



SPC MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 12, 2012
Meeting #52

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. on October 12, 2012 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority (SCRCA) Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

Bob Bedggood	Darrell Randall
Murray Blackie (SPA Liaison)	Jim Reffle (HU Liaison)
Brent Clutterbuck	Joe Salter
Pat Donnelly	Charles Sharina
Dean Edwardson	Pat Sobeski
Patrick Feryn	Augustus Tobias
Paul Hymus	John Trudgen
Carl Kennes	John Van Dorp
George Marr	Darlene Whitecalf
Don McCabe	
Valerie M'Garry	
Hugh Moran	
Teresa McLellan (Provincial Liaison)	
Sheldon Parsons	

Regrets:

Kennon Johnson
James Maudsley
Joe Kerr
Doug McGee
Earl Morwood

Staff:

Chris Tasker
Deb Kirk
Steve Clark
Bonnie Carey
Ingrid Vanderschot
Girish Sankar
Linda Nicks
Rick Battson
Brian McDougall



1) Chair's Welcome

At 9:10 a.m Bob Bedggood noted that quorum was not achieved. The members present decided to begin with information items and began with Agenda item 6.a.

6) Business arising from the minutes

a) First Nations Update

Steve Clark reported the First Nations Liaison Committee monthly meetings continue to occur. All of the discussion papers have been reviewed with the exception of the paper on DNAPLs which will be covered at the next meeting on October 31, 2012. The next stage is to review draft policies.

Having all of the First Nations involved in SWP discussions was noted as important. Darlene Whitecalf reported there is continual participation from four of the region's First Nations and attendance from others is sporadic. She indicated Walpole Island First Nations does not attend. Attempts have been made to encourage participation and the various avenues already in place to do this, one being the Clear Water Revival who meets again on November 5, 2012 and through the First Nations Engagement Committee. Kettle & Stony Point First Nations has recently changed Chiefs and the administrator and there may be more involvement once they are settled into their positions. Moravian Town is extremely involved and Augustus Tobias attends the meetings when available.

7) Business

a) Draft Source Protection Plan comments

The comment period for the draft Source Protection Plan ended on September 26, 2012. Comments were submitted from 5 provincial ministries, 2 non-government organizations, 3 municipalities, one business and 2 from the general public.

Comments generated from open houses across the region related to how policies affect people specifically. In Sarnia concerns about the recent spills and from Ingersoll concerns about the new land fill and impacts to groundwater were expressed. All comments and proposed responses were circulated to the members with the meeting package. The discussion paper "*Draft Proposed SPP comments for review*" was circulated to outline comments that required the committee's input.



A presentation titled “*Draft Proposed Source Protection Plan Public Consultation Review*” was also given to highlight comments requiring discussion.

Key Points:

- Updates to Official Plans (OPs) shall be initiated as soon as possible after the effective date of the SPP ***with a goal to be completed within 3 years*** of the effective date of the SPP. The Ministry of Environment (MOE) has asked for flexibility in the wording to allow for open ended timelines for implementation to allow for discretion of the Director. The committee felt it important to retain the current 3 year time line with the understanding that the SPP is approved by the MOE and the Director could make amendments.
- Updates to zoning by-laws shall have the goal to be completed within (2) years of the passing of the Official Plan Amendments if required.
- Policies written pursuant to Section 43(2) of the CWA (prescribed instrument) regarding the amendment to the prescribed instruments shall conform to the SPP ***within 3 years*** of the effective date of the plan.

At 9:30 a.m quorum was achieved and the chair requested the committee consider the agenda.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was accepted with the additional item under Business from the previous minutes, “Draft letter concerning spills in the St. Clair River corridor that posed a significant threat to drinking water sources”.

Moved by Paul Hymus -seconded by Carl Kennes

“RESOLVED that the October 12, 2012 agenda be approved with the additional item under business arising from previous minutes: Spills letter.”

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

There were no delegations.



4) Minutes from Previous Meeting -August 10, 2012

Moved by Charles Sharina -seconded by John Trudgen

“RESOLVED that the August 10, 2012 SPC meeting minutes be approved.”

CARRIED.

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

The committee continued with the Source Protection Plan comments.

