



Thames – Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: February 11, 2011

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

Meeting Location: St. Clair Conservation Authority office

Proposed Agenda

Item	Time
1. Chair's Welcome	9:00
2. Adoption of the Agenda	
3. Delegations	
4. Minutes From the Previous Meeting	
5. Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
6. Business arising from the minutes	9:15
a. Cross jurisdictional issues in planning stages	
b. SCRCA apAR	
c. GUDI Technical Advisory Committee	
7. Business	
a. Election	
b. Septic Threats Policy Discussion Papers	9:30
c. Handling and Storage of Fuel background paper	
Lunch	12:00
d. DNAPL background paper	
8. Information	3:00
a. MOE Technical Bulletins (Threats Related to on-site sewage septic systems)	
9. In Camera Session	
10. Other business	
a. Water Governance Research Project Survey	
11. MOE Liaison report	
12. Members reports	
13. Adjournment (next meeting March 4, 2011)	3:30



Meeting Materials

Agenda Item	Description
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">January 14, 2011 minutes
7b	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Updated Septic Threats Policy Discussion paper with proposed policieswill be distributed separately
7c	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Handling of Storage of Fuel background paper
7d	<ul style="list-style-type: none">DNAPL background paper
8a	<ul style="list-style-type: none">MOE Technical BulletinsThreats Related to on-site sewage septic systems



SPC Sub-committee MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 11, 2011
Meeting #35

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on February 11, 2011 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority (SCRCA) Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

Bob Bedggood
Brent Clutterbuck
Dean Edwardson
Pat Feryn
Paul Hymus
Joe Kerr
James Maudsley
Valerie M'Garry
Sheldon Parsons
Charles Sharina
Darrell Randell

Jim Reffle (MOH Liaison)
Joe Salter
Patrick Sobeski
John Trudgen
John Van Dorp
Darlene Whitecalf
Teresa McLellan (Provincial Liaison)

Regrets:

Kennon Johnson
Murray Blackie (SPA Liaison)
Pat Donnelly
Carl Kennes
Doug McGee

Earl Morwood
Joe Van Overberghe
Don McCabe
Augustus Tobias
Robert Olivier

Staff:

Steve Clark
Chris Tasker
Deb Kirk
Linda Nicks

Ingrid Vanderschot
Teresa Hollingsworth
Ralph Coe



1) Chair's Welcome

Bob Bedggood welcomed the committee and indicated that a quorum had not been met. The members present agreed to proceed as a subcommittee and report to the full Source Protection Committee to endorse the decisions made today, at the next meeting of the SPC.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

It was noted that elections would be deferred until a quorum is present. An additional item was added to the agenda following 7a to discuss the draft notice of source protection plan preparation.

moved by Sheldon Parsons-seconded by Valerie M'Garry

"RESOLVED that the agenda be approved as amended."

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

There were no delegations. It was noted the committee can receive delegations. The delegation is required to give three weeks notification in advance and include material in package to SPC. An item will be included on the SP website outlining rules for delegations. It was highlighted this may occur more during the planning stages.

4) Minutes from Previous meetings

moved by Charles Sharina-seconded by Dean Edwardson

"RESOLVED that the January 14th, 2011 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 will give an update on cross jurisdictional issues at the next meeting.

b) SCRCA apAR

The SCRCA apAR was posted on the website February 3. The comment period ends February 20th. Notices went into the newspaper and copies of the report were circulated to the Municipal offices. Submission date to the Ministry is February 28th.

c) GUDI Technical Advisory Committee

The first meeting was held last week. There was not complete representation from all municipalities but names have been submitted for future meetings. Consultants have provided methodology for completion of the work and have also been contracted by Oxford to assess their GUDI systems. There is interest from Delaware Nation and Chippewa of the Thames to participate in the studies.

7) Business

a) Elections

The election for the vice-chair and recording secretary did not take place due to not having a quorum.

