

---

## 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. If you are unable to attend please contact Deb Kirk at 519-245-3710 ext 46.

**Meeting Date:** February 13, 2009

**Meeting Time:** 9:00 a.m to 3:00 pm

**Meeting Location:** St. Clair Conservation Authority Board Room

---

### Proposed Agenda

Item	Time
1. Chair's Welcome	9:00
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. Corridors response from the Minister	
b. MOE rules training (presentation and discussion)	9:15
7. Business	
a. MOE program review of ODWSP	10:00
b. Technical Work Review and Acceptance Process	10:30
c. AR Consultation Plan (presentation)	11:00
d. IPZ3 delineation (presentation)	11:30
Lunch	12:00
e. Preliminary MOE feedback on Terms of Reference	12:30
8. Information	1:00
a. ODWSP zones (IPZ1, WHPA-B) approvals update	
b. First Nations update (verbal)	
c. Communications update (verbal)	
d. Chatham-Kent and West Elgin IPZ (Stantec) Presentation	1:45
9. In Camera Session	
10. Other business	2:45
a. David Suzuki Stewardship fund	
11. Members reports	
12. Adjournment	3:00

## Meeting Materials

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Description</b>
Discussion Papers	2009.02.6b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOE rules training</li> <li>• List of items for discussion at the meeting</li> <li>• Request for additional items from members</li> </ul>
	2009.02.7b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Work Review and Acceptance Process</li> </ul>
	2009.02.7e	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary MOE feedback on Terms of Reference</li> <li>• Recommended updates to the Terms of Reference to forward to MOE</li> </ul>
Other Materials	January 2009 Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distributed to municipalities and posted on the web site</li> </ul>
	November 14, 2008 meeting minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting minutes distributed to SPC in December</li> </ul>
	Minister's letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minister's response to corridors letter</li> </ul>

SPC MEETING MINUTES  
FRIDAY FEBRUARY 13, 2009  
Meeting #12

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, February 13, 2009 at the St. Clair Conservation Authority Board Room. The following members and staff were in attendance:

**Members:**

Bob Bedggood	Brent Clutterbuck
Dean Edwardson	Marg Misek-Evans
Paul Hymus	Earl Morwood
Carl Kennes	Murray Blackie
Joe Kerr	Pat Donnelly
Don McCabe	Joe Salter
Doug McGee	Valerie M'Garry
Richard Philp	Patrick Feryn
Darrell Randell	Joe Van Overberghe
Charles Sharina	Teresa McLellan (Provincial Liaison).
John Van Dorp	

**Regrets:**

Sheldon Parsons  
Jim Maudsley  
Pat Sobeski  
Jim Reffle

**Others in attendance:**

Robert Olivier, First Nations technical rep

**Staff:**

Bonnie Carey	Rick Battson
Chitra Gowda	Derekica Snake
Chris Tasker	Ralph Coe
Deb Kirk	

1) Chair's Welcome

Bob Bedggood welcomed the committee.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

A motion to approve the agenda was requested.

moved by Charles Sharina- seconded by Dean Edwardson

*“Resolved that the agenda circulated be approved.”*

*CARRIED.*

3) Delegations

None

4) Minutes from the Previous Meeting

moved by Joe Kerr–seconded by Valerie M’Garry

*“Resolved that the minutes be approved as circulated.”*

*CARRIED.*

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

a) Corridors response from the Minister

A letter from Ian Smith of the Ministry of Environment regarding the transportation of materials through vulnerable areas was circulated to the committee. The letter outlines the Ministry’s acknowledgment of the committee’s concern of the corridors not being included in the Act and indicates this issue will be evaluated further. The Ministry anticipates providing written materials on adding threats and identifying new risks in the near future. Corridors will also be considered. Bob highlighted information on the second last paragraph of the letter referring to the municipality’s responsibility of having emergency response plans in place to address spills.

Item 7.a of the agenda was moved up and presented at this point in the meeting.

7 a. MOE program review of ODWSP

Rick Battson gave a presentation to update the committee on the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program (ODWSP). The Ministry of Environment has initiated a review of the ODWSP to determine how its purpose can be fulfilled beyond 2009 and to consider how the program should evolve as the Source Protection Planning process continues. The Source Protection Committee Chairs have been asked to seek input to this program review from local stakeholders. The program review is looking for views on how the scope of and delivery model should change through the third and fourth funding years. The ODWSP is an innovative program to provide assistance to landowners, farmers and others affected by the Clean Water Act.

