
Thames – Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee Meeting Minutes

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: January 14, 2011

Meeting Time: 9:00 am to 3:30 pm

Meeting Location: St. Clair Conservation Authority office

Agenda

Item	Time
1. Chair's Welcome/Introduction of new members, contact list	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	9:15
a. Cross jurisdictional issues in planning stages	
b. Tier 2 water budget	
c. LTVSPA amended proposed AR	
7. Business	
a. MOE directions on SCRSPA AR	9:30
b. Source Protection Plan preparation work plan	10:00
c. Test policy development - On Site Sewage Disposal and Storage Systems	
i. Preliminary Draft Threat Policy Discussion Paper	
Lunch	12:00
ii. Policy Discussions	
8. Information	2:15
a. MOE Technical Bulletins (Prescribed instruments, TSSA, prohibition, risk management plans)	
b. Update on SP Planning Advisory Committee, provincial working groups and provincial background documents	
c. GUDI TAC	
d. Updated/Amended AR Work Plan Approval	
9. In Camera Session	
10. Other business	
11. MOE Liaison report	
12. Members reports	
13. Adjournment (next meeting February 11, 2011)	3:30



Meeting Materials

Agenda Item	Description
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November minutes • Distributed with the December package
6a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross jurisdictional issues in planning stages
7a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directions received from Ian Smith, Director, Source Protection Programs Branch, Ministry of Environment, as per letter dated November 5, 2010 with responses
7a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps 7-1a, 7-1b, 7-1c
7b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source Protection Plan Preparation Work Plan • Circulated with December package
7c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Site Sewage Disposal and Storage Systems – Preliminary Draft Threat Policy Discussion Paper • Updated from the one distributed with December package
8a	MOE Technical Bulletins <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescribed instruments • TSSA • Prohibition • Risk Management Plans
8c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GUDI Technical Advisory Committee Terms of Reference



SPC MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 14, 2011
Meeting #33

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on January 14, 2011 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority (SCRCA) Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

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

Sheldon Parsons
Charles Sharina
Darrell Randell
Jim Reffle (MOH Liaison)
Joe Salter
Patrick Sobeski
John Trudgen
John Van Dorp
Joe Van Overberghe
Darlene Whitecalf

Regrets:

Kennon Johnson
Brent Clutterbuck
Don McCabe
Augustus Tobias
Teresa McLellan (Provincial Liaison)
Robert Olivier

Staff:

Steve Clark
Chitra Gowda
Chris Tasker
Deb Kirk
Ingrid Vanderschot
Derekica Snake
Melissa Sherran (Oxford County)
Bonnie Carey

Teresa Hollingsworth
Ralph Coe
Rick Battson
Brian McDougall
Linda Nicks

Dave Richards (MNR)
Jennifer Arthur (MOE)

1) Chair's Welcome

Bob welcomed the committee and introduced two new committee members John Trudgen and Darlene Whitecalf. He announced Richard Philp not extending his term on the committee. An updated contact list was circulated to the committee after there were no objections.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

moved by Jim Maudsley-seconded by Doug McGee

"RESOLVED that the agenda be approved."

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

None.

4) Minutes from Previous meetings

moved by Darrell Randell-seconded by Dean Edwardson

"RESOLVED that the November 12th , 2010 meeting minutes be approved."

CARRIED.

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

a) Cross jurisdictional issues in planning stages

Brian McDougall gave an update on cross jurisdictional issues in the planning stages. He provided a report outlining information on the Lambton Area Water Supply and Wallaceburg Treatment plant intakes that are located in close proximity to sovereign lands. The work is now at the point where the information can be inputted into a map to be move forward especially when completing the IPZ-3 delineation. A historical catalogue of communications to date, specifically with Walpole Island and its relationship with the Wallaceburg water intake will be provided at the next meeting. The plan is to move forward and investigate specific issues such as drainage patterns at St. Anne's Island within the IPZ-2 for Wallaceburg. Additional information is required for the LAWSS intake and the work the U.S has already completed to have a better understanding of the area.

