
Thames – Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee

Meeting Notice

Please be advised that a meeting of the Thames-Sydenham and Region source Protection Committee has been called for the following time. **Please confirm your attendance** with Deb Kirk at 519-245-3710 ext 46.

Meeting Date: November 14, 2008

Meeting Time: 1:00 p.m

Meeting Location: Oneida Nation of the Thames-Community Centre
 2017 Ballpark Road, Southwold, ON N0L 2G0
 Tel. 519-652-0855

Proposed Agenda

Item	Time
1. Chair’s Welcome	1:00
2. Adoption of the Agenda	
3. Delegations	
4. Minutes From the Previous Meeting	
5. Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
6. Business arising from the minutes	
a. Letter to Minister “Transportation Corridors”	
7. Business	
a. Terms of Reference Consultation update	1:15
b. Vulnerability Peer Review Terms of Reference	
8. Information	
a. London-Middlesex Groundwater Vulnerability Assessment consultant presentation	1:30
b. CELA Terms of Reference Comments	2:30
c. IPZ1, WHPA-B zones for ODWSP eligibility	
d. First Nations update (verbal)	3:00
e. MOE rules training update	
9. In Camera Session	
10. Other business; Mileage-Taxable Benefit	
11. Members reports	
12. Adjournment	3:30

Meeting Materials

Agenda Item	Description	
Discussion Papers	none	
Other Materials	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous meeting minutes for review and approval
	6a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of letter sent to Minister of the Environment on corridors
	7b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft terms of reference for vulnerability assessment peer review
	8b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oct 10 letter from CELA providing elements to be considered in ToR

SPC MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY NOVEMBER 14, 2008
Meeting #11

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. on Friday, November 14, 2008 at the Oneida First Nation Community Centre. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members:

Bob Bedggood	Pat Sobeski
Dean Edwardson	John Van Dorp
Paul Hymus	Brent Clutterbuck
Carl Kennes	Marg Misek-Evans
Joe Kerr	Jim Maudsley
Don McCabe	Earl Morwood
Doug McGee	Murray Blackie
Richard Philp	Pat Donnelly
Darrell Randell	Joe Salter
Charles Sharina	

Regrets:

Rick Vantfoort (interim Provincial Liaison).
Sheldon Parsons
Valerie M'Garry
Jim Reffle
Patrick Feryn
Joe VanOverberghe

Staff:

Bonnie Carey	Rick Battson
Chitra Gowda	Derekica Snake (First Nations Liaison)
Chris Tasker	Ian Wilcox
Teresa Hollingsworth	Ralph Coe
Deb Kirk	

Others:

Robert Olivier, First Nations technical rep
Kate Turner, Ministry of Environment
Jonas Velaniskis (U of G Student)

1) Chair's Welcome

Bob Bedggood welcomed the committee and thanked everyone who was involved in organizing the tour of the London area including the wells of Oneida and Delaware of the Thames that took place this morning.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

A motion to approve the agenda was requested.

moved by Jim Maudsley- seconded by Doug McGee

“Resolved that the revised agenda circulated be approved.”

CARRIED

3) Delegations

None

4) Minutes from the Previous Meeting

A request was made to include reference to abandoned pipelines in the minutes of the meeting as they pertain to the letter to the Minister on transportation corridors. The letter which was sent did include the reference, however the reference needs to be added to the minutes.

moved by Charles Sharina –seconded by Daryl Randell

“Resolved that the minutes be approved as circulated, with the exception of the one edit noted above.”

CARRIED

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict was identified.

6) Business Arising from the minutes

a) Letter to Minister “Transportation Corridors”

As per the previous meeting, the changes were made to the letter concerning transportation corridors and the letter was sent to the Minister on October 20, 2008.

7) Business

a) Terms of Reference Consultation update

Chitra Gowda, the SWP technical coordinator gave a report on the comments submitted, to date. The comment period ends November 17, 2008.

Keypoints highlighted were:

A letter was submitted by Christopher Waffle and Mike Layton of the Environmental Law Association as distributed to the committee. The letter outlined eight bullet points for consideration. These comments were general in nature. As they were submitted after the Terms of Reference had been submitted to the SPAs, they will be included in the package going to the Minister in December. The comments included in the letter had generally been considered by the SPC in preparing the proposed terms of reference

An email was submitted by, John Walsh outlining some general points on policy development. He reminded the committee of the importance of natural methods to clean water and have more emphasis on water conservation.

Jack Robertson of the Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority sent an email identifying that the completion dates for two items in the process check list had been switched and needed to be corrected.

b) Vulnerability Peer Review Terms of Reference

The Draft version of the Vulnerability Peer Review Terms of Reference has been updated since being sent to the committee. Version 1.3 which was distributed at the meeting is the most up to date Version. A copy of the newer version of the document was also circulated to the Groundwater and Surface Water working groups for their input. There is still time for Municipalities to make comment.

The peer review process for the Oxford County wells. The SPC was reminded that half of their wells are in the Lake Erie Region. Through discussion with Lorrie Minshall it was suggested that all the Oxford County systems could be put through the Thames-Sydenham & Region peer review process and staff (likely a hydrogeologist) from the GRCA would participate in the review of the systems in the Lake Erie region. Unfortunately the staff will not be able to participate in the review of the other systems as they do not have the resources to have a representative for the entire process, rather just to review the Oxford County and Milverton wells.