Draft Notice under Ontario Regulation 287/07: drinking water source protection plan preparation.

Teresa Hollingsworth reviewed and circulated the document outlining items required to go in letters to landowners. They need to be notified if they are undertaking activities which could create significant threats to municipal drinking water sources. A chart will be attached to identify what threats have been identified in the vulnerable area. The landowner will be asked if their activities are governed by any Provincial instruments. An information sheet will also be included as an attachment describing which provincial instruments are prescribed. A reply form will be included which can be sent back. Early Response Stewardship programs information will also be included.

Key points during discussion:

- What is the obligation to respond? We cannot make people respond. Our requirement under the Regulation is to send out the notice when Plan preparation begins including the request that the source protection committee would like to know if the individual believes that the activity(s) is governed by a provincial instrument prescribed by the regulation and, if so, is requesting the individual provide the instrument number and a description of the applicable provisions that regulate the activity. It is in their best interest to provide this information as it will demonstrate that they may already be managing the risk associated with the activity. There is however no obligation for the property owner to respond.
- Does it matter **if** they are not a resident of Ontario? If they own the property in the vulnerable areas, it is irrelevant where they reside.
- Include a indicating that *it would be to your advantage to fill out the form*. And indicating that *Public input enhances the development of the SP plan*.
- Second paragraph. *Activities which “would be” significant threats* should be changed to *“could be.”*
- OFA is educating people in general and can contact their area representatives therefore people may be more prepared and understand the process. Through their Nutrient Management plans/strategies farmers will have proof of already abiding by the rules and managing risk and will be encouraged to provide the information.
- The SPC, municipalities and First Nations will all be notified when the landowner letters are sent. Municipalities and First Nations will be receiving their own letters of notification as well.
- For confidentiality purposes, a list of individual landowners will not be made available. The lines drawn on the maps in the AR show the areas involved - WHPA A and B's.
- Language will be added in the letter to indicate the receiver of the notification is requested to forward information to person *“occupier”* engaged in the activity. Further to this in 2nd last paragraph first line *“may affect your activities”* to *“may affect activities.”* A statement will be included if they are not the person involved in the activities, to pass along information to that person.
- 3rd paragraph *“in addition moderate and low threats”* will be removed and included in background information to avoid confusion.
- Insurance/liability was discussed and the risks of landowners not being insured as something to be aware of but it was identified that this is beyond the scope of the SPC.

- An electronic version of the package going out to the landowners will be sent to the SPC and then will go out. Teresa McLellan will also take this to the Ministry to get feedback. Most regions are at the same spot and examples are being put forward to share wisdom.

b) Septic Threats Policy Discussion Papers

Ingrid Vanderschot gave a review of the revised *Septic Threats policy discussion paper* and referred to the MOE bulletin, *Threats related to on-site sewage (septic) systems*. The related Ontario Water Resources Act bulletin is not yet available.

Key points:

- Under Section 5 of the discussion paper, a properly functioning septic can be considered a risk management measure. Therefore all that may be required is an inspection indicating it is working properly (as required under the standards in the Ontario Building Code) and the risk is then reduced.
- Larger systems have pathogens and chemical threats identified. No bulletin on this yet. A question of what kind of inspection program is necessary for large systems was asked. Annual inspections are done by the MOE but randomly.
- Section 6 outlines proposed policy ideas. The appendices contain draft policies, showing the evolution of policy development and consideration based on the discussions from the previous SPC meeting.
- Table 1 in Appendix A identifies the number of significant threats and where they were identified. Septics are a sub-threat of the establishment, operation or maintenance of a sewage system. The information for each system has been gathered at the threat level with sub-threat information being available for some systems but not all.
- A question was asked as to whether sanitary sewers are a risk? As they could leak they are considered a threat. Sewer treatment plants, sewers, pumping stations and will be considered separately.
- Sebringville has many septic fields and are not included in Table 1. Ingrid to follow up.
- Table 2 A and B summarize where significant, moderate and low threats may be found based on vulnerability score.
- A question was asked of whether Woodstock's 186 listed in the chart include moderate and low risks. Table 1 shows only significant threats. Moderate and lows have not been inventoried.
- Appendix B shows the first cut of draft policies. The focus today is to get input/ideas as to how policies are developed and whether the concepts are agreeable to the members.
- The 13 draft policies should address the various circumstances that deal with septics including both small and large septics and holding tanks.

