over the past few years, we’ve heard concerns about the increase in short term rentals (STR) on the Kennisis Lakes and the potential impact on our community. Our 2019 survey did provide additional insights and pointed to consideration for addressing potential issues including but not limited to zoning infractions, noise, parking, building deficiencies, health and safety and environmental impacts.</p> <p>The KLCOA Board recognizes that the discussion on Short Term Rentals has just begun in the Kennisis community and that further work is needed to understand the direction we should take. We’re hopeful that the discussion itself will be the first part of the education process.</p> <p>So far, the KLCOA Board has committed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the positions on STRs that the multi-stakeholder organizations are developing (FOCA, CHA etc.) and further develop the KLCOA position on STRs based on their work • Monitor the STR discussions and bylaw proposals for Highlands East and Minden Hills and communicate the progress to the KLCOA members • Continue to provide the KLCOA membership and the community with resources promoting responsible cottage rental
<p>14.</p>	<p>Ted Parent</p>	<p>First, thank you for your continuing efforts to deal with K.L.C.O.A. business during this pandemic. The format for this year’s spring meeting required additional work and imagination. The results are a comprehensive and clear communication to the members, combined with an opportunity to respond to matters raised.</p> <p>This creates considerably more work for board members and the time and effort are greatly appreciated.</p> <p>I want to comment on the continuing discussion about the Dysart Septic reinspection program because, notwithstanding the continued effort of our ward counsel member, John Smith, I believe that the key point is being missed.</p>

The key point is that the objective of a septic inspection program is to ensure that the septic system is properly sized and is in good working condition.

In order to achieve this goal, the prior council instituted an inspection program that required that the septic system was pumped, flushed and cleaned, to allow a trained inspector to visually inspect the chamber and connections.

This program was described by many as the best practice and established a high standard.

At an Environment Committee meeting, this spring, a certified inspector told the committee that the visual inspection by a trained inspector is the best method of properly completing a septic inspection. He also told the committee that there were several cases where system failures would not have been detected if the septic had not been pumped and flushed at the time of inspection.

I recall that he said there were about 40 such cases related to the systems, that he inspected. I may not be accurate with the number but that can be checked, in any case it was a significant number of failures that would not have been detected.

He said that other inspectors reported similar experiences.

For some reason, none of this was reported in the local press.

So, it is clear that those individuals with training and experience are firm in the conclusion that the best septic inspection occurs when the septic system is pumped, flushed and visually inspected.

Now, notwithstanding this presentation, the municipality is moving to change the inspection process.

The issues appear to be that it is often difficult to co-ordinate the homeowner's attendance with the schedule of the septic pump truck and the inspector.

Also, the first area to be tested, Kennisis Lake, has 112 properties that have not complied with the bylaw and the municipality says that they do not have the resources to enforce the bylaw.

The proposal was to change to a new septic inspection program utilizing a sludge level test to determine if a tank is leaking and saving the cost and organization required for a pump out based system.

However, only one of the certified inspectors believes that the sludge test is a valid method inspection.

Many people have commented on the unfairness of a revised system. They believe that since they were required to have a pump out, everyone should have to have a pump out.

Based on human nature, that is a position that could find support, but it is not the issue. If technology had advanced and a better process was developed for an inspection, that was as good as or better than the "pump out based system, that would be great.

However, that is not the case.

So, the municipality is now suggesting that those that have not complied will need a pump out prior to the inspection but this pump out would not be required at the time of the inspection and could be done a month prior to the inspector's investigation.

They propose that the truck driver will look at the tank and provide a report on the systems condition.

That is simply ludicrous.

First, the septic driver has no skills or training on the requirements of inspecting a system.

His only requirement is to have a proper drivers license and 4 hours of noncertified training about the truck, pumping and transport of waste.

This can be confirmed on the O.A.S.S.I.S. web site.

The training is provided by his employer, there is no test and no certification, in fact, no hard evidence that this training it is even done.

