SPC MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 7, 2014
Meeting #57

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. on February 7, 2014 at the St. Clair Conservation Authority Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

Bob Bedggood
Brent Clutterbuck
Pat Donnelly
Dean Edwardson
Patrick Feryn
Paul Hymus
Joe Kerr
George Marr
James Maudsley
Don McCabe
Valerie M'Garry
Sheldon Parsons
Doug McGee
Hugh Moran
Earl Morwood
Joe Salter
Charles Sharina
Pat Sobeski
John Van Dorp
Darlene Whitecalf
Jim Reffle (HU Liaison)
Jennifer Arthur (Provincial Liaison)

Regrets:

Kennon Johnson
Murray Blackie (SPA Liasion)
Carl Kennes
John Trudgen
Darrell Randell
Augustus Tobias

Staff:

Chris Tasker
Michelle Fletcher
Deb Kirk
Steve Clark
Bonnie Carey
Linda Nicks
Rick Battson
Brian McDougall
Don Pearson
Girish Sankar
Teresa Hollingsworth

External attendees:

Roger Palmini, ERCA by teleconference
Erin Merritt, By-law officer, Chatham-Kent
Cassandra Banting, SP Coordinator, Oxford County
Deborah Goudreau, Oxford County
Jennifer Arthur, MOE
Lisa Ross, MOE

1) Chair's Welcome

Bob Bedggood welcomed the committee and acknowledged a quorum was achieved. Michelle Fletcher was introduced as the new policy advisor. Bob also introduced Jennifer Arthur, MOE sitting in for Teresa McLellan. Erin Merritt the by-law officer for Chatham-Kent was also present.

Deb Goudreau, Manager of Water Services and Cassandra Banting, Source Protection Coordinator both of Oxford County joined the meeting later on. Roger Palmini from Essex Region CA participated in the meeting by teleconference to discuss the microcystin issue for Wheatley. Lisa Ross, MOE also joined the meeting for the discussion on waste management policies.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with an understanding the order may be modified based on accommodating participant availability.

Moved by Jim Maudsley -seconded by Charles Sharina

"RESOLVED that the agenda be approved."

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

There were no delegations. Bob indicated the Lambton Ontario Federation of Agriculture has asked to attend a SPC meeting and may come to the next meeting.

4) Minutes from Previous Meeting

The October 18, 2013 SPC meeting minutes were approved.

Moved by George Marr -seconded by Dean Edwardson

"RESOLVED that the October 18, 2013 meeting minutes be approved."

CARRIED.

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

a) SPP approval process update

Jennifer Arthur from MOE reported the anticipated date of preliminary comments from MOE is April 2014. It is uncertain when final comments will be submitted. It may be possible there is not another set of comments if early comments have been addressed.

The comments being received by other regions SPPs are being considered and a note was made of the schedule being an on-going challenge due to the uncertainties in the timelines.

7) Business

a) Technical Work

i. SCRSPA IPZ-3

Girish Sankar circulated a *draft* document titled "*Longitudinal Analysis in Support of IPZ-3 Revision for Petrolia, LAWSS and Wallaceburg Intakes.*" This report was also recently provided to the Technical Advisory Committee.

An overview of the report was given to include the background of the work Baird Consulting did using event based spill modeling in 2011. The report outlines an extension of this work done in 2013 that included areas outside of the approved IPZ-3 area that were likely to have the same results.

The scope of the work includes looking at other spill scenarios based on identified activities of concern, the calculation of dilution of spill concentrations and compare the concentrations to the *Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standards* to

determine whether the spill is a threat to the water intake. If results suggest the spill would be a significant drinking water threat, IPZ-3 revisions are proposed to include the area where the spill was modeled.

Spill scenarios were considered for Lake Huron from Arberarder Creek, Kernohan Odennell drain, Douglas drain and Hickory Creek and for the Wallaceburg intake from Talfourd Creek, Baby Creek and Clay Creek. A two step approach was used to determine the concentration at the intake. For the spills modeled in the tributaries an analytical approach was used to evaluate the longitudinal dispersion from the spill to the tributary mouth and a dilution factor was calculated using the results from earlier MISED model runs which suggest dilution from the tributary mouth to the intakes.

The results indicate that if a spill were to occur it would result in an exceedence of the ODWQS therefore a revised IPZ-3 extension is required for the Wallaceburg Intake and the Petrolia intake. Maps were included to show the proposed IPZ-3 revisions. MOE's comments will be incorporated into the documentation.

