



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 519-245-3710x 46.

Meeting Date: July 9, 2010

Meeting Time: 9:00 am to 4:00 pm

Meeting Location: St. Clair Conservation Authority office

Proposed Agenda

Item	Time
1. Chair's Welcome	9:00
2. Adoption of the Agenda	
3. Delegations	
4. Minutes From the Previous Meeting (deferred to next meeting)	
5. Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
6. Business arising from the minutes	
7. Business	9:15
a. UTRSPA Assessment Report	
i. Maps	
ii. System Summaries	
Lunch	12:00
iii. Section Summaries	
iv. Sections	
v. Appendices	
vi. Status	
b.	
8. Information	3:00
a. SP Plan Regulation	
b. Off shore wind turbine EBR posting	
9. In Camera Session	
10. Other business	
11. MOE Liaison report	
12. Members reports	
13. Adjournment (next meeting August 20, 2010)	3:00



Meeting Materials

Agenda Item	Description
7.ai	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps
7a.ii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System Summaries (bring from previous meeting)
7.a.iii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section Summaries-3.0, 4.0,7.0
7a.iv.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections 3, 4, 7 (4 to come next week)
7.a.v	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendices -4, 7, 11 and 12 (to be forwarded next week)
8.b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off Shore wind turbine EBR posting



SPC MEETING MINUTES
JULY 9, 2010
Meeting #28

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on July 9, 2010 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority (SCRCA) Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

Bob Bedggood
Murray Blackie (SPA Liaison)
Brent Clutterbuck
Pat Donnelly
Dean Edwardson
Pat Feryn
Paul Hymus
Carl Kennes
Joe Kerr
James Maudsley
Don McCabe
Valerie M'Garry
Doug McGee

Marg Misek-Evans
Earl Morwood
Sheldon Parsons
Richard Philp
Darrell Randell
Jim Reffle (Liaison)
Charles Sharina
Pat Sobeski
Augustus Tobias
John Van Dorp
Joe VanOverberghe
Teresa McLennan (Provincial Liaison)
Robert Olivier

Regrets:

Keenon Johnson
Joe Salter

Staff:

Rick Battson
Steve Clark
Ralph Coe
Linda Nicks
Chitra Gowda
Girish Sankar
Chris Tasker

Deb Kirk
Ingrid Vanderschott
Teresa Hollingsworth
Bonnie Carey
Ian Wilcox
Mark Helsten



1) Chair's Welcome

2) Adoption of the Agenda.

It was requested that an additional item on the Consultation Plan be added.

moved by Pat Donnelly-seconded by Dean Edwardson

"Resolved that the agenda be approved with the additional item."

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

None

4) Minutes from Previous Meeting

The June 25, 2010 meeting minutes have not been prepared and will be considered at the next meeting along with the minutes from today.

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

None

7) Business

Consultation Plan

The UTRSPA AR is to be posted on July 16, 2010 and the 35 day comment period will end August 20th. Tentative consultation meeting dates are scheduled for August 9th in Stratford, August 12th in Woodstock and August 16th in Dorchester. This will offer three open houses

across the SPA. There may be revisions based on comments on the draft proposed AR. Once the revisions are made the Proposed AR will be posted for a second comment period. Thereafter the proposed AR and comments received will be forwarded to the Ministry.

A letter will be mailed out next week to the landowners who are believed to have significant threats occurring on their properties. The package will include the letter and an information flyer describing the Clean Water Act, SPP, Use of Existing Programs and Risk Management Plans. It was noted there were fifty letters sent for the Lower Thames Valley SPA and none for the St. Clair Region SPA. In the UT River SPA it was noted that in one municipality, there are two hundred letters going out. A forum was held for the municipalities to ensure they are aware of the letter being distributed and staff and councilors can respond to the questions people may have. The UTRSPA Source Protection Committee municipal representatives were encouraged to also get the word out. The uncertainty of the letter is whether to include the specifics on the threat. A list of threats which are occurring in that system will offer general information and if they want more detailed specifics, they can contact staff. In the case of Oxford, they will be asked to contact the county directly. This allows for one letter for each of the twenty two systems versus customizing each individual letter to the landowner. The Regulation regarding consultation has recently changed and the details may be necessary whereas they were not with the LTV AR. The question of whether a general letter may create fear was raised. It is thought discussing the specifics with staff, may help to dissipate this. It was noted, of the fifty letters sent out in the Lower Thames Region, there were five calls from landowners.