The committee reviewed and gave input on the report. The key points were as follows:

- A question was raised concerning Significant Groundwater Recharge areas on Page 12 and how this will work logistically. Chris reported that the Water Budget work has its own peer review process on which the vulnerability assessment peer review was modeled. The areas will be defined and reviewed through the Water Budget process. The vulnerability scoring, however, needs to be consistent with the scoring in the other vulnerable areas and therefore should be subjected to the same peer review process as the rest of the vulnerability scoring.
- Clarification is required on the schedule related to the GUDI wells as outlined on page 15. It is unlikely that the GUDI work will be ready to be peer reviewed as indicated in the schedule. The work has yet to be initiated and will not begin until the rules are finalized. The committee may need to reconvene to discuss this separately once the work is completed.
- There was a question raised as to whether it is appropriate to indicate that this is a terms of reference for the “Peer Review Committee”. Further, in Table 6 on

- It was pointed out that much of the work has been completed and in some cases the consultants are no longer engaged in the work. The task outlined in the Terms of Reference included an allowances for the consultants to participate in the process. This area needs some clarity.
- Table 5 titled Schedule on Page 14 should be modified to include a deliverable list. Specific roles should be identified. The Peer Reviewers written comments will, along with meeting notes, and this terms of reference will be compiled into a peer review record, as we move through the various studies.
- A concern was brought forward that the consultants should not participate in the peer review process. It is important to ensure politics are not part of the process and that reports are based on solid science. It was pointed out that unless the consultants participate in the process the final product cannot be improved upon. Often the one important outcome of a process like this is improvement in the documentation of the technical work. Only through dialogue between the consultants, municipal staff and the peer reviewers can clarification be sought to determine if the work has been adequately completed.. It is important that this process be transparent.

moved by Darrell Randell –seconded by Jim Maudsley

“Resolved that the committee endorse and approve the principals of the distributed Vulnerability Peer Review Terms of Reference Report with the above changes included.”

CARRIED

8) Information

a) London-Middlesex Groundwater Vulnerability Assessment consultant presentation

Darin Burr and Rob Kell from Dillon Consulting attended the meeting. Darin gave a presentation on the London-Middlesex Groundwater Vulnerability Assessment. The presentation also included their work on the Chatham-Kent systems in Ridgetown and Highgate. A copy of the presentation will be made available to the members. The presentation outlined some of the findings of the study as well as an outline of previous

work completed, an overview of the study area, the scope of the work, methodology, results and the next steps. The areas of study included Mount Brydges in Strathroy-Caradoc, Birr, Melrose and Komoka in Middlesex Centre, Thorndale and Dorchester in Thames Centre and Highgate and Ridgetown in Chatham-Kent.

b) CELA Terms of Reference Comments

A letter with a spreadsheet was distributed to the committee authored by Christopher Waffle and Mile Layton of the Canadian Environmental Law Association. The letter outlined elements to be considered for inclusion in the Terms of Reference. There were a number of discretionary issues to be considered. It was pointed out that the letter was received prior to the posting of the proposed terms of reference, thus the comments were based on the draft posted earlier. It was pointed out that as the letter was received subsequent to submitting the terms of reference to the SPAs there was no opportunity for the committee to revise the terms of reference. The items which were being brought to the committee's attention by the letter had generally been considered by the committee in developing the proposed terms of reference. As such, the committee agreed that the letter should be forwarded to the Minister with the Terms of Reference by the SPAs.

c) IPZ1, WHPA-B zones for ODWSP eligibility

The committee was reminded that the IPZ1 and WHPA-B (2 yr zone) will be forwarded to municipalities for ODWSP eligibility. Municipal resolutions are required before the projects in these areas are eligible. The committee was reminded that the areas are not final, that the peer review process needs to occur, and the report need to be considered by the SPC before these areas are finalized. The municipalities will therefore be accepting those areas only for the purposes of eligibility for the ODWSP. It will be important that as outreach happen in these areas that property owners be made aware of the interim nature of these lines.

d) First Nations update (verbal)

Derekica Snake, who was introduced to the members during the tour was recently hired as the First Nations Liaison. Her role will focus on establishing relationships with the First Nations. On November 5, 2008, Derekica and Rick Battson attended a meeting at the London Chiefs council. The First Nations people voiced their concerns of only being allotted three seats on the committee. They would prefer eight, one to represent each of their distinct Nations. Robert Olivier continues to attend the committee meetings. A question was raised of how some of the issues outlined in the letter from CELA to incorporate aboriginal traditional knowledge can be incorporated in the process without their involvement on the committee. The goal is to continue to try to build these relationships and it may take time.

e) MOE rules training update

The Ministry of Environment has scheduled another date for a SPC technical training session which was cancelled when the rules were not released. It is to be held on January 7th, 2009 at the Days Inn, Wellington Street, London. A concern was raised that the MOE cancelled the session with very short notice. The committee members will be provided with the details and can contact Deb Kirk at the St. Clair Conservation to be registered. There are other training session options being held across the region, outside the London area, in December and the details for these will also be forwarded.

9) In Camera Session

None

10) Other Business; Mileage-Taxable benefit

Ian Wilcox, the General Manager of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority reported to the committee that the mileage paid for meetings held at the St. Clair Conservation Authority office are considered a taxable benefit due to this office being deemed the committee members' place of work. The majority of the meetings are held at this location. If the committee attends meetings outside of the St. Clair office, it is not a taxable benefit. There was some debate concerning this issue. The Human Resources Administer of Upper Thames River Conservation Authority recently posed this question to Revenue Canada and received a response explaining the decision. The enquiry and written response will be provided to the committee.

11) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 310 p.m. The committee is reminded that the next meeting is February 13, 2009 at the SCRCA.