Discussion:

- A question was asked about insurance and the liability for the landowner whose property is identified high risk. Whether the lines are on the map or not the liability is there; a RMP would help to satisfy the insurers that *Best Management Practices* are being used and monitoring is in place.

- An error was noted on Table 1 that *Highway 11* should be changed to *County Road 11*.

- A question was asked of whether there is confidence that all scenarios were covered in the proposed IPZ-3. Other areas could be assessed, however, based on the limited scenarios and areas that were assessed, this is a reasonable extent.

  The IPZ-3 has been extended on land to the greater of the Regulation Limit or 120 m which therefore did not include the entire area.

This report will be finalized when the MOE comments are incorporated and the SPC gives final approval at the next SPC meeting. Changes will also be made to the Assessment Reports to incorporate these updates.

ii. LTVSPA IPZ-3

Jason Wintermute gave a presentation on highlights of the LTVSPA IPZ-3 work. The status is similar to the SCRCA work. This report has not been circulated to the Technical Advisory committee although it does reflect feedback received from them on methodologies.

Background: Three intakes in the Essex Region SPA had IPZ-3 related to fuel spills delineated. Baird Consulting concluded in a report that modeling showed particles in the lake at the mouth of the Thames were reaching the intakes at Windsor, Belle River and Stoney Point. The question was then asked of how far an IPZ-3 may extend into the Lower Thames SPA and the modeling showed fuel from the Thames River could reach Stoney Point and Belle River at concentration exceeding the ODWQS. The work currently being undertaken was to determine how the TSR should address cross boundary issues and delineating an IPZ-3 in the Thames River.

Additional funding was not available to engage a consultant however the modelling was done in-house based on Baird's 2011 report which modeled spills in the mouth of the Thames River. The current work uses longitudinal dispersion methods and from modeled spill locations to the mouth of the Thames and then uses dilution factors from the MISED model for in-lake dilution.

Baird's modeling used a combination of mean flow out of river combined with wind and wave action in the lake. Therefore there were restrictions in looking only at only similar scenarios. The Baird work looked at Big Creek (at Rail Line) Big Creek (at Baptist Creek) and the Prairie Siding Bridge and did not go upstream or consider the pump schemes. Using mean flow led to the large flood plain area at the mouth of the Thames being excluded because when the dykes and pump systems were taken into account the flood plain area did not show up at the intake due to dilution. The TAC asked about tributaries further along Lake St. Clair. The modeling done by Baird does not give information on dilution from these locations. Extending the dilution in this more northerly direction would not be appropriate without more in-lake modeling.

The Essex Region went with a 15,000 L spill; if we use this the results would be as shown in dark purple in Figure 3. This would only include the community of Lighthouse Cove up to the railroads tracks slightly upstream half way between Big Creek and Jeannettes Creek and then just past the confluence of where Big Creek and Baptiste Creek split. The Thames is further from the intake with more dilution in the lake and from the Thames itself resulting in the area not extending as far up the smaller tributaries as in the Essex Region. If 34, 000 L was used then it essentially reaches all the way to the head waters of Big Creek including Baptiste

Creek system; up past Prairie Siding Bridge, up Jeannettes Creek as far as the first set of wetland ponds and all the way to head waters of Baptiste and Big Creek. This area is shown in figure 3 in the lighter purple.

The committee was asked to consider the option of using 34,000L and include the entire area in lighter shading on the map, up to the end of the tributaries similar in area to the analysis done in Essex but a different volume. If this is adopted, Leamington and Lakeshore would use 15,000 L in ERCA and 34,000L in LTVCA. The other option is to go with 15,000L ignoring all the areas upstream knowing the modeling shows it is a concern at 34,000L. In other parts of the region different volumes are used for different areas. (68,000L being a rail car, 34,000L a large tank truck, and 15,000L a small tanker).

Spills include a spill from a truck and also storage. Spills from a truck or rail tanker are difficult to manage and would not involve a RMP rather a *spills notification* process.

IPZ-3 mapping may be altered due to the type of intakes. The Lake St. Clair is similar to an inland river. The technical rules indicate that the IPZ-3 includes the total watershed contributing area so technically it would extend to cover a large area upstream to the headwaters,. However this methodology is tied to the vulnerability scoring which some of the areas would be score so low they would definitely not have significant threats and as you get further from the intake would not have threats. More discussion with MOE will happen around this.

The question of whether nitrogen or turbidity has been deemed an issue in Stoney Point was asked. This has not been an issue and would be found in the Essex Region AR.