- The fields in the tables are consistent with the web forum so all regions can share this as they develop it. In the future, ideas will be inputted and shared as policies are being developed rather than awaiting endorsement by the SPC. Fields lay out pieces required for a policy and will eventually be transferred to the Ministry database, to be available to the Province and municipalities.
- A question was raised of whether Certificates of Approval are included in prescribed instruments? The MOE bulletin is coming. C of A's are considered a prescribed instrument, applying to systems with more than 10,000 L/day capacity or small septics covering more than one property. It is estimated that regular household have 800-1000 gallon tanks that can handle 1600-2000 liters a day. An example was discussed of a retirement home with apartments which had above 10,000 liter peak flow and therefore required a C of A.
- Editorial: Table 2a and b change Certificate of *Authorization* to *Approval*.
- Under the Ridgetown wells, sanitary sewers show NA to mean information is not available. There are 5 significant risks for waste threats but the information is not available for sub-threats. No additional work is being done at this point to gather more detailed information. Policies will be developed and may apply to areas where there is not information available. The capacity of sanitary sewers relates to its level or risk; the pipes in Ridgetown area are likely small enough to not pose a significant risk. The question of whether sanitary sewers are a threat because pathogens or chemicals will be considered in more detail when we address that sub-threat in a subsequent discussion paper.
- If a sewer is identified on private property, it is the municipality's responsibility to negotiate or re-negotiate easements. A sanitary sewer is counted as one threat rather than the number of properties it crosses.

Policy Review Discussions:

Policy #1 Existing septics subject to OWRA

- Limitations for prescribed instrument policies relating to C of A's for septic systems over 10, 000 were outlined on the last bullet of Section 5: Policy Considerations, page 7, Teresa McLellan clarified that for any septic system subject to a C of A, policies can be written through the prescribed instrument and the MOE will be required to conform. However, the prescribed instrument policies must be written within the legal limitations of the C of A. Septic inspections under the current C of A program are done on a rotating basis. In the Southwest Region, every C of A is inspected within approximately a 4 year inspection cycle, but this is not formally in policy and is not necessarily consistent across regions. The Ontario Building Code has a re-inspection program with a 5 year cycle for small septics. We would like to include timelines for re-inspection within our policy covering large septics

that reflect the standards for small septics but cannot do this within a prescribed instrument tool. Rather, we can recommend inspection timelines and priorities using “*Other: Specify Action*” without legal effect.

- Another option might be for the SPC to write a monitoring policy to which all public agencies must conform. Can a monitoring policy be included that would require reporting from the MOE, making suggestions of time frames that an inspection be done? It was suggested that the inspection time line cannot be included however the policy could ask for annual report indicating which systems were done. Monitoring policies to not specify action, only outline monitoring. Need to look into this further.
- It was noted that there are likely very few of the large systems with 10,000 L/day within our vulnerability score 10 areas. Even if we do not have large systems specifically identified, we still need policies in place to address them.
- The SPC was asked whether it agrees with strategic action being an acceptable tool to address C of A inspection, and how important re-inspection programs are to the management of the significant threats. The committee needs to consider how strongly do they want to encourage the Ministry to do it?
- Re-inspection for older systems was noted as being more important than inspections for new ones.
- The policy tool will be changed, from “*prescribed instrument*” to “*other; specify actions*” and the wording changes from would to should. The legal affect is “*strategic action.*” The Monitoring policy is separate and requires that public bodies be responsible.
- A question was raised whether it could be recommended that government make changes to the legislation to allow inspection to be part of the instrument. The example of an owner of large systems having to comply with inspections every 5 years was outlined. A recommendation was given to think about asking for a change in legislation to include inspection requirements.
- A problem with re-inspection programs is they do not take changing design standards into account. Wording to read “*System must function to standard it was designed to or better*” but old functioning septic systems should not be held to meeting current design standards. Upgrading to current design standards may not be possible for some. However, if a system requires replacement it needs to be to current higher standards.
- If inspection fails it is up to the approving agency and system designers to determine the options in dealing with it. Options such as advanced treatment systems with tertiary treatment or raised beds may also be looked at.
- It was noted that a system under 10, 000 liter a day and located on two properties requires C of A, under Ontario Water Resources Act.