The committee looked at the proposed text for the information sheet to go out with the letter. A concern about how pesticide use was described was discussed. It was suggested that the wording in the flyer in the Use of Existing Programs section “*Pesticide use bylaws*” should be changed to *Pesticide Licensing etc.*”

The notice will go in the paper, using the same template from the other regions. The letter will be sent to clerks, First Nation’s Chiefs, Great Lakes contacts and neighboring SPC Chairs and Conservation Authority’s.

a) UTRSPA Assessment Report

i. Maps- Suggested edits/Revisions:

Managed Lands and Livestock Density Maps

The methodology is the same as in the other Assessment Reports but the organization of the maps has changed. Managed land is defined as land having nutrients applied to it; including crop lands, soccer fields, lawns, etc.

- *7-2-1 Birr*. Density needs to be figured out. It is a very complicated calculation process which results in simple product. A comment was made about nitrates vs. livestock density such as in the case of a herd of forty deer

on bush land. If it was possible to deal with non-domestic animals, the responsibility would likely still fall to the landowner. If an inventory of deer, ducks, etc is completed and was included in the livestock density it could actually raise the threat level for the livestock farmers in the area. An information sheet, based in science, was discussed to educate the public to the fact that livestock is not the only source of nutrients and pathogens. Teresa M. highlighted the Trent Region adding a managed wildlife area as a threat. The area promoted the feeding of geese and ducks which can be managed to not promote feeding and congregation of the wildlife. If there is an area where wildlife is a contributing factor/threat, the area could be identified and policies developed to affect the landowner's management of the land so as not to promote the feeding or congregation of the wildlife. It was suggested to not include SPA boundaries in legend if it does not apply to map and be consistent with all maps (Birr and Dorchester). Municipal boundaries removed from legend as well.

- 7-2-2 *Dorchester*. No change.
- 7-2-3 *Kilworth-Komoka*. Remove municipal boundaries in legend.
- 7-2-4 *London-Fanshawe*. No edits.
- 7-2-5 *Hyde Park*. It was noted residential areas are not considered managed lands but the lawns are (under 40% of area). Sifton Bog is in this map.
- 7-2-6 *Melrose*. Remove municipal boundary.
- 7-2-7 *Thorndale*. No edits.
- 7-2-18 *Mitchell*. Blue dot represents livestock density. These are based on the actual polygon. Ridgetown had the example of a barn with horses that upped WHPA-A. Nutrient per acre units were used rather than converting the scale into odd numbers. These were the units required in the rules. Municipal boundary removed.
- 7-2-19 *Sebringville*. No edits
- 7-2-20 *Shakespeare*. No edits.
- 7-2-22 *St. Paul's*. Municipal boundaries removed.
- 7-2-23 *Stratford*. No edits.

Impervious Surface Area Maps

- 7-1-1 *Birr*. Municipal boundaries removed. A question arose on what the orange rectangles represent. Chris T. explained the process of going though the entire region and applying a grid so there are not overlapping grids. This helps avoid issues with the SGRAs/HVAs that come close to WHPA or intake protection zones and the boundaries between the SPAs; the result was one grid

system across the entire region. The percent impervious within the grid is indicated by the colour of the grid. This is only assessed in vulnerable areas where it could be a threat. Areas not shaded were not assessed.

- 7-1-2 *Dorchester*. No edits.
- 7-1-3 *Kilworth/Komoka*. Scale needs to be changed.
- 7-1-4 *London-Fanshawe*. Scale need to be changed.

A motion to approve the maps subject to legend and scale changes was brought forward. If there are any further changes, the members can contact Chitra or Chris by Monday.

moved by Darrell Randall-seconded by Doug McGee

“Resolved that the maps be approved subject to changes to the legends and scales”

CARRIED.

Maps continued:

- 4-2-1 *SGRA*. No edits
- 4-2-2 *SGRA Vulnerability*. Municipal names are associated with areas not dots. Scoring is high, medium and low. The highest Vulnerability score is 6.
- 4-3-1 *Aquifer Vulnerability*. No edits.
- 4-3-2 *Highly Vulnerable Aquifers*. HVAs are areas marked with red color, scored high, at 6. These areas are based on ISI scoring. Only highs get a score.