The SPC agreed to delineate two separate zones for 34,000L and one for 15, 000L. Some revisions will be completed based on MOE comments. The committee supported the document therefore it will be finalized and incorporated into the AR.

iii. Wheatley Microcystin Issue

At past meetings, the work ERCA has been doing on assessing microcystins as an issue has been discussed. A discussion paper was circulated summarizing the work and two reports to the Essex SPC. The first report recommends identifying microcystins as an issue on their Lake Erie Intakes and the second outlines the ICA which was proposed. Wheatley was the system that was used as the template for other systems on Lake Erie. The hope is to have someone attend the ERCA SPC

meetings as they discuss this work and the policies. The committee was asked to consider whether this region should identify microcystins as an issue at Wheatley. Discussion:

- Microcystins were described as toxins released by blue-green algae and this has been occurring on the western basin of Lake Erie on both the north and south shore and now is extending eastward to Wheatley. Contact with the algae can cause skin problems, sore eyes and throat and if consumed inadvertently can cause stomach problems and diarrhea. If consumed it can lead to liver damage.

- The Chatham-Kent PUC has indicated that while it is an operational concern they are not sure that is should be elevated to an issue at this time. While there are a few exceedances of the half MAC and one recent exceedance of the MAC in the untreated water, this is an operational concern that they are able to manage with operational changes and costs. The treatment process would involve turning off the pre-chlorination in the intakes that stop the zebra mussels from growing.

- Although there have been issues identified in the US rivers, data collected by Essex shows high levels of phosphorous in the tributaries, along the lakeshore. It is a local issue especially in the creeks where there are green house operations.

- Studies are indicating it is a particular type of phosphorus (dissolved reactive phosphorous) that is the problem and is showing up more in the lake.

- A concern was raised of how treatment plant operators would know there is a bloom to ignite the treatment process change to address it. This is monitored on a regular basis. Minor adjustments to the water treatment would be required.

- Anything contributing to the issue would be considered a significant threat within an ICA. Septic systems become a significant threat and are dealt with through a building code and inspections are mandatory. MOE and the green house operators are working on dealing with phosphorous discharge in their waste water and there are prescribed instruments that could deal with these particular concerns. The NMA could be applied or RMPs could be used. Education and Outreach could also apply to these threats.

- A comment on the table, page 162 of the December 16th report from Essex raised the concern of looking at the larger aspect of looking at extreme events versus the specific threats identification.

- A note was made of this being an international issue and a suggestion was made to review the International Joint Commission report on the blue-green algae issue and the recommendations. The Americans are leaning toward the regulatory tools in dealing with nutrients and crop insurance, to ensure farmers have NMPs.

- A member reported Winrock International Foundation will be providing funding to look at the Great Lakes to include prosperous trading. Data is available including a Lake Erie report for agriculture is available and Grand River water management plan.

- The trends are not fully understood at this point. Essex and Pelee Island operators agreed this is an issue. Although data is available for 2013 more data could be added to help determine whether this should be an issue at Wheatley.

- The esthetic concerns were also noted and the public concern over these should not be ignored. In addition to the microcystin concern algae also causes significant taste and odor concerns in drinking water as well as recreational use concerns.

- Extreme events are occurring more and consistency will be important with neighboring SPA regions and monitoring alone does not address the problem.

- Failed septic systems should be addressed.

- This Issue is a basin wide problem and is spreading; it is not new and has been happening since late 60's and 1970's.

- The option of considering this issue at a later date and updating the AR and SPP at that time was noted.

- In keeping with the SPC's guiding principles of being fair and reasonable, if this was deemed an *issue* local public open houses would occur.

After a discussion, the committee decided to table the discussion until the next meeting to determine whether microcystins should be identified as an issue. This will allow staff to obtain and review 2013 data, have further discussion with the PUC and gather more information from other jurisdictions. The Lake Erie Ecosystem Priority report will also be considered in further discussions on this issue.

Moved by Sheldon Parsons -seconded by Jim Maudsley

"RESOLVED that the report on microcystin issue be tabled until more data can be collected and presented to the committee within a reasonable time frame at a subsequent SPC meeting."

CARRIED.