Policy #2 Expanding, future or existing septics subject to OWRA

- SPC can include specific conditions for current and future systems but cannot include re-inspection requirements.
- The SPC agreed to that leaving it to the Ministry to ensure the threat is managed such that it does not become significant, is sufficient.
- It was recommended through strategic policy that the MOE prioritize significant threats within the 4 year inspection program.
- More detail can be added as the committee continues to work on policies.
- A C of A will cover landowner's due diligence.
- Monitoring policy will occur annually to coincide with our responsibility to report to the MOE. We do not have to report after first year of plan, but after second year we do. Report annually thereafter and the report should include how threats were addressed.
- A comment was made to ensure municipalities are in the loop of communication. Website will also make these policies available to the public as well.

Policy #3, Expanding and future septics subject to OWRA

- After a discussion the SPC agreed these systems should be discouraged rather than prohibited in a vulnerable area to offer some flexibility and not be so prescriptive.
- By being less prescriptive it allows the approval agency to take into consideration the configuration on the site, design, etc to maximize safety.
- This policy focuses on the Ministry's issuing of C o A's.
- Link with Policy #2 to rules around existing systems to offer same level of protection.
- Policy tool needs to be changed to "*specified action*" and not identified through a "*prescribed tool*" (conform).

Policy #4, Existing, septics subject to Ontario Building Code

- Existing septic systems under 10,000L/day fall under Ontario Building Code; those identified as a significant threat are now required to be inspected every 5 years.
- Wording changed to reflect the original design standard as opposed to the current applicable design standard as was suggested for wording of Policy #1, unless the septic system is being replaced.
- It was asked who would pick up the costs? Municipalities will pick up the cost but are permitted to charge a fee to recover their costs.
- It was asked whether the inspection required for tertiary treatment systems by suppliers could be accepted rather than requiring a separate inspection. The building code does allow the inspector to accept a certificate from the suppliers inspection, but it needs to be in a form approved by Municipal

Affairs and Housing and be signed by a qualified person as set out in the regulation.

- Grey water systems also fall under this category. If a system was put in years ago and could cause a significant threat, and the threat is not managed by the system it needs to be upgraded.
- It was highlighted that the *Source Protection Planning Bulletin – Threats related to on-site sewage (septic) systems*, on page 3 speaks to the details of the Inspection program.
- Old systems can work well and new systems fail at times. A new resident may not know where the tank is. If the tank cannot be found then it moves on to Phase 2 of inspection.
- There is a concern that legal enquiries are becoming less stringent. There is greater reliance on title insurance issue. There are no records in some areas.
- A question of process relating to the annual reporting and the role of the SPA was asked. The CA staff will compile the monitoring information into a report and provide to the SPC before being submitted to the MOE.
- The possibility of specifying a Policy requiring a re-inspection prior to transfer of property discussed. There was some discussion that there was no trigger that could be used by a municipality to make this mandatory? Valerie M'Garry and Teresa McLellan will report back on this. Education and Outreach was noted as another method to encourage inspections to happen prior to taking ownership of a property rather than making in required.