b) Tier 2 water budget

The final Tier 2 Water Budget peer review meeting was held. Most of the concerns have been satisfied and the final review of the documentation is occurring. The data is being collected from consultants to be provided to the Tier 3 Water Budget consultant who is well underway on the Tier 3 project.

c) LTVSPA amended proposed AR

An update on the Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area amended proposed assessment report was provided by Chitra Gowda. The LTVSPA Amended Proposed AR was posted in November 2010 and the comment period ended January 7, 2011. There were no written comments submitted. The persons identified as having significant threats in Highgate and Ridgetown WHPA areas were notified by letter and telephone. General concerns included what the policies for significant threats down the road will mean and the sewage lagoon facility near the Ridgetown intake. The Lower Thames Amended Proposed report will be submitted to Ministry of Environment next week. It was noted that the Highgate well supply system will no longer be considered a GUDI system, therefore not requiring a WHPA-E and F delineation and assessment.

7) Business

a) MOE directions on SCRSPA AR

A table was circulated outlining the twenty two directions based on the letter from Ian Smith dated November 5, 2010. A review of the directions and how they have been addressed was given by Chitra Gowda. The St. Clair Region Amended Proposed Assessment report will be posted early February 2011 and submitted to the Ministry of Environment on or before the February 28, 2011 deadline. The St. Clair Region SPA's Proposed Assessment report was submitted knowing there were data gaps. Additional threats and risk assessment using the livestock density and managed lands mapping was conducted to fill gaps. The work resulted in no significant threats.

It was reported at the project manager's meeting that of the thirty eight AR's submitted, three have been approved, five require revisions and the others are still being reviewed. The project managers were concerned that the pass/fail ratio is poor and wondered if MOE was being too picky in providing their comments. Chris pointed out that although there were many minor comments identified, the major ones were indicated in the submitted ARs as gaps and work had progressed to fill the gaps. MOE assured the project managers that the minor comments would not have resulted in directions to amend the AR without the more significant gaps.

b) Source Protection Plan Preparation work plan

A *preliminary* draft of the Work Plan was distributed to the committee for approval with an understanding it will be a work in progress. The plan will be maintained to document what was done through the process. A review of the Purpose, Background, Stakeholder Engagement, Policy Development Framework, Threats policy discussion papers, Source Protection Plan Preparations Principles, Decision Making Criteria, Schedule and Deliverables was given.

Key points of discussion;

- *Under 2.2 Objectives of Source Protection Plan* a question was asked of what protecting existing and future drinking water sources means. Future drinking water sources have to be planned, reaching a certain stage such as through an environmental assessment. An additional description of what future means will be included to the text.

The question was raised of whether there are any new future drinking water systems planned? There are no new systems planned but two wells are being proposed within existing systems. Within this region Petrolia is looking at pushing their intake out but it cannot be considered as a future water source at this point.

- How the three Source Protection Plans are managed will pose some challenges. The work plan will act as a guide and will be appended to the explanatory document. The process may work better with them running parallel to each other. Threats based discussions will offer consistency between all the areas.
- *2.3 Significant Threats across the Region.* A concern was raised of the chart showing several threats listed for one property. The number of locations for potential significant threats means number of properties. A description will be included in the table to clarify the numbers. For example, three types of activities may occur on one property.
- *3.0 Stakeholder Engagement* is a big part of the work plan and will be included in more detail, similar to that of the AR consultation plan. The communication team will be looking at this and documenting the consultation. The flow chart outlines the various phases of stakeholder engagement from distributing letters to landowners to consultation with the municipalities. Once the work plan is approved this will be the criteria to follow in the notification/engagement process. A recent session with Municipal planners, Chief Building Officials resulted in good attendance and generated some volunteers for the Municipal Advisory Committee. A section on First Nations consultation was also included within the work plan.
- It was noted the implementation phase will happen after the Source Protection Plan is submitted.
- *5.0 Threats Policy Discussion Papers.* On page 14 “*in many cases it may be preferred to solicit input from MSPPAC into the background materials included in the first draft of the discussion paper*” was highlighted and included to ensure the Municipal SP Policy Advisory Committee has input into the process early on.