In responding to a request by MOE to allow them open-ended timelines for implementation, the SPC agreed to stay consistent with timelines for all implementers and not allow open ended flexibility for prescribed instruments. The wording outlined in Policy 1.10 (Implementation Timing) #4 will be retained.

Moved by Valerie M’Garry -seconded by Sheldon Parsons

*“RESOLVED that policies written pursuant to Section 43(2) of the CWA (prescribed instrument) regarding the amendment to the prescribed instrument shall conform to the SPP within **3 years** of the effective date of the Plan”.*

CARRIED.

- The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing suggested OP and Zoning updates follow the Planning Act requirements of 5 years for the OP and 3 years from the OP date for resulting zoning by-law changes. Policy 1.01 allows for 3 years for an OP update and 2 years for zoning updates as a goal. It was intended that updates to zoning by-laws *shall have the goal to be completed within (2) years* of the passing of the required Official Plan amendments. Planning Authority decisions need to be consistent with the Source Protection Plan regardless of whether the OP’s are updated. It is therefore important that the OP

be consistent with the Source Protection Plan so that developers and Planning Authorities are aware of the requirements. An important distinction was made between amendments for the SPP and amendments that are done through the 5 year comprehensive OP update Source Protection Plan related to the opportunities for appeals. It will be beneficial to get the SP policies reflected in the OP/bylaws as soon as possible. There are also advantages of the municipalities in the region working together using the same timeframes, resulting in better products. Potential liability to the municipalities for non-compliance was noted. The committee agreed to retain the timelines outlined and wording to be changed to:

3.ii updates to zoning bylaws shall have a goal to be completed within 2 years of the passing of the SPP or the Official Plan Amendments if required.

Oxford County's policies will be more specific to what the county will do and what the local municipality will do, distinguishing between Upper and Lower tier. Section 59 Restricted Land Use will take effect when the SPP is in effect and it is to the municipality's advantage in terms of any development proposals being submitted to have SPP policies reflected in the OPs to avoid confusion and potential liability. The decision to retain the same timelines and the reasons for the committee's decision will be included in the rationale.

- The Thames, Sydenham and Region's SPP is more complex and will take longer to review/approve than some of the simpler plans. Teresa McLellan outlined the Ministry's SPP review process of a government review team with representatives from different ministries meet weekly to discuss the plans and work through the policy impasse forms if there are disagreements; and then work with the committees. The more simplistic plans are being reviewed first as a pilot.
- Teresa read MOE's suggested wording for SP implementation.

In order to allow the Ministry of the Environment sufficient time to establish an effective implementation framework the Ministry requests that timelines for implementation of all prescribed instrument policies use the language provided below:

“The Ministry of the Environment shall comply with the policy within 3 years from the date the plan takes effect, or such other date as the Director determines based on a prioritized review of Environmental Compliance Approvals that govern significant drinking water threat activities”.

- The MOE has requested for *Specified Action policies* (2.02, 2.18 and 2.43) to adjust the wording from “*shall consider*” to “*should consider*”. The committee discussed whether deficient systems “should be” required to make improvements which would be consistent with the non-mandatory wording of the rest of the policy. It was decided that as deficient systems are in contravention of the Water Resources Act that it was appropriate to retain the “are required” wording in this case. Wording for Policy 2.18 Septic System-Compliance Monitoring was reviewed and revised as follows:

“To reduce the risk to municipal drinking water sources from septic systems or septic holding tanks that are subject to an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA), in accordance with the Ontario Water Resources Act and which are a significant drinking water threat, the Province (Ministry of Environment) **should** (remove *consider*) **develop**(*ing*) a compliance monitoring program. The compliance monitoring should include inspection of the system to ensure that it continues to function as designed, meets applicable design standards, and is being properly maintained. Priorities for the compliance monitoring program should include areas where known septic failures have been identified and areas where older systems have not recently been inspected. Systems found to be deficient (remove *should be*) **are** required to undertake improvements to be in compliance. The sentence “(These systems shall be the subject of inspection once every five (5) years from the issuance of, or revision to, the Environmental Compliance Approval)” will be removed.

- Policy 2.07: Existing Discharge of Untreated Stormwater from a Stormwater Retention Pond – Management was explained. This policy is a significant threat policy using the PI to manage existing discharge of untreated stormwater from a stormwater retention pond. A comment from MOE related to the part of the policy that had a specify action legal effect. In the last sentence the word *Application* of road salt was taken out of a circumstance as it is not a significant threat.