	<p>Secondly, the truck driver’s job is to complete pump outs and move on to the next customer. He does not have either time or motivation to complete an inspection.</p> <p>Thirdly, it raises the legal obligation of the pump out company. I personally cannot see septic transporters wanting this additional responsibility. If their drivers approve systems that are then proven unsafe or ineffective they may assume some liability.</p> <p>Forth, the driver is not trained in the ethical responsibility of making sure the inspection is properly completed and is vulnerable to property owner potential coercion.</p> <p>This solution is crazy!</p> <p>I would suggest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The municipality should enforce the by-law that was in place. 2. A subcommittee should be formed to study the administration of the by-law seeking administrative improvements and tools for enforcement, utilizing expertise of pumpers, inspectors and administrators. 3. That the K.L.C.O.A take a firm position on the integrity of our septic testing system. <p>You don’t change a good law because enforcement is difficult.</p> <p>For example, school zones have speed limits.</p> <p>These are difficult to enforce.</p> <p>Nobody suggests raising the speed limit in a school zone, to ease enforcement.</p> <p>The objective is to make sure our lakes are safe.</p> <p>If the current pandemic teaches us anything, it is the power of infections and virus and the importance of vigilance in matters of health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Nothing is more fundamental to our health and economic wellbeing, than the quality of our water, so we should not compromise on the level and integrity of our septic inspection program.</p> <p>I thank our counselor, John Smith. He has been a voice, alone, crying in the wilderness and for some reason, other members of counsel are not hearing or appear not to be independently researching the situation.</p> <p>The counsel is looking for a solution, not the best solution. They appear to want the problem to disappear and will accept anything.</p> <p>Many have accused John of beating a dead horse, but that is not the case. He has been trying to maintain an excellent septic inspection program, one that has been applauded by other municipalities and lake organizations.</p> <p>Amen!</p>
<p>KLCOA Response</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The KLCOA would like to thank the 850 properties that participated in the Septic Re-inspection program over the last 2 years. Thank you also to all of our members who reached out to both the KLCOA and Dysart over the last few months as we expressed our concerns over the direction Dysart was going with the proposed bylaw changes and the handling of the 112 properties that did not complete their inspection. The level 4 inspection process is something that the KLCOA has worked closely with Dysart on for a number of years now. Discussions will be brought forward again by Council in the Fall. We believe there will have to be some kind of public consultation before a change to the bylaw can be finalized. How we proceed from here is a topic on the agenda for the next board meeting and we will keep our members informed.</p>

15.	Tayce Wakefield and Roy Campbell	<p>We continue to appreciate the work of the Board and all the volunteers who contribute to the KLCOA and make the Kennis community a special place to be. With the current pandemic-related challenges, we appreciate the Board putting together this chart deck and sharing it with the membership as a good way to convey information while respecting social distancing constraints. We thank you very much for taking the time to respond to these questions.</p> <p>We wish everyone a happy and healthy summer on the lakes!</p> <p>We have the following questions and input on selected items in the materials:</p> <p>1. Fireworks</p> <p>The fireworks are probably the best-attended of any of the events sponsored by KLCOA, and we appreciate the efforts of the qualified pyrotechnics experts who put it on each year. We hope that it will be possible to have a fireworks display this year (depending on whether it is appropriate in the context of the provincial/municipal coronavirus constraints and good prudence).</p> <p>We were pleased to see an increase in the budget for this item after a number of years of "carryover". Our question is how much (if any) of this increase is for a "bigger/better/longer" show and how much (if any) is the result of the imposition by Dysart et al of a new fireworks by-law in 2019 (which essentially duplicated existing federal requirements for community events but may have imposed new costs, processes or insurance requirements in favour of the municipality)?</p>
	KLCOA Response	<p>For 2020 we have budgeted to spend approximately \$3,000 on the physical fireworks plus a further \$1,100 on special event insurance. The \$3000 is the budget amount recommended to us by our pyrotechnics expert. In the last few years, we were not required to buy the special event insurance and the actual physical cost of fireworks was in the \$2,400 range. We are currently obtaining quotes on the special event insurance and are very close to finalizing a much more favourable rate. At this point, we will need permission (license) from Dysart to hold the event on August 1 due to current COVID-19 restrictions on group gatherings. We will continue to monitor and keep the membership informed.</p>
16.	Tayce Wakefield and Roy Campbell	<p>2. Water Quality Testing</p> <p>We appreciate the work of the volunteer team to test our lake water regularly to provide early warning if issues are emerging. Can the KLCOA please provide the complete results of water quality testing in 2019? (The 2019 Fall AGM results do not include the September sampling and there are no results in this chart deck. The material on water quality on the website dates from 2018. Unfortunately, the link to the Ontario Lake Partners Program does not easily yield up the data on calcium & phosphorus for Kennis.)</p>

