



Thames – Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: March 4, 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	
	a. Sub committee minutes from February 11, 2011	
	5. Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
	6. Business arising from the minutes	9:15
	a. Cross jurisdictional issues in planning stages	
	b. SCRSPA amended proposed AR status	
	7. Business	
	a. Election	9:30
	b. Handing and Storage of Fuel discussion paper	
	c. ASM and Commercial Fertilizer background papers	
	d. Letters from Saugeen/Bruce	
Lunch		12:00
	e. DNAPL Presentation	
	f. DNAPL background paper (previously circulated) and preliminary Policy considerations	
	8. Information	3:00
	a. MOE Technical Bulletins (Nutrient Management Instruments)	
	9. In Camera Session	
	10. Other business	
	11. MOE Liaison report	
	12. Members reports	
	13. Adjournment (next meeting April 8, 2011)	3:30



Meeting Materials

Agenda Item	Description
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 11, 2011 subcommittee minutes
6a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on cross jurisdictional concerns
7b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Handling of Storage of Fuel discussion paper
7c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASM background paper Commercial Fertilizer background paper
7d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrient Management Act & Environmental Farm Plan Program letter Motions from Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Committee
8a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MOE Technical Bulletin on Nutrient Management Instruments



SPC MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 4, 2011
Meeting #36

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. on March 4, 2011 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority (SCRCA) Boardroom. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members

Bob Bedggood	Sheldon Parsons
Murray Blackie (SPA Liaison)	Darrell Randell
Brent Clutterbuck	Charles Sharina
Dean Edwardson	Patrick Sobeski
Pat Feryn	John Trudgen
Paul Hymus	John Van Dorp
Carl Kennes	Joe Van Overberghe
Joe Kerr	Darlene Whitecalf
George Marr	Teresa McLellan (Provincial Liaison)
James Maudsley	
Don McCabe	
Doug McGee	
Earl Morwood	

Regrets:

Kennon Johnson	
Pat Donnelly	Joe Salter
Valerie M'Garry	Augustus Tobias
Jim Reffle (MOH Liaison)	

Staff:

Steve Clark	Chitra Gowda
Chris Tasker	Brian McDougall
Deb Kirk	Rick Battson
Ingrid Vanderschot	Bonnie Carey
Teresa Hollingsworth	Derekica Snake
Ralph Coe	
Linda Nicks	Melissa Sherran (Oxford County)

1) Chair's Welcome

Bob Bedggood welcomed the committee. He indicated that a quorum had not been met and the meeting would commence with round table introductions for the new member George Marr and agenda items not requiring quorum. Bob noted Darlene Whitecalf, John Trudgen and George Marr participated in an orientation session February 28th

Agenda Item 12, Members reports;

Joe Kerr: reported travelling to the United States recently and noted the Americans look at water differently due to the water shortage there, showing pride in their watershed and what they have done to protect it.

Don McCabe: gave a report on a climate change workshop he attended in Cancun, Mexico. He noted the issues relating to water appear to be in realm of climate change along with oil and food. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture, in concert with other groups, held a water innovation forum at the Ivey School of Business to look at water issues. Concerns were highlighted through presentations from MNR, MOE and OMAFRA which will result in a document for future release. Don noted the green initiatives by companies globally, highlighting Pepsi Co. as working with farming communities in United Kingdom to reduce the greenhouse gases by 50% and a 50% reduction in irrigation water within the next five years. He also noted how it took a large company like Walmart to demand that water content in detergent be reduced to reduce their shipping costs while benefiting the environment. In relating these issues to the SW process, Don relayed it will be important to be transparent and not leave room for misinterpretation.

Charles Sharina- reported there was a lower court decision of allowing wind turbine activity to proceed on land but not water. He noted the metals mined in China, in the wind turbines magnets have been reported to be contaminated.

7e. DNAPL Presentation

Linda Nicks gave a presentation on DNAPLS as requested by the committee, to have a higher level of understanding of them. Presentation key points included:

- DNAPL's are a significant threat described as chemical compounds that are denser than water and do not dissolve readily in water,
- DNAPL's are listed as Threat #16 in the MOE list of prescribed drinking water threats and Handling and Storage in WHPA-A, B and C with any vulnerability score are a significant threat.