The committee discussed wanting to be certain affected property owners living within the IPZ’s are aware of the process. More information will be available to the public in May and June when the mapping is complete. The ODWSP allows those affected to apply for

available funding for such actions as well decommissioning, septic system upgrades, removal of leaking fuel storage tanks and fencing livestock from water sources. In the past year, there were limited funds utilized due to non-eligibility with a limited geographic scope of people within 100 meter of a municipal well and 200 meters of an intake. Once the municipalities approve the 2 year and IPZ-2 lines, there will be a much larger eligible area. Bob reported the committee's opportunity to give input. The SPC Chairs will report back to MOE. MOE will also be seeking input from provincial agricultural associations and others. A White Paper detailing the revised ODWSP Framework will be posted on the Environmental Registry for public comment. The final report is due to the minister on March 15, 2009 but may be extended to the end of March.

In the third and fourth year of the stewardship program, the assessment reports will be completed, identifying who may be affected and what activities will be a threat. There would be an opportunity for the program to be more reflective of this information.

Meetings will be scheduled across the region starting in the beginning of March. Invitations will be sent to specific people within organizations including agricultural groups such as Ontario Farmers Association, Christian Farmers, and Farmers Union. Recreational (golf courses), aggregate, and the oil and gas industry will also be invited. A First Nations forum will also be held.

Bob introduced Teresa McClellan, the new MOE Liaison and thanked Rick Vantfoort's for his work to date, with the committee.

b) MOE rules training (presentation and discussion paper  
2009.02.6b)

The Ministry hosted training sessions for the Source Protection Committees and technical staff. The committee session was held January 7, 2009. Some of the material from the session was discussed and reviewed by the committee today. Some of the challenges with the technical work were addressed. Items for discussion included: Issues Evaluation, Threats Inventories versus Listed Activities, Drinking water threats not included in the prescribed list of activities, Corridors, Abandoned pipelines, Inclusion of preferential pathways in IPZ-2 and 3, Delineation of IPZ-3 and the extreme event, Wallaceburg intake type, Vulnerable Areas across boundaries and Great Lakes Targets.

**Issues Evaluation**- the consultants are struggling in this area as the rules have become less prescriptive than past guidance. Solid benchmarks to identify issues were removed. Issues need to be identified through schedules of the Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standards: Schedule 1-pathogens (E. Coli, total coliform), Schedule 2-Chemical parameters (organic, inorganic, metals), Schedule 3-Radiological parameters and of the Technical Support Document for the Drinking Water Standards, Objectives and Guidelines, Table 4-Aesthetic objectives (taste, odor, color, turbidity). Operational guidelines affect the treatment process or esthetic parameters such as water hardness. The schedules have stronger health significance than the Table 4 objectives. An issue is deemed an issue if the parameter is present at a concentration that may result in the deterioration of the quality of water for use as a source of drinking water or there is a trend of increasing concentrations where the continuation of that trend would result in the deterioration of the quality of water for use such as source of drinking water. There is not

a hard or fast level or concentration at which a parameter becomes an issue. A question was asked as to how spills related to issues. Spills are dealt with differently as they are related to an activity which could be seen as a threat.

Schedules have Maximum Acceptable Concentration (MAC) and the municipalities base their monitoring on these parameters. A ½ MAC is a trigger to increase the monitoring of a parameter to every three months. These results are identified in inspections and annual reports. Water systems operators are aware of parameters which have exceeded the ½ MAC due to their requirement to increase monitoring. The MAC can be used as an issues screening tool to check for possible source water issues which need closer assessment of level, trends and impacts on drinking water to determine if they are issues.

Pathogens in surface and groundwater are treated differently. Turbidity spikes in surface water need to be considered as they may indicate increases in pathogens and may also pose additional challenges with the disinfection processes. The range of coliform data could be used as an indicator. Pathogens become an issue if a microbial risk assessment indicates the pathogen is present at a concentration that may result in the deterioration of the quality of water or there is a trend of increasing concentrations of the pathogen at the surface water intake or well and this could result in the deterioration of the water quality.