Policy #5 Existing, septic subject to the Ontario Building Code

- Ontario Building Code allows for discretionary inspection programs for moderate and low threats and this policy supports this.
- This policy applies to all land use not just residential, agriculture. Future implementation schedule was added as a placeholder once the required business is completed.
- Policy tool would be “*other specified action*”

Policy #6 Future, septic subject to the Ontario Building Code

- Policy 6 looks at future septic systems under Building Code/land use planning. Official plan policies must consider that they do not become significant risk.
- We received a comment that there may not be provincial guidelines in terms of lot size therefore it was suggested that it be reworded to be in accordance with “accepted standards”.
- The Implementation schedule was discussed and reads to be *updated within 2 years of the SPP*. Municipal planners were asked and agreed it was best not to wait until a comprehensive update is completed. Municipalities can start as soon as policy is available to incorporate language into their plans. It was

agreed to change time frame to *“Initiate process within 6 months from Source Protection Plan approval with goal of completion within 2 years.”*

- There was some discussion around whether bylaw changes should be on the same schedule or delayed as was suggested in the proposed policy. The wording will be *“included in official plan/zoning by-laws.”*

Policy #7, Future, all septics

- We are suggesting new septics be discouraged but does not change standards already in place.
- Language needs to be clarified in terms of using minimum lot size rather than restriction. Also, change allowable land use to permissible land use,
- It was also noted that the Municipal Act covers hook ups to sewers rather than the Planning Act.
- Can municipalities rely on science we have provided? The AR, once approved, establishes the areas and what is a significant threat. If a decision is appealed to the OMB who defends it? It was pointed out that some of the studies were done for the CAs while others were done for the municipalities. It is understood that the CA’s would be expected to participate in an appeal. It expected that the OMB would be considering whether the municipal decision follows the SP plan.

Policy #8 Existing and Future, all septics

- This policy requires mandatory hook-up of existing septics to municipal services.
- Land use planning is the incorrect policy tool. Rather it may fall under the Municipal Act. It may be that it is already required under the Municipal Act and therefore not necessary for us to have a policy. Ingrid will confirm
- Even if it is already mandatory, having an SPP policy may give municipalities something to stand behind.

The committee broke for lunch from 12:15 to 1:00 p.m.

Policy #9 Existing and Future, all septics

- Making recommendation that if Municipalities are putting in sewers to consider areas of risk as a priority. No changes.

Policy #10 Existing and Future, all septics

- Incentives were discussed. This could be recommended or as strong as conform. There are two phases of an inspection. Incentives may be received after Phase 1 but after an order, eligibility for incentives is unlikely.
- The question of fairness when it comes to two neighbors; one being in the significant risk area, having an advantage of receiving funding was discussed

- Mandatory municipal contributions may not be the way to go.
- Are we setting a trend? Concern with other areas/risks. The SPC may want to re-visit/re-consider the trends. Moving from lesser to more was suggested as a better way to proceed rather than starting out with more stringent policies and softening them later.
- Legal effect is “*strategic action*” we do not know if the stewardship funds will be there in the future.
- Some municipalities are already contributing to the UTRCA Clean Water Program since 1980’s.
- The possibility of using a have regard policy rather than a must conform policy was discussed. It would have to be conform unless you use “*strategic action.*”
- This purpose of this policy is as an incentive to get people to do things earlier within the 5 year period that the incentives would be available.
- It was suggested that the request for funding be voluntary and to be consistent with a voluntary program.
- Strategic action policy in which we strongly recommended that the municipalities support this type of program.
- It was noted that as a result of the Early Actions Program we are seeing more requests to replace septic early that may not need to be replaced yet. This points out the importance of the policy being carefully worded so that only work that is needed gets funded.
- Teresa McLellan indicated the legal affect is “conform.” It was suggested the policy recommend municipalities do this.
- If a property owner does not comply with needed improvements then compliance dates are implemented through an Ontario Building Code order.