- The history of DNAPL's was outlined,
- Most common types and examples were discussed,
- What DNAPL's look like and how they behave in the ground was illustrated,
- The most common DNAPL's found at contaminated sites was described,
- Common uses for coal tar, a common DNAPL, was outlined,
- Another well known DNAPL, PCB's, was discussed including how they can be cleaned up.
- Many DNAPL's are suspected or proven human carcinogens (cause cancer).

Discussion:

- Are DNAPL's near the wells in this area where there is a slope on the bedrock a concern? DNAPL's generally travel in same direction as groundwater but the density of DNAPL's allows the contaminant to move in a different direction from groundwater as the contaminant can follow the bedrock topography. There is safety built into the 100 meter circle. As DNAPL's dissolve very slowly in water the concentration of one part per billion which equals approximately ½ teaspoon contaminant in the volume of water in a municipal water tower can contaminate an aquifer.
- A question of whether the biological treatment process works was asked. Biological methods at this point are the best technology. NASA has also come up with chemicals to scrub the DNAPL through the sediments. It needs to be treated and there always is hope on the horizon to be able to clean it up contaminated sites.
- Are there problem areas in our watershed? DNAPL's do exist in this watershed. It has not been identified as a drinking water issue in our region, but does not mean it could not be identified in the future. Due to the nature of the material it takes time to get into the aquifer and show up in the water at the well. In a well field in the not too far from the region, it took more than twenty five years for TCE to show up in the drinking water and prevent the use of that source without very expensive treatment.
- DNAPL's are in the Great Lakes, surface and groundwater. Although DNAPL's have been identified in Port Stanley harbor, testing at the intake near the harbor indicates the DNAPL's are not showing up in the drinking water source as they are bound in the soil.
- Concerns were noted by a committee member about DNAPL's outside the IPZ2 in Sarnia. Dean Edwardson reported DNAPL's were disposed of in cavern storage. Clean Harbors stopped deep well injection and the wells were closed in 1988.
- The Ministry of Environment has information as to where DNAPL's disposal or storage has occurred, such as PCB sites. Invasive methods for cleanup may mobilize DNAPL's,



making the situation worse. A notable example was the disposal of waste transformer oil at Westinghouse, London.

A quorum was reached at 10:10 a.m allowing the Source Protection Committee meeting to begin.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

An additional *Item 6.c* was added to the agenda to discuss the draft notice of source protection plan preparation.

Moved by Jim Maudsley-seconded by Charles Sharina

“RESOLVED that the agenda be approved as amended.”

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

There were no delegations.

4) Minutes from Previous meetings

Bob asked the members present for the sub-committee meeting to consider the minutes circulated in their package

Moved by Darrell Randall-seconded by Brent Clutterbuck

“RESOLVED that the February 11th, 2011 SPC sub-committee meeting minutes be approved.”

CARRIED.

The SPC was asked to consider the actions/decisions of the “*sub-committee*” of the February 11, 2011 meeting.

Moved by Dean Edwardson-seconded by John Trudgen

“RESOLVED that the February 11, 2011 sub-committee meeting decisions be endorsed by the SPC.”

CARRIED.

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

a) Cross jurisdictional issues in planning stages

Brian McDougall gave an update on cross jurisdictional issues. A report is being developed in chronological order outlining the types of communication that have taken place. The staff has attended meetings with the Great Lakes Observing System, Water Treatment Plants and is working with First Nations to gather information from them.

Darlene Whitecalf gave an update. As a newly appointed member she relayed that she is working to get up to speed on the issues and the challenges ahead. She identified the First Nations maintain that they are governed by Federal regulations, not Provincial statutes and each nation is governed by their own by-laws. Darlene acknowledged and told the committee that she supports the work the SPC is doing and she will endeavor to enhance communications and information transfer between the SPC and will bring forward information to the First Nations. She plans to meet with the Chiefs to advocate for the approval of participation in ongoing studies. Chippewa of the Thames and Delaware Nation have agreed to this. A letter was drafted by Robert Olivier to encourage the First Nations to approve work and Darlene indicated advocating for them to implement by-laws to support good neighbor-ship and apply similar regulations within the First Nations. The First Nations two year election cycle poses a challenge with frequent changes in council. Darlene acknowledged Derekica Snake's support and future assistance from Robert Olivier's replacement.