Managed Lands and Livestock Density Maps

- 7-2-8 *Beachville*. Well is drilled through aquifers with flows from different directions. Ingersoll has similar well.
- Maps 7-2-9 *Embros*, 7-2-10 *Hickson*, 7-2-12 *Innerkip*, 7-2-13 *Lakeside*, 7-2-14 *Mount Elgin*, 7-2-15 *Tavistock*, 7-2-16 *Thamesford*, 7-2-17 *Woodstock*. No edits.

Areas Where Activities Related to Pathogens, Chemicals or Dense Nonaqueous Phase Liquids are. (DNAPL) Maps

- 7-3-1 *Birr*. These series of maps were discussed at the previous meeting. It was suggested that we should be using non-applicable in certain parts of the tables. This was discussed with staff and determined it would add confusion.

- 7-3-3 *Kilworth/Komoka*, 7-3-4 *London-Fanshawe*, 7-3-6 *Melrose*, 7-3-8 *Beachville*, 7-3-10 *Hickson*. No edits.
- 7-3-11 *Ingersoll*. Scale is on map because top left hand corner maps are on a different scale. It was noted DNAPLs are significant out to WHPA-C then they resort back to chemical scoring. Determining the level of risk of DNAPLs in WHPA-A, B, and C is not based on vulnerability scoring within them. Figures indicating where they are high, medium and low are included in system summaries.
- 7-3-12 *Innerkip*, 7-3-14 *Mount Elgin*, 7-3-16 *Thamesford*. No edits.
- 7-3-17 *Woodstock*. Remove Ingersoll label on lower left map.

The committee took a break from 10:40 a.m. to 10:55 a.m.

Wellhead Protection Area Maps

- 4-1 *Vulnerability Overview Map*. Overview of all areas and will include St. Mary's, when it is approved. Beachville and Ingersoll have two travel paths. A question arose on whether you can identify which well contaminants are coming from. If a problem is identified studies would be completed but otherwise this cannot be determined. Ingersoll label is two times, one represents municipality and one the system.
- 4-1-8 *Beachville*. Woodstock on top left map is WHPA and asterisk refers to map 4-1-17 for complete coverage of WHPA as indicated in the sidebar notes.
- 4-1-11 *Ingersoll*. Municipal well location is indicated with a green circle to show where the wells are located within these areas, staying consistent with mapping symbology. The color may be confusing. It was noted the Trillium well is a planned well.
- 4-1-14 *Mount Elgin*. Scale is off slightly from others and needs adjustment.
- 4-1-17 *Woodstock*. Remove Thamesford labels. Remove green circle from Trillium well and it was suggested to use a different color for planned wells to clearly identify them.

Water Budget Maps

- 3-1 *Tier 1 Water Budget Subwatersheds*, 3-2 *Average Precipitation*, 3-3 *Average Evapotranspiration Distribution*. No edits.
- 3-2 *Average Precipitation*. No edits.
- 3-3 *Mean Annual Recharge* /3-4 *Mean Annual Recharge*. Recharge is based on land use and soil type. On all but first maps, East "Zorra-Tavistock" is missing the word "East".

- *3-4 Mean Annual Recharge.* Map comes from Tier 2 work. Chris pointed out AR shows the best and most recent information from the Water Budget and not all the stages are shown to document how we got there. A question was asked whether roads need to be shown. Web mapping product would allow people to turn roads off, but printed maps do not allow for this, pdfs may actually allow this. Label Thames River downstream of London needs to be moved.
- *3-5 Surface Water Potential for Stress.* Best information available was used for Tier 1 water budget. Legend at bottom shows version number. Sub-watershed boundaries changed between Tier 1 and 2. In Tier 2 sub watersheds boundaries were broken up to better organize the supply and demands together. The three areas affected were: in the Avon River, the upper part was separated from Black Creek, North Thames/Medway where St. Mary's had wells in multiple watersheds were put together and smaller sub-watersheds were taken out and Reynold's Creek was broken out of Thames River near Ingersoll. Legend needs to indicate reference.