Through the Source Protection Planning process, we need to consider to the implications of identifying something as an issue. If it is deemed as issue, the activities that contribute to that issue need to be identified and policies developed to reduce the risk. The SPP will include policies to deal with and monitor the issue. Any activity that causes an issue is automatically a significant threat. Policies have to be in place to deal with significant threats. Issues can be naturally occurring; however the Source Protection Plan will not have to do anything about these. The process of identifying issues must consider whether an issue is naturally occurring.

A question was raised about how nitrates will be dealt with. If nitrates are triggering a ½ MAC, municipality will be stepping up the monitoring. The data can be assessed and possible treatment options can be considered (generally blending with sources with lower nitrates). Trends can be looked at to determine if it is likely to exceed the MAC (10-mg/L). The ability of the treatment processes to deal with the parameter needs to be considered. The question needs to be asked as to whether the issue is a natural occurrence and if not it will be necessary to determine the activities that contribute to it. Policies would be put in place for those activities which contribute. In terms of agricultural fields and nitrates, it is not what you have on your fields but rather what shows up in the source drinking water that will be used to identify issues. Some of the situations that may reach ½ MAC and naturally occur are salt, fluoride, and sodium.. A question was raised if heavier pumping rates within municipal wells affect nitrate levels? The effect will depend on the circumstances, for example, in Mount Bridges when water is pumped harder, nitrates levels decrease.

Consultants have been requested to provide their thoughts on identifying issues. Their feedback will be summarized in a discussion paper, and presented to the municipal operators and the consultants for their comments. Once finalized, this methodology will be provided to the consultants as direction and will offer consistency across the region.

A question was raised about how Brownfield fit into the legislation and issue identification. Brownfields, due to their past land use, possibly suggest “conditions” as

defined in the rules. Conditions are automatically assigned a score of ten due to their existence and the impact they could have on wells or intakes. Environmental Site Assessments are required for Brownfields if there is future development planned. Known conditions will need to be looked at, even without new development, if they pose a threat.

A concern was raised as to what the definition of “0” is when identifying issues and whether the process will be science-based, rather than just looking for issues. Rick Vantfoort spoke of the changes that occurred during the EBR consultation. Initially, issues were only deemed issues if they exceeded the standards (MAC). Comments during the EBR posting were submitted by people wanting to include issues not nearing the standard, such as in lower trace values of organic compounds that could cause deterioration in the drinking water. This change allowed for more flexibility with the definitions. The SPC will need to decide how far they want to go when identifying issues. Municipal water systems operators are aware of the potential issues and the hope is to not have the issues exaggerated. MOE enforces the Safe Water Act to ensure the treated water meets regulatory standards. The SPP will be a tool to determine the source of the problem.

Pathogens are excluded from being considered issues in highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas, they can only be considered in WHPA and IPZ and only if a microbial risk assessment suggests they are an issue.

***Threats inventory versus required lists-*** The consultants developed inventories for the Tier 1 Risk Assessment (RA) as part of the initial projects; however, the Province has now provided a table that includes 21 activities/threats. Even if an activity is not occurring now, it still needs to be identified as a potential risk as at some point someone may wish to undertake that activity in that location. The list includes activities, the circumstances around the activities, where it is considered significant, moderate or low. The number of locations that activities that are a significant will also need to be identified. Although a map of the threats is not a requirement of the Assessment Report, the question was raised as to whether one will be available to show the areas with threats. When the AR is posted, we are required to send notice to the people involved in activities which are identified as significant risks. Therefore the locations will need to be known, but will not be part of the Assessment Report. The members were encouraged to review table of activities.

A question was asked as to whether an activity which is risk managed would then be removed from the list of Risks. This would not occur; the activity is still considered a threat which has been managed. A question was asked of who the arbitrator is of identifying a good risk management plan? The Province may need to address this when identifying acceptable risk management measures.

MOE has offered to talk to the consultants to discuss issues and how to deal with conditions so the SPC will be given the product they need to complete the AR. Water system operators need to be involved in defining issues related to their systems.

***Corridors*** themselves are not a threat but an activities which could be considered a threat include a few related to the handling of various materials. With most corridors it will be difficult to determine what the materials are which are transported.

**Abandoned pipelines** do not fall under list of activities but it could be seen as a transport pathway. The challenge would be in obtaining data on the location of abandoned pipelines.