The main driving force behind the cross jurisdictional concerns is what is happening on the Lake St. Clair River corridor and the lines drawn on the map in areas which we do not have jurisdiction, Michigan and St. Anne's Island (part of Walpole Island First Nation) and the mapping of these areas which fall within identified Intake Protection Zones. Currently, these areas are identified are shown as with cross hatched lines. It was noted that if lines are drawn in the First Nations areas without being endorsed by band councils, there it may be a set back in the growing relationship with the Region's First Nations and potentially impact the relationships between the First Nation and the farmers who rent agricultural lands within the area. It was noted patience is important and First Nations Committee members will continue to assist staff in moving forward to mapping these areas with First Nations acceptance. Cross hatched lines will remain on the maps until the First Nations is comfortable in moving forward. Continuing the

ongoing GUDI work with the Chippewa and Delaware First Nations and attempting to engage Walpole Island First Nations will continue to develop the needed relationship.

Darlene advised the committee if farmers who rent land in the First Nations areas and take part in studies may be at risk of not having renewable land leases if this is forged through without band council approvals. She also noted she was appointed by the London District Chief's Council and can bring issues forward for discussion with them.

b) SCRSPA amended proposed AR Status

The SCRCA apAR was posted and submitted to the Ministry of Environment for approval. Bob announced Chitra Gowda accepted a position with the Essex Region Conservation Authority. She will continue assisting with the Assessment Report work through an agreement between Chris and the Project Manager at ERCA.

c) Notice under Ontario Regulation 287/07 drinking water source protection plan preparation

Under Ontario Regulation 287/07 drinking water source protection plan preparation notification of landowners who are identified as having threats in vulnerable areas is required. The *draft* letter was discussed at the previous SPC meeting and re-circulated to the committee electronically for any further input. The updated version of the letter was distributed today and reviewed. Once approved, the letters will be sent out early next week. There are approximately seven hundred and fifty letters being mailed to landowners. The package will include the letter, a chart of significant threats around municipal wellheads, a list of prescribed instruments, a questionnaire of whether they are using any prescribed instruments and a self addressed envelope to return it. If the person rents the property they are asked to forward the information to the property renter if it is the renter who may be engaged in the threat activity. Stewardship program information will also be included. A letter will be sent to the municipalities and First Nations in the region to advise them of the process. The landowner letter will be included.

A motion to approve the letter with the incorporated changes was brought forward.

Moved by Jim Maudsley-seconded by Dean Edwardson

“RESOLVED that the letter be approved with the changes recommended by the SPC and mailed out to the landowners.”

CARRIED.

7) Business

a) Elections

The election for the vice-chair and recording secretary proceeded. The CWA does not allow for a position of Vice-Chair however, the committee made the decision to appoint one in the event that Bob is absent. In the absence of the Chair, the committee would approve the Vice-Chair to act as chair though a motion prior to the meeting.

A motion was brought forward nominating Dean Edwardson as Vice Chair.

Moved by Jim Maudsley-seconded by Doug McGee

“RESOLVED that Dean Edwardson be the SPC Vice-Chair for the next term.”

CARRIED.

A motion was brought forward to re-nominate Earl Morwood as the in-camera Secretary.

moved by Charles Sharina-seconded by Joe Van Overberghe

“RESOLVED that Earl Morwood continue as the in-camera Secretary.”

CARRIED.

b) Handling and Storage of Fuel Discussion Papers

A Draft Handling and Storage of Fuel Threat Policy Discussion Paper was circulated. Ingrid opened the discussions and indicated the paper has intentional gaps to illicit ideas and generates discussion. She noted through the process additional technical expertise may be required.

Key points during discussion:

- Under #5 Policy Considerations on Page 8, the 4th bullet point was highlighted as being new. It was pointed out that the larger volumes of fuel

storage and underground tanks are greater drinking water threats. The MOE threat volumes are based on tank sizes and not on frequency of refills.