Lunch Break 1155-1235 p.m.

iv. Water Quantity Risk Assessment

Sam Bellemy of Matrix Solutions gave a presentation at the June SPC meeting. The work on the water budget is now complete and peer reviewer comments are in. The consultant is working on incorporating comments into the final report. There are no significant threats for water quantity for this region. Changes will be incorporated into the AR/SPP. A question was asked as to whether well 12 in Woodstock was included in the work. This well is a planned well which has gone through the EA process and therefore is included in the Water Budget and is also in vulnerability assessment work already included in the approved Assessment Report.

v. Woodstock ICA and Woodstock Vulnerability Revisions

A discussion paper along with two figures was circulated to the committee for the Woodstock Issue Contributing Area and Vulnerability Adjustments. Oxford County has completed their work to delineate an ICA for Tabor well field and proposed some revisions to the vulnerability scoring for the Sweaburg area. Deb Goudreau gave a presentation highlighting the results.

Key Points of presentation:

- Elevated nitrates have been identified in 7 of the 10 wells in Woodstock and are identified as an issue.
- The delineation of the ICA for Tabor wells utilized the following information: Tier 3 water budget work which developed refined groundwater models for the well fields; years of additional nitrate testing in municipal, private wells and monitoring wells.

- A work plan for the ICA for the Thorton wells is being developed.

Tabor Wellfield

- An ICA was delineated for the Tabor wellfield due to the increase in nitrate levels which could compromise both wellfields.

- The delineated ICA was characterized by land that contributes 100% of the recharge to each well field, it is primarily agricultural and total travel from ground surface to the well is 60 years.

- A significant threats table was shown to indicate the land use activities, threat type and number of occurrences in the ICA.

- Policies applied to the threats contributing to the issue in WHPA-A & B (10) remain unchanged.

- It was determined that applying the existing SDWT policies to threats in the ICA was not always appropriate. The ICA is considerably larger than the WHPA-A and B(10) where most of these activities are already a SDWT. Any activity in the ICA which is a threat and contributes to the issue is a SDWT. In the broader ICA there are not quantity circumstances and therefore much smaller scale activities can be affected by policies than in the WHPA-A,B (10).

- Current SDWT policies will be applied to the ICA. Industrial Waste threats will be prohibited; sanitary sewers and storage of sewage, ASM/NASM application and storage, application of commercial fertilizer, outdoor confinement areas and livestock grazing will be managed.

- Three new threats that become possible in an ICA were added. These activities most likely will never occur in a rural setting and therefore can be prohibited. These include sewage treatment, combined sewer and industrial effluent discharge and STP by-pass.

Questions:

- The question of why 60 year time of travel was used? The hydrogeologist used this based on the technical rules. 60 year time of travel is the time from the surface through down to the aquifer and then to the well. The 25 year time of travel used for delineation of WHPA-D is travel time in the aquifer only.

Sixty years corresponds to the timeframe when land use (especially fertilizer application) in the area increased contributions to the nitrate in the groundwater.

- A concern was raised of applying policy to an *occurrence of an activity* rather than an exact location. The management of these areas is the goal versus prohibiting the activity. This allows the activities to occur but ensures BMPs are in place.

- A question was asked about the Tabor wells and the lines on the map extending from the wells in Norwich. Modeling shows a sharp groundwater divide, with these wells pulling from the southwest while the Norwich wells draw from the northwest.

Thorton ICA Workplan

- The ICA for the Thorton wells has not been delineated yet but a workplan is being developed.

- In 2002/2003 Oxford County purchased three different farms of several hundred acres of land. Rather than take this land out of production they have tendered out parcels of land to farmers with enhanced NMPs that are far more restrictive. Research has been done on these sites for 20 years to try to understand how the nitrates are moving though the groundwater. There are areas where there is no aquitard; no separation between the upper shallow groundwater and the municipal aquifer therefore the nitrates move very quickly. These sensitive areas have been removed from production.

- Wells 1 & 5 have shown a decrease in nitrates. Three of the wells are showing reduced scatter but are not showing this decrease. There is not enough data at this point to determine if there is a reducing trend but results show promise.

- Land Use Management practices will continue, SP policies will be applied to subject lands and nitrate concentration will continue to be tracked within the wellfield. The intent is to re-assess the need for an ICA prior to the next update of the AR/SPP.

Thorton Vulnerability Adjustments

- Vulnerability in the Sweaburg areas has been adjusted from moderate to high due to the transport pathways (wells and septic systems) as included in the approved AR.

- Services were extended to provide municipal water to the village and the majority of the private wells were de-commissioned. A few declined to participate in decommissioning their well. Adjustment in vulnerability scoring is still warranted as high where the private wells were retained however the vulnerability in the areas where the wells have been decommissioned can revert to the intrinsic vulnerability scoring.