**Transport Pathways- extend IPZ2 & 3.** These pose another issue and are similar to pipelines. It makes sense to extend the IPZ2 's especially with storm sewers. Storm channels and municipal drains will be limited the two hour time of travel. How to deal with tile drained lands is a big question. In terms of the IPZ3, we need to find transport pathway and make the connection. Drainage maps do have all the land parcel information so it is difficult to show the connections. Some farmers self install tiling which would not show up on a map. This is an area where messaging will be a valuable tool to relay everything we do on the land affects our water.

**Wallaceburg Update-** there is four different types of intakes. We are working with the PUC to determine the best way to deal with the Wallaceburg intake as there may be room for interpretation as to which type of intake it is.

**Vulnerable areas across boundaries.** Some vulnerable areas cross municipal, regional and international boundaries. In this case of the regional/municipal cross over, the SPC's can work together. IPZ's that cross international boundaries are more difficult to deal with. Policies for these cannot be developed yet it will be valuable to have these areas drawn on a map.

**Great Lakes targets-** a Lake Erie working group is being formed and discussions have taken place as to who will be involved such as the chairs from those regions, project managers, and CA staff as resources. This is just in the development stages and few details are available at this point. A question was raised as to whether there needs to be a Lake St. Clair working group? This is yet to be determined. There may not be a need for a Lake Huron working group.

## 7) Business

### a) MOE Program review ODWSP

This item was addressed earlier in the meeting, following agenda item 6.a.

### b) Technical Work Review and Acceptance Process (Discussion Paper 2009.02.7b)

Under Regulation 287/07 of the Clean Water Act, consultation on the Assessment Report (AR) is required. A discussion paper on the technical work review and acceptance process was circulated. This includes a table summarizing the various projects and the systems included in those projects. It is unlikely that all work on the AR will be completed by the due date. It is critical that municipal review and acceptance be built into the consultation on the AR. Consultation will allow for materials to be targeted to those who have an interest in the work. This will also allow for engaging stakeholders in the process.

Previous direction from the committee was to review the work subsequent to the peer review process. The first Phase Vulnerability Assessment will involve getting information out to the public to bring awareness of the vulnerable areas, it will be locally based and site specific. When the information is ready, meetings can begin in the specific areas. Municipal information packages will be sent out as part of the local public consultation as part of Phase 1 consultation. The anticipated consultation locally and with municipalities, will take place from May to September 2009. An offer made to councils asking if they want staff to attend their meetings as a delegation. Phase 2 will involve consultation on Issues and Threats between August and November 2009. Phase 3 consultation will involve a review of the Proposed Draft Assessment Report between on a regional basis via public meetings. The Final phase is anticipated to occur from January to May 2010 on a regional basis consulting with the public, municipalities and the First Nations on aspects of the Assessment Report which were not available when the Draft AR was consulted on. A flow chart was developed to show the technical work contributing to the AR. The SGRA and HVA's will not be available until a later stage.

The SPC review and acceptance is at end of process and there will be opportunities to discuss with the consultants. The SPC will see the information in advance of the municipal and public release. A suggestion was made to change the word acceptance in the report to consultation. At this stage, it is a draft document with more opportunities to make changes. The SPC Review and Acceptance wording in the flowchart will also be changed to read Preliminary Endorsement of Draft. The goal is to deal with the concerns with the Vulnerability Assessment early on in the process. Phase 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the consultation process will be identified in the flow chart.

The delivery of the Assessment Report is due within twelve months from the approval date of the Terms of Reference, (assumed to be March 2010). This deadline is most likely not feasible for a complete AR. Discussions have occurred with MOE as to what we can do to meet this requirement. The Tier 3 Water Budget and GUDI wells may be identified as data gaps as that work is unlikely to be completed, peer reviewed and consulted on prior to March 2010. It may be that an updated version of the Assessment Report be submitted later than the one year deadline, (Phase 4 discussed above). The SPC will continue to work on policies, where they can. There was general consensus as to the flow chart and consultation identified (with the above noted suggested changes). If MOE asks for items to be changed, the report would need to be re-submitted. Depending on the change, consultation may be required on these aspects which would be part of phase 4.

#### c) AR Consultation Plan (presentation)

Chris gave a presentation on the Assessment Report Consultation which builds on materials discussed in the previous item. The target audiences are municipalities, landowners, stakeholders, First Nations and the general public. There are three phases of consultation to include Vulnerability Assessment from May to August 2009, Threats/Issues from August to September 2009 and Assessment Report Formal Consultation from October to November 2009. As well as a 4 phase for materials not part of the phase 3 AR draft.