- Clarification of the terms was given. The CWA uses the terms above, below or partially below grade whereas the TSSA uses the terms below or above ground. Basement tanks are considered differently by TSSA than by CWA due to the ability to inspect a tank in a basement being more similar to the above ground tank. The CWA however considers where the spill is likely to impact and therefore considers them below ground storage. A question of whether basements with or without drains should be considered differently? This is not part of the definition of this threat rather a consideration in how it is managed.
- Geothermal applications do not fit under this; they are not defined as having fuel.
- Proposed policy ideas in the table on Page 9 were reviewed.
- Moderate drinking water threats are possible in: Wellhead Protection Areas A, B and C with a vulnerability score of 8 or greater; and intake protection zones with a vulnerability score of 7 or higher. Moderate threats can occur in the IPZ1 of LAWSS, Town of Petrolia, Wallaceburg, Wheatley emergency, West Elgin Emergency and the IPZ2 of Wallaceburg. The Sarnia Yacht Club located in the IPZ-1 of LAWSS and a marina is considered a moderate drinking water threat, as outlined on Page 2.
- A question of what types of pipelines are being referred to on Page 8, under Gaps in existing legislation, policies and programs was asked. There is Federal legislation once pipelines cross water. Joe Van Overberge will provide further information.
- The question of where portable tanks fit in was noted. The TSSA (Technical Standards Safety Authority) does the inspections.
- The third gap listed waste oil not used as fuel is not considered in the Table of Drinking Water Threats; it is regulated under MNR through Oil, Gas, and Salt Resources Act. Waste oil is not a fuel so it is not considered under this threat rather it fits with the waste management threat.
- Under the Municipal Operations/Infrastructure table on Page 10, bullet 3, a committee member who is a volunteer firefighter made note of fire prevention officers most likely will not take part in educating residents and business owners about spill containments.
- A discussion occurred relating to Appendix B-draft policies, number 15-2. A concern was made of the draft policy *“No new bulk plants or refineries shall be located in a vulnerable area with a score of 10”* and *“Bulk plants and refineries should be discouraged in WHPAs with a vulnerability score of 6 or*

higher and in IPZs with a vulnerability score of 4.8 or greater” and the use of the policy tool- prohibition. It was noted it is difficult to go from the conceptual versus reality when the information is in the document. It was explained that the draft policies are ideas for consideration only at this point and there will be an Explanatory document outlining how decisions were made. In developing policies, it was agreed to separate Appendix B out to air within the committee first to avoid the misunderstanding of it being policy and it will be re-named worksheet to offer more clarity. Draft policies will be called policy options, the policy number will be policy example number and the policy itself will be renamed as policy recommendation. Transparency was noted as important in how decisions are finalized.

- Working groups and sub-committee meetings are options to work through some of the Threats Policy Discussion Papers. The extra meetings will allow for hashing the details out before presented to the SPC for further discussion. Technical expertise could be solicited for some of the threats where more information is required. This would not be necessary for all threats, such as in the agricultural threats whereby committee members can provide expert information. The SPC would appoint the working group chairs and approve the Terms of Reference. Other committee members could attend if they wish.
- A working group for the Handling and Storage of Fuel was discussed. Someone from TSSA, a fuel distributor and staff from MOE spills would be invited.

Items suggested though the discussion also included;

- The draft policies need to clearly indicate it is a *Draft* document.
- SPC consensus needs to occur when policies are finalized and the committee needs to feel comfortable with the decisions.
- The goal of the SPC is to mitigate significant risk.
- Interpretation in wording needs to clear, concise.
- Formal motions will be passed for each policy as it changes from a policy option to a draft policy.
- Stakeholder forums may be necessary to get to those who are affected, at a later stage.
- The committees across the province are being encouraged to seek out provincial experts to ensure there is consistent messaging across the province.
- Provincial Bulletins and background papers are crucial to the process.
- Eliminated policy options will be included to show that they were considered.



A “*Handling and Storage of Fuel working group*” was discussed further. A Motion was brought forward to nominate Dean Edwardson as chair and Joe Van Overberghe to participate. Policy ideas will be reported back to the SPC for endorsement.

Moved by Darrell Randall-seconded by Doug McGee

“RESOLVED that a Handling and Storage of Fuel threat working group be formed with Dean Edwardson as the chair and Joe Overberghe to participating.”