The last paragraph on page 14 highlights Oxford County as having the lead for their policy development for groundwater systems.

- *8.0 Schedule* is outlined showing tight deadlines with eleven months remaining to complete the work.
- *9.0 Deliverables* outline indicates other deliverables needing to be done, Threats Policy Discussion Papers and the Explanatory document. A Table of Contents (outline) will be developed and included as an appendix to the work plan.
- A consultation and accommodation section for First Nations will be included. Kettle Point intake has been added but the technical work has not been included in the AR as the work has not been completed. A Memorandum of Understanding is being signed for the technical work between the Ministry of

Environment (MOE) and Kettle Stoney Point First Nations and another agreement between MOE and Ausable-Bayfield Conservation. There are no recent updates on the status of these agreements. Proposals for the work are in. Once the work is completed, the AR and the SPP will need to be updated accordingly.

The goal is to continue engaging all First Nations in the region. Work is currently being done on GUDI wells and it is hoped that the First Nations will participate in this study.

The committee broke from 1030-1040

c) Test Policy development-On site Sewage disposal and Storage Systems.

i. Preliminary Draft Threat Policy Discussion Paper

An *On-site Sewage Storage and Treatment Systems* discussion paper was circulated to the committee. The discussion paper is a working draft intended to generate discussion. This discussion paper was based on background papers completed by the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority. Working groups were set up across the region to add input.

Key points during discussion:

- A question was asked of why the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority has taken the lead in developing the discussion papers? It was noted they were ahead in the process so it became a starting point only so as not to re-invent the wheel. The Ministry of Environment bulletins, a few of which were circulated today, is another tool to assist the committee during policy development.
- The definition included is based on the Ministry of Environment's twenty one prescribed drinking water threats, one of these deals with sewage. The threat "the establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage", has eight sub-threats and this paper considers two sub-threats only: on-site septic systems; and septic system holding tanks. The process of reviewing the background papers is on-going at the Ministry and the bulletin about the prescribed instrument on the Certification of Approval is not available yet from MOE which creates a gap. The process will be to identify gaps and experiment with less than ideal information.

- A description was given on the small and large systems and the approval requirements for each. Smaller systems are septic systems with a design flow of less than 10,000 L/day, usually private residential and businesses. Large systems have a design flow of greater than 10,000 L/day (one example may be schools or institutions).
- The question of whether density is being considered was posed. If issues are showing up in the drinking water then it needs to be considered. Generally, density is not a factor as prescribed by MOE in source water protection. How the cumulative affect is captured was discussed, as the issue may not show up for awhile. The question was asked of whether an assessment of soils should also be part of the process? It was noted the threat is highly regulated now and requires approvals. The Planning Act has evolved and new standards are in place. In terms of density, evolving and changing environmental planning standards should be considered in policy development.
- It was discussed that for new development a holding tank is the last option.
- After a discussion around some of the “*definitions*” the committee requested that they be sourced and referenced.
- It was highlighted that chemicals for large systems are deemed significant risk in a WHPA A and B with vulnerability score of 10. Small systems are only considered a threat for pathogens.
- A question was asked of why nutrients/phosphorus is not being considered on smaller systems? This decision was made by the Ministry in developing the tables of threats.
- A comment was made about pets not being considered while cattle are considered. It was noted that this is not relevant to septic threats.
- It was pointed out that small villages with each household having individual septic systems may be important especially in higher vulnerability areas or where there is a high water table. Sweaburg, Strathroy and Mount Brydges are examples of areas where high nitrate levels have resulted in municipal water being brought in. Sweaburg was also identified as an area where due to a higher density of septic systems, the vulnerability score was increased due to the transport pathways. This is different that in other areas where the septic systems are not considered a transport pathway to deeper aquifers.
- Policies may need to consider transport pathways.
- Different policies may be required for older systems versus new ones. It was noted that historical research conducted under the Clean Up Rural Beaches program found older systems had a 30% failure rate.