Policy #11 Existing and future, all septic

- Softer policy and is more general. Recommended incentives are supported after Phase I inspection.
- Environmental Farm Plans is a Federal program which we do not have influence over but we will encourage this to continue offering added support.

Policy #12 Existing and Future, all septic

- Looks at education for significant, moderate and low risks, and is a strategic action policy.
- Combined 2 similar policies together to avoid having so many policies.
- Implementation schedule is a concern. Wording should be changed to indicate that the program be initiated for significant threats within 1 year.
- Who should be responsible for this was considered. The original draft indicated municipalities. A partnership with MOE, CA’s, municipalities and

health units was suggested. CA gets money from levy and has the ability to share costs already.

- Suggested one package could be developed for SWP messaging to be circulated across the region, building on existing septic education and outreach programs.

Policy #13

- Applies to all threats; not just septic.
- Monitoring policies will be strengthened and include other monitoring policies consistent with the CA/SPA requirements to report to MOE, including working with municipalities and other implementers to establish a suitable format/content for reporting.
- Tank pump-outs were discussed. There are provincial requirements for haulers. Hauled sewage is a separate sub-threat under the sewage threat and will be covered later under a separate discussion paper.
- As more pumping is encouraged it will be important that there is adequate capacity to treat the sludge.

c) Handling and Storage of Fuel background paper

Ingrid Vanderschot gave a presentation of highlights from the background document for Handling and Storage of Fuel. The SPPAC (Source Protection Policy Advisory Committee) has reviewed the document. The background paper format will be used for the first circulation to the SPC. Based on the initial discussions on the Background Paper the content will evolve into our own format for the discussion papers.

Discussion key points:

- Mobile tanks such as used on construction sites as well as for refueling equipment used in aggregate pits should be added to the list. They may be covered under private outlet category.
- A question of whether handling of fuel is a more significant threat than storage of it? The two cannot be separated and go hand in hand.
- A question was asked of the risks of a tank in basement. Is the basement considered secondary containment? Teresa McClellan will look further into this. It was also clarified that a tank in a basement is considered below grade as it impacts groundwater whereas TSSA considers this above grade as it is accessible for maintenance.
- Page 2 of 17 was highlighted and the committee was asked if describing in text vs. tables which captures most of concepts, is appropriate. The tables may complicate it. Tables could be included for the significant risks only were another option to consider.
- Moderate and low risks will be described using examples.

- A question of where bio-fuels fit in, was asked. Methane digesters were also highlighted as another concern. If blended with fuel, it may be covered under handling.
- Person distributing fuel is responsible to ensure it is going in a tank that meets standards.

A case study example was given of a proposal for a key/card lock gas station to be built in a WHPA A (score of 10) to generate discussion on what may need to be considered in policy development and reviewing the risks. Current standards and zoning as they exist today, would allow this card lock gas station to be built in the WHPA-A. Should the Source Protection Plan allow this to occur in the future?

A preliminary discussion followed which did not conclude with consensus around all aspects.

Key points during discussion:

- Part II of CWA allows prohibition of existing land uses as a last resort
- Risk Management Plans are also an option to be used to manage the risk of a fuel threat.
- The Land Use Planning tool may limit growth or changes. However, it does not manage the risk of existing land uses which can be considered legal non-conforming.
- A question of whether future gas stations should be prohibited in WHAP-A or B with a score of 10 was asked? If so should expanding and existing ones also be prohibited?
- The other question raised was to whether a Risk Management Plan can adequately manage the risk for existing fuel stations? And if so, can it be used to adequately address the risk for expanding and future gas stations within vulnerable areas with a score of 10?
- Consensus was to prohibit future fuel storage which would be a significant threat.
- Consensus was also to manage existing fuel stations with a Risk Management Plan. Although it was expressed by some that if there is an existing station, asking them to re-locate may be necessary.
- Consensus was not achieved on how to address expanding operations.
- It was suggested that it may be safer to have the risk managed within the vulnerable areas through a RMP than to have the fuel tanks installed across the road, (outside a source water vulnerable area) without any regulations or risk management plans.
- .Some viewed expanding as virtually the same as new and as such felt that expansion should be prohibited.