“To reduce the risk to municipal drinking water sources from existing stormwater management ponds in vulnerable areas where the discharge of untreated stormwater from a stormwater retention pond is a significant threat, the Province (Ministry of Environment) **shall review** and amend if necessary Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECA). The amendments shall incorporate conditions that, when implemented, would manage this activity such that it is no longer a significant threat to drinking water. This review should also consider the impact of snow

melt water and road salt on drinking water where the (*application*), handling and storage of road salt is a significant drinking water threat. This review ***should*** consider the impact of snow melt water and road salt water where the (*application*), handling and storage of road salt is a significant drinking water threat”.

- The Lake Erie Region is suggesting using the following wording for all significant threat policies, after receiving legal advice. This is based on wording contained in the CWA so that policies remain consistent with the wording of the CWA. The committee agreed to use the same wording. This wording will be incorporated into all appropriate policies.

“The activity cease to be a significant drinking water threat” for existing and;
 “The activity never becomes a significant drinking water threat” for future.

- The recommended wording to the significant threat policies were presented as follows:

“To reduce the risk to municipal drinking water sources from the application of agricultural source material (ASM), this activity shall be designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act and a Risk Management Plan shall be required where this activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat. Nutrient Management Act principles (including NMA prohibitions) shall form the basis of the Risk Management Plan provided the Risk Management Official is satisfied these principles **ensure** the activity *ceases to be or never becomes a significant drinking water threat.*”

- Using the word “**ensure**” was debated due to the liability this could pose to the RMO and the potential that and RMO might interpret that as a need to eliminate all risk. It was suggested that the wording to be: “***provided the RMO is satisfied these principals manage the activity such that it ceases to be or never becomes a significant drinking water threat***”. “Ensure” is used throughout the CWA and if it is not included in the policies it does not change the fact that this governs the RMO approval. Best Management Practices and the RM Catalogue will provide guidance for the RMO as to what measures adequately manage the risk.
- As the staff will be revising multiple policies based on this wording, the members asked if they would see the wording of the other policies. The policies will be revised and provided to the members for the next SPC meeting. Final wording for all polices will be approved at the next meeting.

- Moderate to Low Threat Policy 3.03 will be removed. There are no means to regulate or implement this policy. Includes salt storage that is uncovered and therefore would not trigger an application.

Policy 3.04. Run off that contains chemicals used in the de-icing of aircraft for low and moderate threats policy should be removed as it carries no legal weight and is not implementable.

Agricultural Policies. A letter outlining comments from OMAFRA was included in the package. Generally, OMAFRA is not supportive of four main aspects of the agricultural policies. Perth County Federation of Agricultural and Oxford County also submitted comments. Each of the OMAFRA concerns was reviewed by the committee.

- OMAFRA does not support prohibition of activities within WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. A quick review of the mapping suggests that only few farms are affected within the TSR, not including Oxford, This would apply to ASM, NASM, fertilizer, pesticide storage and application of NASM. WHPA-B with a score of 10 is equally as vulnerable or in some cases more vulnerable than WHPA-A. Oxford County received similar comments in Lake Erie SPR and has included additional rationale. The committee decided in fairness to an existing, to manage this risk and only prohibit future due to this area being highly vulnerable and of significant concern; information will be included in the rationale.
- OMAFRA recommended a RMP be required only for farms and activities not regulated under the NMA. If a person has a NMP they have 2 options: A notice from the issuer of the Prescribed Instrument needs to be provided to the RMO that identifies the Prescribed Instrument (PI) and outlines that the PI conforms to the significant threat policies set out in the SPP or they have to highlight where this is stated right in the instrument. If they do not comply the RMO can request in writing that they do this. This comment requires no change as it is already permitted under the CWA.

A question of nitrates being an issue was asked. “*Issues Contributing Areas*” (ICAs) are not defined yet (areas where issues that are identified as drinking water issues which are or may be affected by man’s activities on the landscape. When these ICA’s are defined, then activities that contribute to the issue become significant drinking water threats). Policies only deal with significant threats and further work is required to determine whether some of the ICAs in this region occur naturally or are anthropogenic before ICA can be defined which would require amendments to the Assessment Reports.