The naming convention is different to stay consistent with the consultant's report. Tier 2 water budget used a numbering system that has of 301s, 411s coming from coding in surface water models. Tier 1 water budget report used a different naming convention. The stress result was determined through a process and is explained in the text. To summarize, it is calculated using percent demand, based on demand over supply minus recharge. The rules identify what the thresholds are to call the potential for stress low, moderate or significant. It is based on total demand on an area, all water users are considered, not just municipal. At this stage, we are identifying higher risk areas and moderate or significant areas move to Tier 3. This means more work is needed in those areas. Significant threat level most likely will be managed with the Permit to Take Water program. It was noted that neighboring SPAs will have the similar mapping (but may not have proceeded beyond Tier 1). Tier 2 is done on a sub-watershed basis. Tier 3 looks at the area that contributes water to the municipal system and is more detailed. The text outlines which Tier is used to calculate the potential for stress for each subwatershed as well as which scenario within the tier triggered the additional work..

- *3-6 Groundwater Potential for Stress.* No edits.

Maps 7-1-8 to 7-1-17, *Impervious Maps: Beachville, Embro, Hickson, Ingersoll Innerkip, Lakeside, Mount Elgin, Tavistock, Thamesford, and Woodstock* were approved by the committee with legend and scale changes as per the previous motion.

ii. System Summaries

The committee reviewed System Summaries for: Birr, Kilworth/Komoka, Melrose, Dorchester, London, Thorndale, Mitchell, Shakespeare, St. Pauls, Sebringville, St. Mary's, and Stratford as well as Beachville, Hickson, Innerkip, Mount Elgin, Thamesford, Embro, Ingersoll, Lakeside, Tavistock, Woodstock.

It was identified that the System Summaries format is the same format as in Lower Thames and St. Clair Reports. It was identified that the reason all of the City of London pumping rates are the same is because they are back up wells that do not pump very often (not since 1982). The modeling is based on how the wells might be pumped if they were used.

Revisions/Edits:

- Beachville. Maps on the last page are of Embro.
- Mount Elgin, St. Mary's and Woodstock. Missing figures will be added.
- Thamesford. Page 3 in Table on fifth line down to read "*higher*" nitrate water vs. high. This will also need to be changed in the issues summary and section.

iii. Section Summaries

3.0 Water Budget and Water Quantity Stress Assessment

- East is missing from East Tavistock-Zorra in Figure 1. Tier 3 Water Budget at end indicates stress assessment to be completed and timelines, needs to be revised to be consistent with the revisions made to report and identifying water quantity threats.

4.0 Vulnerability Assessment

- Needs to be updated to include updated St. Mary's mapping.

7.0 Threats and Risk Assessment-Water Quality

- Thorndale needs to be removed from Oxford County. Threats tables are a condensed list. Woodstock threat numbers are high because of the high number of septic systems in the area.

iv. Sections

Section 7 Threats and Risk Assessment-Water Quality

- Footer to be changed to refer to Section 7.
- It was pointed out that Tables 7-5, 7-6 and 7-7 give a count of significant drinking water threats in each location. Numbers cannot be just added; a property could expand over two zones for example. St. Clair did not have significant threats so this type of table was not necessary. The Lower Thames had fifty occurrences but the level of detail was not available at that time. The table of threats will be appended to the landowner letters.

The committee discussed the “*Number of Locations of Significant Threats Table*” length and the repercussions of reporting locations and number of threats where there is only one in a given area. Doing this would identify individual landowners and a concern was raised that we should not be publishing the information in such a way to identify significant threats. Due to the limited number of activities in some areas this is unavoidable. Relationships with people and the confidence they feel with the process was noted as important. Working with people in a partnership is preferred versus using prosecution. A comment was made of public interest trumping privacy and municipalities have struggled with privacy issues and what can be made public. The question was asked, if the systems are not identified how can someone self identify? The Ministry’s well records are provided without using names. If someone wants to locate the information it is within the technical studies. Suggestions were made to not report the WHPA zones, or group the threats together to offer a higher level of confidentiality.

A motion was brought forward to revise the “*Number of Locations of Significant Threats Table*” by removing the third columns, having a summary at the bottom of the total numbers. The two lines in the summary will include significant threats and number of occurrences.

moved by Dean Edwardson-seconded by Richard Philp

“Resolved that the table be revised to address privacy concerns, by not identifying the lines on the table, removing individual numbers, to include only the grand total which offers more confidentiality.”

CARRIED.