- Some of the policies the SPC develops may need to re-visited while going through the process, as more is learned.
- Inspections in sensitive areas should be expected to ensure systems are meeting code.
- Tables in the discussion paper identify the potential for a septic system drinking water threat to occur on a system by system basis. Since, policy decisions will not be based system by system, it is not necessary to provide this level of detail in the tables. However, it was noted that the Woodstock rural well is an area with a high number of significant threats and that this information should be included in the discussion paper. The preference is to try to characterize and generalize what makes the risk significant and the also the volume that are out there. Policy development will apply to where significant threats could occur. The existing tables will be removed and a more generic table will be provided to summarize where threats may occur based on WHPA and vulnerability score combination. A separate table will account for the number of significant threats, only, and where they are found throughout our SPA.
- Disposal of hauled sewage is a different sub-threat category.
- Text concerning the number of significant threats in Highgate (25), and Ridgetown (5) was missed and will be included.
- St. Clair does not have any significant threats currently yet policy still needs to be developed and included in the plan as there are small areas where significant threats could occur.
- If a property touches a WHPA only the part within the WHPA would be affected by the policy.
- The SPC can focus on Generic policy.
- Encroachment after a septic system has been installed according separation distance guidelines was noted as an issue, and that if re-inspected today, may not meet guidelines Jennifer Arthur, of the Ministry reported to the committee on this. Inspection guidelines/timelines are in place under the Building Code Act. Re-inspection programs are in place to verify they are still in compliance. The intent of the program will be explained in a future bulletin.
- A question of whether water quality is affected in municipal wells surrounded by septic systems? Systems where this occurs would have nitrate, pathogens of other septic related contaminants identified as issues. In order for activities which are contributing to issues to be identified in the AR as a significant threat, they have to be identified in an “*Issues Contributing Area.*” These areas are currently not defined within the Thames-Sydenham Assessment

Reports and therefore significant threat policies will not apply until these issues contributing areas are defined.

- A review of Advanced Treatment Units or new technologies was given. A paragraph was included as a policy consideration on Oxford County's experience and their concerns with tertiary systems failing, requiring more maintenance with a higher cost. This is based on a statistical study from Board of Health. Melissa Sherran will follow up and obtain further reports to strengthen the reference. There was some discussion that in other locations the advanced systems have been shown to work where raised beds have not worked.
- A disclaimer on the discussion paper templates was suggested explaining that this is the best information that the SPC has to base their policy decisions on. Given the timelines and accessibility of information, it will be impossible to include all the science and research on each one. It will be important to get what information we can, noting where it came from. Input from experts as well as anecdotal information needs to be included so various opinions and view points are acknowledged and considered in policy development. The goal is to move forward with best information available at this time.
- Dating and adding page numbers to the discussion paper was suggested for better referencing.
- Clean Water Act; Part IV tools (risk management plans, prohibition and restricted land use) do not apply to sewage systems. The *Ontario Water Resources Act* or *Building Code Act* provides the authority to address these threats.
- Clean Water Program Grants are offered being in some areas within the region.

In summary, as the committee moves through the policy development there will be homework to be done on each discussion paper. They also will be reviewed by the Municipal Advisory Committee. There are options in how the process is implemented such as having the committee discuss the policy, bring in experts or have the working groups complete the preliminary work.

The committee broke for lunch from 12:10-12:50 p.m.

ii. Policy Discussions

Ingrid Vanderschot, the policy advisor, led a discussion on things to consider during policy development. A reminder was given of the objectives of the SPP to protect existing and future drinking water sources and to manage/reduce

significant threats. The committee was asked to think about each option and how they can be applied to each approach and how they can manage risk.

Each of the policy approaches was reviewed:

Education and Outreach: What can be done with this tool?