- Under policy 2.25 Future NASM Storage, the committee chose prohibition as the policy tool. OMAFRA suggested NASM plans adequately manage the risk. The committee was asked if they want to re-consider using PI to manage the risk rather than Part IV tool and reviewed the rationale for using this approach was due to the gap for category 1 storage. There is no distinction between the categories when it comes to the chemical threat, (related to the nitrogen).
- OMAFRA asked for more explanation as to why existing storages are not being prohibited in WHPA-A. The rationale is consistent with the committee's approach to manage existing and prohibit future.
- Under Policy 2.26 Oxford County allows for application of commercial fertilizer in WHPA-A but not ASMs. The TSR policies prohibit this and everyone agreed if it creates a significant threat then it should be prohibited.

The committee took a break from 11:15-11:30 a.m.

- The Perth County Federation of Agriculture suggested that feedlot facilities not currently used, but could be used in future, which is located in a WHPA-B could be subject to a RMP rather than prohibited.

The TSR has separate policies:

- Policy 2.51 Existing ASM Generation through Livestock Grazing or Pasturing land, an outdoor Confinement Area of a Farm Animal Yard-using manage,
- Policy 2.52 Future ASM Generation by Livestock Grazing or Pasturing Land-manage and;
- Policy 2.53 Future ASM Generation through Outdoor Confinement Area or Farm-Animal Yard-prohibit.

Oxford County combined and developed one policy using a RMP. Due to the nature of this threat changes in this use may not be caught in any approval process. The only way to catch an outdoor confinement yard is through a building permit and few would even require this. As a result Oxford chose to manage it. The circumstances that make livestock grazing and outdoor confinement areas a threat relate to both pathogen and chemical threats. For the outdoor confinement area it becomes a threat for the nutrients if greater than 300 animal units, however it is a pathogen threat if there is one or more animal. The intent of the committee was to prohibit large scale feedlots and the concern is if a person wants to purchase land and have 20 head of cattle or even a single animal

then the TSR would prohibited this. The suggestion was to combine policy 2.51, 2.52, and 2.53 into one with the object to manage the threat. The following proposed wording was considered:

“To reduce the risk to municipal drinking water sources from outdoor confinement areas and animal yards, this activity shall be designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act and a Risk Management Plan shall be required such that it ceases to be or never becomes a significant drinking water threat. Where applicable, the Nutrient Management Act principles shall form the basis of the Risk Management Plan (including any NMA prohibitions). In the opinion of the Risk Management Official, where management measures will not ensure an outdoor confinement area never becomes a significant threat, the Risk Management Plan should prohibit the establishment of a future outdoor confinement area in those areas where it would be a significant drinking water threat”.

In combining the policies the RMO then could manage the threat, prohibiting the larger scaled feed lots if they could not be adequately managed. The proposed wording would be consistent with how other ASMs are handled, would address Perth County Federation of Agriculture concerns and would be consistent with Oxford County’s policies.

A concern was noted of if the change of ownership of an existing outdoor confinement not having a trigger to be caught and may be found by an inspection only after it has been established was discussed. The RMO should have the ability to use discretion to ask landowner to move a feedlot if it poses risk. Other triggers to prevent this threat could be through NMPs or CA’s enquiries through the CA Act, if municipalities wish CA’s to build SP policies into their existing enquiry process. This may not be caught during a land acquisition and unless an inquiry was made. Compliance Monitoring will be important and may require plan updates although the goal would be to manage first rather than to ask someone later to remove the animals after they have established the activity. Education and Outreach will assist in bringing awareness. The policies will be combined, re-worded and presented at the next SPC meeting.

- Transitional Provisions, Policy 1.12. The definition of existing is being worked on with the MOE and Oxford County and the intent will be to adopt this policy as a best fit. Our definition of existing was:

“Existing Activity: An activity that is legally established as of the date the Source Protection Plan was approved; ***or legally permitted by existing zoning without any further permits or approvals***; or replacements, modifications or expansions to legally existing activities

that, in the opinion of the Risk Management Official are minor in nature and will either improve management of the threat or not increase the threat to drinking water.”