Further discussion indicated the zones that significant threats in vulnerable areas (WHPA-A,B,C, D), total number of activities, locations and summary of significant number of occurrences will be retained.

St. Mary’s threats maps will be revised to reflect the most recent updated WHPA maps.

Section 4 Vulnerability Assessment

- It was pointed out that the section detail on uncertainty analysis has been removed and put into Appendix 13.
- Table 4-1 updated information will be forwarded on the work in progress in Oxford County or can be amended to add this before the Proposed AR. Lines will be added to table to make it easier to read.
- Table 4-2 GUDI wells table should include a line above it of “the result of the study will be used to amend to the next AR.”
- Table 4-4, lines should be added.

Section 3 Water Budget and Water Quantity Stress Assessment

- Section is based on best information we have and the biggest changes since the last time the committee reviewed it are in the tables.
- Table 3-6 Source of data is shown for Tier 1 and 2, average conditions for Tier 2.
- A question was raised of whether slopes are considered in calculating recharge. In Tier 2 it is not directly considered in the model, rather a combination of land use and soil type is used through the GAWSER model. Through calibration of the GAWSER surface water model, the modeled runoff is compared to measured. In calibrating the model for the water budget extra effort in calibration focused on base flow which is an indication of recharge. This gives improved reliability over relationships like were used in the Tier 1 recharge determination.
- Naming of the river should be consistent between the maps and text.(South Thames River, to be renamed to Thames River to be consistent with studies). It was pointed out that many of the rivers have multiple names to which they are referred, but consistency within the reports reduces confusion to those less familiar with the area.

v. Appendices

Section 1.0 Uncertainty

- This section was moved to an appendix as was done in the SCR Assessment Report. More discussion is included in this AR due to more studies being involved. Text quote from the technical reports and were used. Perth quotation will be identified as such or reworded for clarity. It was pointed out that the more complex the models gets, the more variables and layers there are, and therefore the more places where uncertainty can be established. More

important is how you deal with and consider these uncertainties in using the results.

- Page 3 Second paragraph from bottom. It was noted that the word precursory (look at it beforehand) should be changed to read cursory (look at it superficially). Although this was a direct quotation, it will be changed.

The other appendices which were not included in the packages for review have already been reviewed and accepted in the Lower Thames and St. Clair Assessment Reports.

vi. Status – St. Mary’s Presentation

Chris Tasker gave used the consultants presentation to highlight the additional work completed since the last meeting. Teleconferences and meetings have occurred with the peer reviewers. Conceptual and numeric models were reviewed, establishing scenarios that were to be run to determine the uncertainty in the delineated zones. The consultants modeled the scenarios and another teleconference occurred to discuss this uncertainty and the end result is that the committee should have considerably more confidence in having a good product.

From the models, the well locations were adjusted. The peer reviewers had questions of how the drainage worked around the quarry. Additional work was done to identify which aquifers, or layers, the wells were screened in. K represents how easily water flows through the medium. A number of sensitivity analyses were done. In areas where there were questions about whether they should be included in the WHPA particles were released and the model ran in forward mode to determine if any of them reached the well (forward tracking). The scenarios looked at both vertical and horizontal conductivity using varying ratios. The consultants then considered various calibration indicators to determine how good the model fits on a regional sense to the calibration targets. The consultant then combined capture zones from all the scenarios which resulted in a reasonable calibration to come up with the proposed capture zones. Discussions occurred as to whether it is best to us the most likely scenario or one that includes the range of reasonable alternatives. The agreement of the peer reviewers, consultants, municipal reps and staff was to lean on the side of conservatism but reasonable conservatism. Less reasonable scenarios had been excluded from the proposed WHPA.

The St. Mary’s maps were reviewed outlining the confirmed areas. Consultants are re-visiting the threats counts based on the new information and will be forwarding revised counts for including in the AR.

More work has been done in this area than any other. This was warranted due to the uncertainty in the old model and now the committee should have confidence in the end product. Maps were accepted by the committee.