- Education and outreach programs such as CURB, Environmental Farm plans do not always reach everyone.
- All problems will not be solved when writing policy rather we will be “doing the best we can with what we have.”
- Building Code Act revisions came into effect January 1, 2011 which include a re-inspection program for septic systems which are significant threats.
- If we know of who has the septic systems near the wells this information could be used to target education and outreach programs, but important consideration would be who provides it and how broad the target audience is?
- Homeowners can now obtain information from the Canada Mortgage Corp. The Local Building Official and Health Units can also provide information. It will be helpful to also tie it into the municipality where the threats are.
- Historically outreach programs on proper septic maintenance have been in place and there are multi faceted ways in which information has been made available to the public. Receiving local information was noted as important such as the announcement of hazard waste disposal days.
- Who gets a notice may depend on who delivers it. People who have significant threats may need to be targeted.
- There is benefit to broader focused education target. A suggestion was made to send an information sheet with tax bills by the municipalities. A comment was made that many people do not read these flyers.
- Pharmaceuticals were discussed but it was noted that they are not a prescribed threat for source water protection.
- How larger systems would be approached was discussed, in particular who would be the target audience. The owner may be reached but it may be more difficult to reach the users of the system. It was also noted that these systems may have multiple users such as trailer parks or commercial plazas.
- Open houses/consultation could be used to optimize benefit of education and outreach.

Incentive Programs: How can this concept be included in the plan?

- If a septic system is not maintained it should be expected to cost the owner eventually.
- Incentives should be used for maintaining systems versus pumping them.
- Who will pay for the programs was discussed. There is a danger in loading costs on municipalities although there would be benefit to the community. If a person is given the suggestion to fix their system and funding is available, this may encourage them to do it. Whether all home owners take this responsibility is debatable.
- An inspection program was discussed using the St. Clair Michigan the drainage inspectors inspect all tile drains. Where do inspections fit into policy program? “Others” category? Incentive programs whereby the individual looks for support and where there is an order it is usually not supported financially. A built in incentive is to not have to pay a fine for non-compliance.
- How long will the incentives be put in place or available? Currently, the Ministry of Environment will be providing funding for significant drinking water threats through the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program – Early Response for the next few years.
- The committee was reminded of not getting bogged down with the details. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing provincial guidelines will be coming out to offer more information on what can or cannot be done under the septic re-inspection program.
- Acknowledging people who have contributed was noted as valuable.

Planning Approaches:

In the planning approach, options of specifying severances sizes, land use restrictions for future development, considering by-laws requiring mandatory hook-ups where sewers are options which can be considered.

- A concerns was expressed about standards being applied through existing approval processes through either the Ontario *Building Code* or *Ontario Water Resources Act*. It was discussed that improving standards and the application of those standards may be responsible for this impression.
- It was discussed that most municipalities are already requiring mandatory hook-ups where sewers are available. In many cases of severances are not being approved (or even if approved building permits are not issued) for years

until the area is serviced. It was also noted that in some areas sewers can be very expensive for only a few additional connections due to need for pumping stations, etc. An example described in St. Mary's where a handful of houses would cost millions of dollars to service with sewers. In some cases it is not as simple as extending a pipe.

- The SPP can include “*strategic action policies*” that are implementers are not bound to but which are recommendations for their consideration. This could be used to give additional importance to servicing the areas where septic systems are significant threats without requiring municipalities to move forward with something that is not economically feasible.
- The committee was asked if they would entertain the option of restricting future septic systems in vulnerable areas where these systems would be significant threats, WHPA A and B with vulnerability score of 10. There was some concern about doing this and it was discussed whether there was a way which would leave the decision to the municipality? It depends on how policies are written. The policies can be written as recommendation to the municipalities to “*have regard*” versus “*must.*” The policy needs to justify and consider the threat and ensure that management options are there which ensures that the significant threats are managed.
- Holding tanks should not be first option due to their ongoing operating costs and the concern that they may overflow or otherwise leak.

Provincial Instrument Approaches:

Under Ontario Water Resources Act Large Septic systems and holding tanks require Certificates of Approval. Although under the Building Code mandatory re-inspections programs are implemented for significant threats there does not appear to be a similar consideration for the large systems. Key points during discussion:

- A question was raised of when re-inspection programs are done if information is provided of where the vulnerable zones are. The information can be found in the AR and would be available to MOE. It was discussed that threats information was a desktop exercise and that the CoA records would be a better indication of where systems are, they would need the AR maps to indicate where the CoA would result in a significant threat. The approval agencies should have records. Targeting an area of significant threats and specifically areas where failing systems are known or suspected would identify priority re-inspection areas.
- The inspection guideline for the building code was noted five years from January 1, 2011 and then re-inspection every five years thereafter. It was

suggested that a similar approach for the OWRA systems would be appropriate. Do not have technical bulletin on this yet.