Amendment to Motion: Dean Edwardson indentified his role of chair as a potential conflict of interest. As a result Joe Van Overberghe will be the Chair and Dean Edwardson will participate as an alternative chair. This amendment was seen as a friendly amendment to the motion. Joe Kerr asked to participate and a staff lead will be assigned.

Motion CARRIED as amended.

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

c) ASM and Commercial Fertilizer background papers

Ingrid Vanderschot presented on Threat # 3 and 4 ASM (Application and Storage of Agricultural Source Material) and Threat #8 and 9 (Handling and Storage of Commercial Fertilizer).

Key points during presentation:

Threat # 3 and 4 ASM (Application and Storage of Agricultural Source Material)

- The treat was described as materials making their way into surface water and groundwater from: the application of ASM’s to land and storage of: manure, runoff, wash water, organic materials, anaerobic digestion output and regulated compost.
- ASM’s significant threats were reviewed. WHPA A or B with a vulnerability score of 10 as a pathogen or nitrogen, application and storage of ASM in WHPA-E with vulnerability score of 9 and WHPA-E with vulnerability score of 8.1.

- Understanding the nature of the threat needs to take managed lands, livestock density, total phosphorous, nitrogen's and pathogens into consideration.
- A question was asked of whether greenhouses fit into this. They could be considered by the organic material output and could pose a threat.
- A table was reviewed of the scope of ASM threats in this region. Clarification was given on how the data was collected. A property is counted as a location.
- Applicable policies were outlined.
- Policy Option considerations were reviewed.
- Livestock density was explained and the maps in the AR were referenced.
- Composting storage building standards have improved, and a note made of Oxford County now requires cement floors and a roof.
- Currently livestock burial is not considered a prescribed threat. One SPC is looking at applying to have it added as a local threat.

Threat #8 and 9 (Handling and Storage of Commercial Fertilizer).

- Commercial fertilizers were defined as a synthetic substance containing one or more plant nutrients and primary plant nutrients include nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium and can contain supplements such as lime or gypsum.
- The term synthetic will be removed from the discussion paper if not sourced in the MOE definition in prescribed instruments.
- Nitrogen, total phosphorous make their way into surface and groundwater from application or fertilizer to land or spills resulting from storage and handling of fertilizers.
- The application of commercial fertilizers and handling and storage are a significant threat in WHPA A or B with vulnerability score of 10 and WHPA E or IPZ with vulnerability score of 9, application of fertilizer is considered a significant threat, but not the handling and storage of.
- Table of threats in this region were reviewed, a total of 56.
- A question was asked as to why the number of locations of application of commercial fertilizer in Oxford was significantly different from ASM (18 compared to 3). ASM are applied to agricultural properties whereas commercial fertilizer can also be applied to other types of land. Also ASM takes livestock density and managed lands into account. It was noted that the background paper indicates that it is also considered for commercial fertilizer. Whether it is a significant threat goes back to the definitions from MOE of what the circumstances is that make it so. ASM's and commercial fertilizers are two different threats and the mapping circumstances that applied to threats are also different.
- Commercial fertilizer have the same applicable policies as ASM's with additional policies under Canadian Food Inspection Agency, the Fertilizer Act

and Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, Canadian Fertilizer Industry Storage and Handling Guidelines and Golf Course Best Management Practices. The Ontario Water Resources Act applies to commercial fertilizer as well.

- A comment of whether fertilizers in seasonal storage and transport are being counted? It is unlikely that this would have been included in the inventories.
- It was also suggested that Municipalities can regulate seasonal sales and could establish safe zones. This will be included in policy consideration.
- Is liquid application considered differently than granular? There is a different approach in terms of storage/spills. This will be clarified in the policy consideration stage and added to the discussion paper.
- Dave Buttonham of Ontario Agriculture Business Association was identified as a person to obtain further information from on policies. Retail stores will have fertilizer standards. Farmers work under margins and the issue becomes using best storage, best pricing at the time. It was identified that they usually do not use more than necessary due to cost.
- Recreational/lawn care companies will also be considered under commercial fertilizer.

Policy Options were reviewed.