Tier 2 Water Budget

Tier 2 Water budget work is another area with data gaps. A teleconference occurred and the peer reviewers identified concerns in the documentation of the consultant's work. The consultant is working to address all of those concerns.. The peer reviewers had concerns with how the re-delineation of subwatersheds assessed for stress and additional analysis that was required to confirm that some of the areas had a low potential for stress. Large sub-watersheds such as the one which contains the Ingersoll wells also included Reynolds Creek, which has Mount Elgin wells. If this subwatershed was assessed as a single unit in Tier 2, it would have drawn the Mount Elgin system into a Tier 3. Another example was in North Thames/Medway watershed and Thorndale and Birr systems would have been drawn into Tier 3 because of the high demand in the St. Mary's area which had been lumped together for Tier 1. Proposed re-assessment at Tier 1 was discussed with MNR and presented to the peer reviewers. The peer reviewers and MNR were not satisfied with it and suggested that it would require an update to the Tier 1 report which would require peer review and MNR acceptance. As a result additional Tier 2 scenarios need to be assessed to consider drought scenarios to confirm the current understanding that these areas have a low potential for stress. The model needs to be rerun in unconfined, transient mode to assess these small systems for drought scenarios.

Also, the Middle Thames was not included in the scope of the Tier 2 work as it started before the Tier 1 was completed. As a result there was not a level of comfort with models in this area to satisfy Tier 2 work. Surface and groundwater model calibration in these subwatersheds, need to be verified. The AR will acknowledge this work needing to be done. Everyone including the peer reviewers agreed to move forward with the uncertainty knowing it may affect work that is done in Tier 3.

The SGRA maps may need adjustments as a result of peer review comment. This is mostly expected in river valleys, and will reduce the areas determined to be SGRA.

8) Information

a) SP Plan Regulation

Teresa M. gave a brief overview of the SP Regulation. If you have comments please direct to Teresa M and Chris and copy Ingrid Vanderschot. The regulation will be discussed more at

length at the next SPC meeting. This is the final version and after being posted on EBR in the past. The regulation can be found in the source law on the province's eLaws site. It cross references Clean Water Act making it difficult to read without the other documents available to refer to.

Stakeholder groups concerns were highlighted:

- Agricultural groups have concerns of moderate and low threats will be unfairly targeted in terms of policies. Provisions were added to the regulation, now only applying to significant drinking water threats. A suggestion was made by them that prohibition of significant threats should be scoped to only when there is a unanimous agreement from the committee. This did not change. It reads to be in the opinion of local committees.
- Concerns with future transport pathway notification were identified. Notification is only required when an application is received where it would increase the vulnerability.
- Explanatory document with each policy would include impact and cost analysis.
- Concerns were brought up that the "Prescribed Instruments list" is too short. These did not result in any increase to list.
- Stakeholders wanted to be advised of the planning stage starting.
- They also asked to have cost assessment included.
- Regulation was amended to include policies specifying actions for planning around spills in protecting drinking water systems.
- Definition of a Transport Pathway was given as a condition of land resulting from human activity that increases the vulnerability of a raw water supply of a drinking water system. These transport pathways do not have to be identified in the AR, on a general basis, to have policy written on them.
- A question was asked of what containments are when considering the delineation to IPZ3. More info on this next meeting.

Teresa M. is hosting a session with project managers, staff and SP Chairs to provide detailed training.

b) Off Shore Wind turbine EBR Posting

A discussion paper is posted on the EBR, June 25 relating to wind turbines and references the CWA and SP. The posting suggests when wind turbines are constructed there is a five kilometers shoreline exclusion zone which would establish a distance from the intake zones which are usually within 5 km of shore. Site specific and environmental studies need to occur. Transmission cables would have to be run at least one kilometer away from IPZ. Teresa also noted that based on ERCA's assessment of the prescribed threats related to wind turbines, the volumes of fuel and lubricants used within the turbines were reported to be 130 litres combined, and could be considered a low to moderate threat.



9) In Camera Session

None

10) Other Business

None

11) MOE Liaison Report

Teresa, referred to the discussion on the new regulation and indicated that she had no additional information to report.

12) Members Reports

Marg Misk-Evans introduced Mark Smith, a Fanshawe College summer co-op student working as a planner, compiling low and moderate threats for Oxford County.

Don McCabe- noted he gave a presentation at an international conference in Brazil on no till farming and the improvements that can be made to air and water quality. There are now SP committees in Brazil.

Teresa McLellan introduced two summer students from University of Toronto and Fanshawe College, working in the Safe Water Branch.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m. Next meeting is scheduled for August 20, 2010.