- The SPC will have no discretion with the mandatory re-inspection program under the Building Code Act. There was considerable discussion about the opportunities for re-inspection process on large systems.
- A suggestion was made that if there were maps created for implementers showing septic tank threats it would be beneficial to include wells.
- Using provincial instruments during planning processes, C of A's may be an option to consider prohibiting large systems in areas where they would be significant threats.
- It was noted that sewer lines are also significant threats in these areas (dependant on the size of the sewer) however it is the municipality who would be responsible for managing this threat rather than the landowner.
- Tools not available to be used for septic systems include Risk Management Plans & Interim RMP's, Prohibition and Restricted Uses however these can be explored through other routes.

In considering the discussion paper review process, the committee was asked questions of how they would like them managed. It was discussed that an additional meeting per discussion paper (three meetings for each threat) should be planned. This could result in working between the scheduled once a month meetings, working groups could assist to bring more focus.

Evaluation Criteria:

- The re-inspection program was noted as not being enough rather a specific plan for mitigation needs to be in place to ensure that faulty systems are repaired. Part of the inspection program will cover this.
- Writing general policies is all that is necessary at this stage and then getting more specific when writing plans.
- A suggestion was made for staff to develop proposals, in a multiple choice manner and recommend to the SPC. It was discussed that the committee needs to explore the options collectively as part of the learning process.
- A web forum to share policy ideas is available; however there is limited information to draw from because people are not comfortable yet inputting information.
- Using scenarios/examples such as gas stations in neighborhoods, case studies presented from each end of the scale was noted as helpful.

- The committee was encouraged to ask questions in between meetings to allow time to find answers or to engage experts who may know. Another option explored may be to forward the discussion papers via email to the members for comment prior to the SPC meeting. A newer version then can be circulated at the meeting with improvements based on the early comments. Early circulation of drafts with feedback coming before the meetings will allow development to progress so that time at the meetings can be more meaningful and discussion not put off until a subsequent meeting.
- Accessing local experts may be a challenge as the province will be assisting nineteen regions in the process at the same time.

8) Information

a. MOE Technical Bulletins (prescribed instruments, TSSA, prohibition, risk management plans).

Technical bulletins were circulated to the committee and more will be coming out. These are resources to the SPC for policy development. Aspects will be incorporated into the discussion papers as the bulletins become available.

b. Update on SP Planning Advisory Committee, provincial working groups and provincial background documents.

As covered in the presentation by Ingrid.

c. GUDI TAC

Dillon Consulting will be doing the work for the WHPA E & F delineations project. A working group has been established as for the IPZ-3 project. Municipal operators are being engaged through participation in this group. Some of the representatives on the working groups have been established. A London representative has not been named yet and Pat Donnelly offered to assist. It was noted that Highgate (no longer considered a GUDI system) and Kilworth-Komoka (now decommissioned) well systems won't be part of the GUDI studies.

d. Updated/Amended AR Work Plan Approval

The Work plan was submitted October 2010 and letters from the Ministry were received in December. They looked at four categories, “*Updated tasks, Amended tasks, Out of scope tasks and No further work to be completed tasks.*” The *Out of scope task* identified was the Tier 2 Risk Assessment. *No further work* is to be done in the Delineation of WHPA F for some of the systems. A phased approach and to Conditions Investigation was proposed. The initial map review with the Ministry enforcement staff will not be able to be done due to time constraints and availability of MOE staff to undertake the work. This will need to be put off until a future AR however if potential conditions are brought to the attention of the committee they can be investigated where the data is available.

9) In camera session

None

10) Other Business

None.

11) MOE Liaison Report

12) Members Reports

A question of whether USB’s will be circulated. It was reported updated USB’s will be distributed soon.

13) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. Next meeting is scheduled for February 11, 2011.