	KLCOA Response	<p>The WQ testing team is still assessing the results from September 2019 and we will be posting the full 2019 test results in the near future. We are re-evaluating our testing plans for 2020 due to the pandemic, but also assessing whether we should move to a different test frequency, perhaps every second year. This information update will be delivered in an e-blast and posted on the website once recommendations from the WQ test team have been approved by the KLCOA BoD.</p> <p>The Lake Partner Program website is indeed difficult to navigate. FOCA reposts the provincial LPP data here: https://foca.on.ca/lake-partner-program-sampling-assistance/ . Often neither are accurate or up to date as there is sometimes a lag for the LPP/DESC data to be updated to the FOCA site.</p>
17.	Tayce Wakefield and Roy Campbell	<p>3. Short Term Rentals</p> <p>We note that the survey cited had a response rate of less than 25% of the membership, with roughly 2/3 expressing concerns and 1/3 not having concerns. We question the statistical significance of this survey as a basis for action by the KLCOA. The chief areas of concern cited by "concerned" respondents (noise, septic overuse, boating safety, property overloading, lake health) are not exclusive to renters but unfortunately can also be exhibited by property owners, too. There are already municipal by-laws (or federal/provincial regulations) in place to address many of these issues. Advocating for STR regulation would put KLCOA adverse in interest to a large number of its members, and would take considerable research and technical knowledge on municipal law, tax law and other issues which may be beyond the expertise/resources of the Board. Instead, we suggest that the Association look for constructive ways to address the noise/septic/boating/etc concerns in a way that could be supported/welcomed by all members of the community. This might include a "Voluntary Code of Conduct" which sets out community norms for all users on the key items of concern; and/or posters/booklets which provide information on responsible use to all users (which could be left in every property to inform users); and/or information as to the existing legal frameworks on each of these issues along with enforcement/compliance methodologies already available.</p>
	KLCOA Response	<p>The KLCOA is encouraged by the response to our August 2019 survey – 25% is quite healthy and we’re still wanting to hear more. STR concerns continue to be raised in many urban and rural municipalities across Ontario and are reported frequently in the media. The Board recognizes that the discussion on Short Term Rentals has just begun in our community and that further work is needed to understand the direction we should take. We’re hopeful that the discussion itself will be the first part of the education process. As such, we will continue to provide the KLCOA membership and the broader community with resources promoting responsible cottage rental.</p> <p>As you rightly note, many of the concerns raised reflect issues not limited to STR, but issues present in the community as a whole. Having said that, we believe it is both helpful and important to understand how STR may be contributing to issues including but not limited to zoning infractions, noise, parking, building deficiencies, health and safety and environmental impacts.</p> <p>The Board has not made any decision with respect to advocating for regulations. We are monitoring what others are doing, searching out practical information we can share and as always looking for best practices that will make a difference for our community. In that spirit, we’ve committed to the following:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monitor the positions on STRs that the multi-stakeholder organizations are developing (FOCA, CHA etc.) and further develop the KLCOA position on STRs based on their work• Monitor the STR discussions and bylaw proposals for Highlands East and Minden Hills and communicate the progress to the KLCOA members• Continue to provide the KLCOA membership and the community with resources promoting responsible cottage rental <p>Please watch for more information as this topic evolves.</p>
--	--	--