- The bolded text is to be removed as it opens the definition up too much.
- *Replacements, modifications and expansions* are not defined in polices; only places limits on them and in the opinion of the RMO cannot be ignored in defining these. The committee agreed to retain this wording and that it may be adjusted based on the work of Oxford County and the MOE.
- Further justification and documentation will be included in the Explanatory Document to capture the committee’s intent.

The committee was asked to advise Ingrid Vanderschot if they have further questions or comments on the policies. Staff will proceed with these policy revisions and provide final wording to the committee for acceptance at the next meeting.

b) Updated Policy Approach Tables

The updated *Policy Approach Tables* were circulated for review. The tables have evolved through the consultation process and improvements have been made. It is intended that this version be used in the SPP. The tables are more compact and offer more detail of the circumstances as to what makes a significant threat. The tables capture the policies and will be incorporated into the matrix in the Appendices to Volume II and Volume III. The TSR tables will look similar.

c) SPC Meeting Schedule

The proposed 2013 SPC meeting schedule was circulated for review to include meetings up to November 2013. Highlights were given as follows:

- November 2012 meeting is set for November 2 which is a week ahead, for the final SPC approval of the SPP to meet the SPP submission deadline. The SPA submits the SPP to the Minister in December.
- December meeting is tentative.
- January 2013 meeting is scheduled for January 25th to allow time to compile comments from the final stage of consultation to be presented

to the SPC. The meeting may be held at the UTRCA pending construction completion.

- Meetings in 2013 are set for every other month to allow for the option of engaging the committee if MOE comments and questions require the committee's input.
- The TSR SPP is more complex than some of the other regions and the approval process may take longer. We expect to be at the bottom of the pile due to the complexity and being one of the last plans submitted.

Business arising from the minutes, additional agenda item.

6. b) Letter to the Minister-Spills in the St. Clair corridor pose a significant threat to drinking water sources

A draft letter was presented to the committee for review relating to the recent spills in the St. Clair River. The committee wanted to bring their concerns to the MOE and identify how the policies in the SPP deal with these threats. It was also seen as an opportunity to gather more data and to highlight the importance of event specific modeling.

Dean Edwardson provided the committee with an update. The first spill event related to a dredge barge and tugboat which sank on the American of Lake Huron spilling diesel upstream of the LAWSS intake. Although enquires have been made there is no data available for this event. The second incident was a ship that went aground close to LAWSS which did not release any fuel or chemicals.

The spill during the loading of ethylbenzene to a ship docked on the St. Clair River upstream of the Wallaceburg and Walpole Island was discussed. SLEA was aware of the company loading a tanker at the dock and reported they had a spill contingency plan. The monitoring station in Courtwright tracked the source when it approached 1 part per billion (as per their regulations) and all required regulatory agencies were notified by the company once they knew about the spill. Detailed sampling was done at Walpole Island intake and the spill was contained. It was 30 hours until concentration levels became below 1 part per billion. The intakes at Wallaceburg and Walpole were shut down during this period. MOE's requirement for spills reporting is 2.24 parts per billion. The EPA short term exposure which is a ten day health advisory for a 10 kilogram child assuming consumption of 1 liter water is 3200 parts per billion over 10 days. The maximum concentrations level during this spill was 3.32 parts per billion; the appropriate actions were taken in preventive measures by shutting down the intakes. The spill was from the ship and not from an on shore release.

The intent of the letter was to highlight concerns with the spills notification process. The committee discussed various aspects of these events and what points would be included in the letter.

- The barge sinking fell short of expectations in the notification process and discussions are occurring on the American side.
- An internal review process with a number of agencies is occurring concerning the ethylbenzene spill. A suggestion was made that there is a redundancy of notification protocols.
- The sentence “*according to media accounts of the events, notification has room for improvement*” will be removed. The media may not always be accurate in the reporting. The sentence “*Concerns continue to be expressed relating to the notification process*” will be included.
- The letter will include acknowledgement to SLEA for detecting the spill and the work done in reporting it.
- These spills give an opportunity to calibrate the modeling.
- Public notification could have been more extensive to include businesses, farms and individual property owners who also rely on the water. Concerns about irrigation of crops on farms occurring during the spill and the risk this could pose were noted and should be included in the letter.
- The question of whether the vulnerability should be increased from the 2 hour limit on IPZ2 as the minimum standard in these areas was asked.