- The work Oxford has done will be incorporated into the AR and available for the SPC at a subsequent meeting.

b) SPP Revision

Michelle Fletcher advised the committee that updates to the policies and revisions to the SPP include edits that: make policies read more easily, use more consistent wording throughout Volume 2&3 as well as between Volume 2&3, and anticipate changes MOE will suggest based on comments on other SPPs. These revisions also include updates to incorporate additional technical work that has been completed (e.g. new Issues Contributing Area in Oxford, Tier 3 Water Quantity Study). Tables were developed to clearly show the proposed changes with before and after versions of the text.

i. Volume 1

The edits suggested for Volume 1 all consisted of updating the text to reflect that the Tier 3 Water Quantity work has now been completed

ii. Volume 2

UTRCA staff worked in conjunction with Oxford County staff to review and edit Volume 2. The proposed changes were largely within the policy section of Volume 2. For the most part these changes focused on incorporating the ICA into the existing policies where applicable (no new policies were created), and restructuring the text in some policies (e.g. incorporating bullet points) to make the policies read more clearly with fewer run-on sentences. A few additional specific policy changes are noted below:

- Policies OC 2.05, OC 2.07 and OC-2.09 were changed from existing use policies to existing and future use policies.

- Policies OC-2.09 & OC-2.10, Sewage Treatment Plant Effluent Discharges or Storage of Sewage, were modified to include an additional 3 sub-threat categories: industrial effluent discharge, sewage treatment plan by-pass discharges and combined sewer discharge. These activities were not a SDWT without the ICA, so now that there is an ICA in Oxford they have been added to these policies.

- Policies OC-2.22 & OC-2.23, Handling and Storage of Commercial Fertilizer, the Definition of *Handling* was discussed. The Explanatory Document outlines it and will be looked at to see if it should be brought forward into the policy.

- New Moderate & Low DWT Policy-this new policy was introduced. The wording of the policy was based on previous SPC meeting discussions.

- The Explanatory Document will also be amended to reflect any of the changes proposed in Volume 2.

iii. Volume 3

UTRCA staff reviewed and edited Volume 3. The proposed changes were largely within the policy section of Volume 3. For the most part these changes focused on restructuring the text in some policies (e.g. incorporating bullet points) to make the policies read more clearly with fewer run-on sentences, and to correct minor mistakes in the text. A few additional specific policy changes are noted below:

- Policy 1.02 & 1.03 Signage. Added IPZ-3 and removed WHPA-Es. Jennifer Arthur spoke to MTO and advised to go ahead with the proposed revisions and see where it gets in pre-consultation.

- Policy 2.05 Future Waste Disposal Sites- Prohibition. Other regions have had comments on their SPP and more guidance is required from MOE. MOE has identified the challenge of only relying on Prescribed Instruments (PI) for Waste Disposal Sites. Although this region did not only use PIs, the other tools under part IV authorities to catch things that may fall through the cracks may be a concern and unintentionally prohibit something. Lisa Ross of MOE explained that waste sub-threats have three areas where there is no environmental compliance approval in place. In some cases approval may not be necessary and prohibition not

appropriate. Examples of sites not requiring ECAs are PCB storage sites, high school science labs, hockey arenas, garages where chemicals are used. Volume is associated with PCBs. The TSR prohibition policy is focused on future, new sites. A new high school would not be prohibited but the chemical use would be in an area where the chemical could be a significant threat.

The other concern is under Hazardous Liquid Industrial Waste storage. Transfer stations are subject to ECA however if the waste is shipped within a 2 year period an ECA is not required. A few examples of this could be dental offices, pharmacies, battery disposal companies. Prohibition may be reasonable in some cases but may not be in all cases.

Municipal landfill sites fall under PIs. Some committees elected to prohibit some of the sub-threats and manage others. An additional challenge is there may be an existing company in one of these areas wanting to engage in these activities in the future.

A question was asked of the definitions in the case of a pharmacy and whether they are storing or collecting medication was asked. These are complex and are Under General Waste Regulation under Reg. 347.

The committee has discussed many times and agreed if these activities are identified as a SDWT and are not there now why would it be permitted in the future? There are other locations which are more appropriate for these SDWT.

Quantities, types of chemicals and whether they are a significant threat need to be considered. Quantities under Reg. 347 was noted and if the volume of waste is less than 5 kg accumulated in any month they become exempt from being a hazardous waste.