- Others suggested that an expansion may actually allow for the threat to be better managed. An expansion subject to a Risk management Plan could require upgrading to the highest spill containment standards and updating of all existing equipment to meet better standards. Requiring this Risk Management Plan for expanding operations may improve existing standards and reduce the risk to ground water contamination.

Ingrid will come up with a few more examples and discuss again. The committee was encouraged to email comments to Ingrid if there are more.

d) DNAPL background paper

The committee was asked to review the document and if they have any questions advise Ingrid. A question of whether the technical diagrams need to be included was asked. It was determined that they do not need to be in our discussion paper as the background paper will still be available and would have all of this detail in it. Linda Nicks gave a brief overview of what happens when DNAPL's are spilled and how they relate to common products such as mothballs and will expand on this at the next meeting.

a. MOE Technical Bulletins (Threats Related to on-site sewage septic systems)

Technical bulletins were circulated to the committee today and will continue to be as policy development continues.

8) In camera session

None

9) Other Business

a) Water Governance Research Project Survey

Hugh Simpson, a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Waterloo and a Hydrogeologist with Ontario Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs is conducting research on environmental decision making processes. As part of that research he has produced a survey. Hugh has asked for the assistance of SPC members in completing that research and specifically requested that they take the time to complete his survey. The web address for the survey will be circulated to the members by email. The members were asked if they had any concerns with Hugh being copied on the email going out to the members so that he has their email and the members will



have his in case they wish to contact each other directly. There was no concern over distributing the email in this manner.

10) MOE Liaison Report

Teresa McClellan reported the LT AR has been approved by the Ministry. It does not become official until the approval is posted on the EBR. It may take two weeks to a month. Until that time the approval is not be publically announced.

More MOE Bulletins are coming out. Teresa reported Bob's up for re-appointment and the Ministry is recommending he continue as the chair of the SPC.

11) Members Reports

In **Pat Donnelly** absence, Bob gave a report for him; CBC Marketplace did a great job of highlighting the scam artists that are going door-to-door locally (London) selling water purification devices to local residents. They use false claims and fear to get people to buy \$3,000 worth of filters under their sink (22 minutes show worth a look called "Clean Water / Dirty Tricks" on the web at: <http://www.cbc.ca/marketplace/2011/cleanwaterdirtytricks/>)

The Thames River, Clear Water Revival Charrette #2 is now confirmed for Feb 24 at Museum London. Invitations will be going out in the next several days.

Charles Sharina- advised people of the St. Clair Conservation 50th anniversary. He asked for an update on wind turbines. It was reported staff received an inquiry about the cumulative affects on many turbines on aquifers. This will be looked into prior to responding to the inquiry. There was also a request made to CAs encouraging CA's to not let turbines be built. Conservation Ontario is preparing a response which indicates that CAs must stick to their mandates and cannot prevent their construction except under limited circumstances.

Jim Reffle- Floride in water pointed out that the addition of fluoride to water is becoming a hot issue in London. It was identified that this is more of a treatment issue than a source water protection issue although there is naturally occurring fluoride in many of the wells in the region. .

Bob Bedggood- The committee needs to be looking at ways to cover the work efficiently in the months ahead and this may result in more meetings days especially in May, June, July. It was suggested that the day before the planned SPC meetings may be used as a subcommittee meeting to review and comment on materials.

Bob also reminded the members that as quorum was not achieved the notes from this meeting will be used to report to the SPC at its next meeting, at which time the SPC will be asked to consider the decisions made by this sub-committee.



12) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. Next meeting is scheduled for March 4, 2011. It was pointed out that this date was scheduled one week earlier than normal to avoid the Friday before the March break.