In summarizing the discussion, the letter will be re-worded and brought back to the November meeting. It will be addressed to the Minister and copied to Darlene Whitecalf and Augustus Tobias to forward to the FN Engagement Committee and to the agency responsible for the Coast Guard. Teresa McLellan will provide the name of the Transport Canada SWP contact.

MOE is looking for suggestions on future technical work and these spills highlight the importance of event modelling work due to the deficiencies in the rules to assess these activities as threats without the event specific modelling. Some of the priorities can be relayed in the cover letter being submitted to the Minister with the SPP.

8) Information

a) Role of the SPC after SPP submission

A presentation was given outlining the role of the SPC after plan submission. The Ministry has not provided information at this time. The presentation has been modified from versions used by other regions. After the SPP submission the role of the committee will be to consider comments on the Proposed SPP, revisions to the SPP, specify which parts of the AR and SPP require review, prepare a Terms of Reference if changes are needed and complete Annual Progress Reports. The timelines for the work

was reviewed as well as Terms of Appointment based on Ontario Reg.288/07) were outlined.

The SPC may be involved in the Great Lakes Protection Act. The blue-green algae issue in Lake Erie was also noted as an issue. The SPP also has a placeholder for Great Lakes targets and climate change.

The TSR SPP most likely will not be approved in 2013 and therefore the first Annual Report would not be due until May 2014.

b) Great Lakes Protection Act

Teresa McLellan gave a presentation on the Great Lakes Protection Act (GLPA) which was posted on the EBR on June 2012 as it relates to the committee. The comment period is now closed but comments can still be considered. The goal of the GLPA is to build on existing legislature and policy frameworks. Elements of the Act include establishing a Great Lake Guardians' Council, establishment of Ontario's Great Lakes Strategy (draft document is available on line) to give authority to set GL targets and take action with Geographic Focused Initiatives (GFI's). The GLPA is about making improvements to the Great Lakes, improving water quality and protecting beaches. Areas of focus are beach closures/algae, invasive species, population growth, natural heritage, harmful pollutants and climate change. A key component is the need to have good science, information management and metrics; similar to the SWP work on drinking water.

If the GLPA is passed it will provide authority to set GL targets which line up with the CWA. Great Lakes Guardians' Council has been established which are providing funding for related projects. Under Section 3 of the draft Act, SP committees are defined as a public body which means they can be directed to do work under the GL Guardians' Council. The GL principles will set direction and address priority areas. Under the CWA the targets relate to drinking water and the GLPA will relate to water relating to other purposes. There are many linkages to the work of the SP committees and a concern is to not have duplication in the work but to utilize existing networks/partners. A proposed focus highlighted was the goal of strengthening municipal water, wastewater and storm water management, including collaboration on drinking water source protection and work with municipalities on storm water and sewage bypasses. Funding application approvals for small scale community actions will be announced soon.

Pat Feryn, John Van Dorp and Don McCabe also attended a session by OFEC and were given a similar presentation. Don McCabe reported comments from various groups are coming that relate to the duplication of Acts. He noted the Guardian Fund does not relate to the Act as the Act has not been passed yet and the issue of definitions and science in the document are debatable between groups.



9) In Camera Session

None.

10) Other business

None.

11) MOE Liaison Report

Current area of focus for the Ministry is reviewing the SPPs.

12) Members Reports

Pat Donnelly- noted the SWP YouTube video on the SWP Website and thanked the members Sheldon Parsons, Joe Salter and Bob Bedggood who participated in this. Pat noted the City of London has started a public review process of the water rates with Bob McDonald from CBC kicking it off. A public meeting was also held for the provincial policy statement with SW, Great Lakes policies and climate change included.

John Van Dorp- made note of the extensive protocol on nitrate testing in the Oxford County area.

Teresa McLellan- reported the Essex Region CA has released a YouTube video on the Lake Erie blue-green Algae issue.

Hugh Moran- reported MNR has rolled about a program to license private gas wells in Ontario. There are restricted areas where they cannot be licensed such as IPZ. There is a program to plug wells; a well abandonment program is in place. The OPI is hosting a conference in Niagara Falls and Chris Tasker will be speaking on the TSR SWP.

13) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next SPC meeting is November 2, 2012. Members were reminded that the date was previously adjusted to meet the submission schedule.