Chris reviewed a table outlining actions specific to municipalities with IPZ and WHPA's, SRA/HVA/IPZ3, and other municipalities and discussed a different level of effort for

these municipalities. Landowners are included if there is an IPZ1 or 2 or a WHPA especially in areas that could have significant risks.

Consultation will include meetings with the municipalities, attending council meetings, working groups will be formed and newsletters will be provided. It was suggested to complete a bulk mailing in the specific postal code areas to inform landowners that are within the IPZ2's and follow up visits may be beneficial. The stakeholder groups, such as agricultural groups will be provided with letters of invitation to Public Open Houses and be provided with updated newsletters.

The committee discussed issues that may arise with property owners, such as in cases where they do not meet their responsibilities. If work is necessary, it needs to be done by a certified professional. Another issue discussed was in the case of a tenant who rents versus the landowner and where the responsibility lands. It was noted this should be covered in the tenant/landowner agreement.

When providing information to the municipalities, it was suggested to take a more proactive approach to ensure they have the knowledge they require. Landowners may require a less obtrusive approach. Absentee landowners need to be considered. The question was raised as to how far do we go to ensure everyone is aware of the 40, 000 properties possibly affected within the region within IPZ2 or two year time of travel. Contacting the clerks and obtaining tax roll contact information was suggested to reach everyone. General public awareness will occur through tabloids, newspapers, media, and press releases. Other avenues of promoting public awareness are in taking advantage of the water initiatives the City of London such as with World Water Day on March 20, 2009. There will be a number of required public meetings in each area.

Meetings recommended in each Phase:

- St. Clair will require two or three meetings in Phase 1 and 2 and one meeting in Phase 3.
- Upper Thames will require up to twelve meetings in Phase 1 and 2 and two meetings in Phase 3.
- Lower Thames will require four meetings in Phase 1 and 2 and one meeting in Phase 3.

The committee was advised if they have any further feedback on the consultation plan to contact the communications staff.

The committee broke for lunch 12:10 p.m

Meeting resumed at 12:50 p.m.

#### d) IPZ3 Delineation

Chris Tasker gave a presentation on Intake Protection Zone 3 Delineation. This also applies to some GUDI wells. The methodologies for delineating the zone for the different types of intakes were discussed. IPZ-3 for Great Lakes and Connecting Channels are

defined through the use of an extreme event. Which can be up to a 100 yr precipitation or wind or freshet.

The committee was asked to consider what they wish the event to be based on; a precipitation event/wind velocity of 100 year frequency or a typical event of 5 year or 10 year? How these areas are plotted and how extreme events are defined was discussed. An extreme event is defined by a period of heavy precipitation or winds up to a 100 year storm, surface water body exceeding its high water mark and a freshet meaning a snow melt event. The intensity and duration of the storm also needs to also be considered. Runoff will also be dependent on the areas over which the precipitation occurs. Using flow frequency was suggested to include, freshet, historical record and regional analysis to transpose the historical records to another area.

Key points of discussion:

- The question was asked whether different modeling events can be used and super imposed as a starting point to delineate the areas. The issue of combined probability was also discussed. It was not desirable to combine different extreme events but the preference was to consider the results of each of these types of events and combine the contributing areas.
- The time of travel is not included, as it is not relevant. Duration of the event is however an important consideration.
- Freshets need to be considered. Snow melt has historically generated higher flow rates and longer hydrographs than summer rainfall events.
- Areas can be re-adjusted if it is shown that an activity could contribute to a deterioration of the water as a drinking water source.
- There were concerns expressed about using a more typical (5-10 year) events and the fact that many design standards already rely on a 100 yr storm (such as SWM ponds).
- Climate change may have an impact on the magnitude and frequency of a 100 year event The Great Lakes may have less ice.
- A concern was raised about how much modeling would need to be done.

Discussion was suspended at 1:40 p.m. when Stantec Consulting arrived to give a presentation. See agenda item 8 d.

Valerie left at 210 p.m.