- Under *Education and Outreach* a bullet point will be added promoting matching nutrients applied to the crop usage and including educational tools to support this.
- In second bullet point BMP will be included to tie into other industries; encompassing land uses other than just agriculture.
- Under *Land Use Planning* a question of why new storage would be prohibited and existing storage allowed? Municipalities have the ability to prohibit and the SPC has options such as requesting prohibition as mandatory or can ask to discourage.
- A question of which act takes precedent was asked. The CWA wording indicates the Act that most protects the water is the one that trumps others. It may be possible that the Nutrient Management Act is an exception. Chris will verify this.
- Under incentive programs there are existing programs that the list should be expanded.
- Buffers are considered an important item due to long term loss of income that needs to be considered.
- A note was made of the background paper information being different than the presentation. The background paper highlights Manitoba Water Stewardship, using 15 meter buffer zones and this was removed due to not being relevant to our area. Teresa McClellan reported the background documents are simply

drafts put together centrally as a method to gather information intended to start discussion and are still under review.

- A Best Management Practices for Farm Drainage document is being put together by OMARFA and is due out April 2011.
- Season and the volume stored should be considered. (i.e., during spring application season).
- A question was asked of whether the SPC can request an intake be moved in an area where nitrate levels are high, rather than recommend buffers strips to be put in. In this same area, it was asked if the sewage plant discharge can be moved. A policy requiring these relocations would be beyond the scope of the Source Protection Plan, however the municipality could weigh the relative merits of this compared to the policies included in the SPP. The question posed in this discussion paper is the application of nutrients for the growth of plants? The focus of the Source Protection Committee at this point is to address threats being discussed in the papers.

d) Letters from Saugeen/Bruce

The Thames, Sydenham and Region SPC was asked to consider endorsing the motions SPC-11-133 and SPC-11-134 passed at the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula SPC meeting. The first motion requested that OMAFRA amend the Nutrient Management Act allowing for the requirement of an approved Nutrient Management Strategy/plan for livestock operations with over 5 nutrient units in vulnerable areas. The second motion suggests the Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association and Environmental Farm Plan staff consult with MOE and DWSP to make modifications to the EFP to make it an acceptable Assessment and Action Plan for agricultural operations in vulnerable area.

The committee discussed and considered each of the motions presented and the decision was made to not endorse them. For the first motion, the decision was based on recognition that the amount of time and province-wide stakeholder involvement required to re-open the NMA was formidable and concerns that the NMA might then be subject to other changes. The second motion, regarding the EFP, was determined to be based on inaccurate assumptions about the EFP's governance and mandate and was therefore not supported.

The Thames-Sydenham SPC decided that policies using existing tools, such as Risk Management Plans, can offer greater flexibility and be written to incorporate the principles of the Nutrient Management Strategies/Plans and the Environmental Farm Plan in such a way that will adequately manage agricultural drinking water threats while maintaining a reasonably consistent standard for farmers.

A motion was brought forward to not support the motions SPC-11-133 and SPC-11-134 passed at the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula SPC. The committee considered filing the request but determined that they need to let the proponents know that they did not agree with their proposal.

Moved by Jim Maudsley-seconded by Charles Sharina

“RESOLVED that the motions SPC-11-133 passed at the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula SPC meeting not be supported by this committee.”

CARRIED.

Moved by Sheldon Parsons-seconded by Jim Maudsley

“RESOLVED that the SPC-11-134 passed at the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula SPC meeting not be supported by this committee.”

CARRIED.

Mike Traynor will be formally advised of the committee’s position on these motions.

e) DNAPL Presentation

The DNAPL presentation was given prior to the start of the SPC meeting.

f) DNAPL background paper

The DNAPL background was previously circulated and preliminary Policy considerations.

8) Information

a) MOE Technical Bulletin

The MOE technical bulletin on *Nutrient Management Instruments* was circulated for the member’s information.

9) In Camera Session

None.

10) Other business

No other business

11) MOE Liaison Report

No new updates.

12) Members Reports

The member's reports were given at the start of the meeting following the Chair's welcome.

13) Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April 8, 2011. Bob noted some of the results from the Handling and Storage of fuel working group may be available for the May SPC meeting. The committee agreed for the two agricultural papers discussed today, Ingrid will develop the worksheet, as opposed to calling draft policies and bring it to the next SPC meeting for review/discussion. Suggestions were made for more information on Best Management Practices the *Land Improvement Contractors of Ontario* is a good resource, as well as OMAFRA and OFA.