The committee agreed to continue on with the policies as written for waste disposal threat sub-categories for submission to MOE in the revised SPP.

- Policy 2.06 Existing Waste Disposal Sites. The question was asked of whether there will be amendment fees for other threats/activities and why is this the only one where waiving fees is suggested? Whether this should be broadened to include all prescribed instruments was also asked and the committee agreed it should be.

- Policy 2.15 Future Septic Systems-Prohibition. Revised the text to make the exception to septic systems associated with municipal water supply facilities.

- Policy 2.23 Application of NASM. No change proposed but policy discussed due to MOE comments on similar policies in other SPPs. MOE comments focused on prohibiting NASM but managing ASM and that the impacts are similar. A note was made that these are different and that OMAFRA would likely be raising this concern. In addition to the chemicals of concern for ASM, NASMs carry other chemicals of concern. This should be covered in the Explanatory Document.

- Policy 2.51 ASM Generation through Livestock Grazing or Pasturing Land, an Outdoor Confinement Area of Farm Animal Yard. This is a management policy so it was revised to remove the wording around prohibiting size increases that are too large. Wording was changed to allowing the RMP to restrict the size so that it never becomes a drinking water threat.

- Policy 4.01 Spill Prevention, Spill Contingency and Emergency Response Plans- Municipal. Added IPZ which was missed in original text.

- New Moderate & Low DWT Policy-this new policy was introduced. The wording of the policy was based on previous SPC meeting discussions.

c) AR Revisions

i. UTRSPA

The technical work is being incorporated into the ARs and all three will be revised. The proposed revisions to the UTR AR were emailed to the committee to reflect the Tier 3 Water Budget and are considered draft as there may be some additional detail included. Many of the changes have considerable ripple effect requiring changes in many other parts of the document. Some mapping products may require further changes.

The committee was advised to focus on second page that outlines a new section that was added 3.4.2. If there are concerns with text changes or proposed revisions the committee was asked to contact Chris Tasker or Linda Nicks. The same editing format will be used when incorporating the IPZ, SGRA work.

d) Implementation Funding

The Lake Erie and the Grand River SPC has requested that MOE extend the eligibility period for the municipality implementation funding to the full three years. The committee was asked if they want to consider sending a similar letter to highlight the intent of wanting to use the funding in the most efficient and effective manner to prepare for implementation.

Moved by Dean Edwardson-seconded by George Marr

"RESOLVED that the Thames, Sydenham and Region SPC will forward a letter to the Ministry of Environment to request that the Province extend the period eligible municipalities are allowed to use the implementation funds to ensure the funds are used efficiently and in the most effective manner."

CARRIED.

8) Information

None.

9) In Camera Session

None.

10) Other Business

a) SPC Appointments

Bob noted that each of the committee members should have received a formal letter to outline their re-appointments being extended for another year until December 2014.

11) MOE Liaison report

Jennifer Arthur gave the committee an update. The Niagara Region SPP has been approved and two others, Mississippi-Rideau and Mattagami Region are being cued up to go to the Minister. The funding agreements with the CAs are currently being worked on. SP is being audited by the Auditor General to ensure the highest quality of Source Protection is in place and the CAs/SPC members may be interviewed. Annual Reporting is moving slowly, the

first one is due May 2017 so it is not seen as urgent at this point. A Risk Management Official forum may be organized. A provincial *Education and Outreach* program is being developed and an implementation workshop is planned for the project managers. Chris Tasker also noted the CA communications staff is organizing a local workshop for *Education and Outreach* on a municipal level to develop a work plan.

The Municipal Engineers Association Class EA is a reference used by municipalities for EAs but it does not include SP. A number of EAs are occurring and SP needs to be considered. The class EA is being updated and includes a commenting period with public consultation. An additional amendment package will be looked at later this year to ensure it includes the threat recognition.

12) Members reports

Don McCabe- noted the OFEC is promoting education towards the agricultural side and are looking for ways to move this process along.

Joe Kerr- made reference to a comment made suggesting it was shocking that a municipality would put in a well without looking at what was around the well. He relayed he thinks it because there are rules there for the constituents but not related to locating municipal wells.

Bob Bedggood- further to the above comment Bob agreed making note that the Nutrient Management Provincial Committee made a statement suggesting it should not impinge on the existing wells, drains or a septic tanks and we at times lose sight of this.

13) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next SPC meeting is scheduled for *March 21* and for *April 11* at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority Board room. The committee was advised to keep these dates open but one of the meetings may be canceled.