The committee continued with the discussion concerning the IPZ3 Delineation and the decision about what modeling time frame will be used was agreed upon.

moved by Doug McGee—seconded by Richard Philp

*“Resolved that the committee agreed, that 100 year events be used in the delineation of IPZ-3 and that the input of the consultants be sought as to the various types of events to be analyzed.”*

*CARRIED.*

e) Terms of Reference

Bob reported the MOE has outlined some concerns with the Terms of Reference. Chris has reviewed the concerns and made the necessary changes and it will be re-submitted. West Elgin Item #2 in the table was addressed. West Elgin will develop their policies when more information is available to them.

moved by Pat Donnelly -seconded by Joe Salter

*“Resolved that the committee endorse and approve the revisions to the Terms of Reference and that it be re-submitted to the Ministry with a letter from the chair.”*

*CARRIED.*

8) For Information

a) ODWSP zones (IPZ1, WHPA-B) approvals update

The ODWSP program review was discussed in the presentation 7.a. There have been few approvals for projects, to date due largely to the limited areas for eligibility. With this year's program the areas have been extended to the 2 year travel time for the wells and preliminary IPZ-2 for the intakes. Letters have been distributed to the municipalities to request their acceptance of these lines for the purposes of eligibility for cost assistance funding available through the ODWSP.

b) First Nations update

Derekica Snake gave a presentation on the work she has been doing with the First Nations from December through to February 2009. Various media opportunities have occurred including; A Watershed Moment” in the London Free Press, An Element of Life Calendar has been distributed throughout the region, and there have been public service announcements. Derekica was invited to attend a meeting at Walpole First Nations regarding environmental planning. A “Grant Opportunities” workshop was held on January 16, 2009 in London to provide information to the First Nations on the available stewardship funds as well as Species at Risk funding opportunities. Robert Olivier, Chris Tasker and Derekica will also be meeting to start to discuss opportunities for beginning technical work related to the First Nations systems. Contacts have been made to arrange for participation in various community events such as the Chatham-Kent/Oxford Children’s Water Festival, a City of London initiative regarding the Thames River Revival and meeting with the individual First Nations to introduce them to the work being done.

### c) Communications update

Bonnie Carey from the Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority gave a presentation on Drinking Water Source Protection Communication Support. She reviewed the Terms of Reference consultation that included displays, tabloids, updates, public service announcements, water festivals and funding application support. Open houses and meetings with various municipal councilors, First Nations and the public have assisted them in understanding the Terms of Reference and allowing them to provide comments. Other avenues of communicating this information have been through events such as the Western Fair, Career Fairs, the Outdoor Farm Show and Water Festivals. There has been assistance given to groups and municipalities on how to apply for funding for Early Actions, Education and Outreach and Special Projects.

Richard Philp- left the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

### d) Stantec Presentation

Gary Deonarine (Project Coordinator), John Langan (Project Manager-Environmental) and Kent Buchanan (Environmental Technician) from Stantec Consulting attended the meeting. Gary Deonarine reviewed their overall work program including Work Completed to Date to in Phase 1- Vulnerability Assessment, Phase 2 - Issues, Threats, Risk and the Next Steps. Stantec's goal is to provide the committee with technical reports pertaining to Surface Water Vulnerability Analysis and Issues, Threats and Risk Assessment to the Assessment Report specifications, where possible.

The Stantec consultants attended the Ministry of Environment training and have since reviewed the new requirements and will be submitting an updated work plan to meet the revised requirements.

The consultant reviewed the Vulnerability Assessment portion of their work. This Phase includes characterization of the intake, delineation of vulnerable zones, vulnerability scores, uncertainty levels. The effort required to close critical gaps and mapping and database work based on Director's rules was mentioned. A review of the preliminary maps was given to include Chatham-Kent, Wallaceburg, Wheatley, Stoney Point, and West Elgin WTPs. John also outlined the work remaining on Phase 1 and Phase 2: Issues, Threats and Risk. The consultant reviewed the work undertaken and planned for Phase 2 of their work. This included Issues Identification, threats inventory work and risk assessment.

### 9) In Camera Session

None

10) Other Business

a) David Suzuki Stewardship fund

Joe Kerr circulated a Suzuki report funded by the province that outlines the different land covers in Ontario and places an annual value to society for each land use. The report indicates justification for financial support for cropland that is retired for the good of society. Included also are two examples of this; Beach and Dune Ecosystem Values and Grassland Ecosystem Values. This is something for future consideration when reviewing funding opportunities.

11) Members Reports

None

12) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. The next committee meeting will be held April 3, 2009. There is not a meeting in March.