

Lake Erie Source Protection Region Guelph-Guelph/Eramosa Water Quantity Policy Development



Summary of Community Liaison Group Workshop June 26, 2018

7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
Victoria Park East Golf Club
1096 Victoria Rd. S., Guelph

Summary Prepared by Lura Consulting

1 Introduction

Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the workshop was to provide context and information about the technical studies that help guide the development of source protection water quantity policies, including the Risk Management Measures Evaluation Process (RMMEP) and Threats Management Strategy (TMS); to provide an update on the current status of the policy development process; and present the Water Quantity Discussion Paper. The workshop also provided a brief recap of the results of the Tier 3 Technical Study.

Background Materials

Liaison group members were provided the link to the Threats Management Strategy and Water Quantity Discussion Paper that were presented to the Lake Erie Source Protection Committee meeting on June 21st, 2018. The Tier 3 study, all previously shared documents, meeting summaries, and a copy of the CLG Terms of Reference remain available to members [online](#).

Meeting Format

The workshop opened with a welcome, agenda review, and introductions, facilitated by Susan Hall, of Lura Consulting and Martin Keller, of the Grand River Conservation Authority. Ms. Hall provided an overview of the May 23rd workshop. Mr. Keller provided a brief summary of the completed Tier 3 Technical Study results and a review of the Risk Management Measures Evaluation Process. The focus of the presentation was on the Threats Management Strategy, including the threats ranking, risk management measures analysis and results, as well as proposed risk management recommendations. He discussed both the municipal and non-municipal threats and the results of risk management scenarios.

A second presentation discussed the Discussion Paper and potential policy options, tools and frameworks.

2 Summary of Community Liaison Group Feedback

The following is a summary of the Community Liaison Group's questions and comments, provided after Mr. Keller's presentations. Questions are marked with a 'Q,' answers are marked with an 'A' and comments are marked with a 'C.'

Review of Technical Studies (Tier 3 Technical Study Results, RMMEP Process, and Threats Management Strategy)

Following presentations on the technical studies by Mr. Keller, Committee members asked the following questions:

- Q. Use of the dewatering water from Dolime Quarry is not listed as a risk management measure. Given that Dolime (River Valley Developments) is ranked third in terms of greatest percentage impact and is in competition with the Membro Well, will use of this water be considered?
- A. Use of the dewatering water isn't formally listed as an RMM but it is considered in one of the scenarios which considered increased pumping by the City and reduced takings by Dolime. However, from a treatment aspect, using any surface water as drinking water requires full treatment. The cost of treating surface water is three to four times the cost of groundwater. The City would like to try to capture the water as groundwater in a way that avoids the costs of enhanced treatment. The City is also working to address quantity and quality related to the quarry and the nearby municipal wells.
- Q. Who is responsible for the oversight of consumptive water taking? For example, if there is a drought scenario, who would address a large water taker to stop water taking? Is it the conservation authority (CA), the municipality, or the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP)?
- A. Coordinating and enforcing Permits to Take Water is the responsibility of the Province under the *Ontario Water Resources Act* and will remain so once source protection plan policies come into effect. The project team is working towards establishing a joint water management model, which is more about communication or collaboration between the government agencies rather than joint decision making. The joint management model could include the province, municipalities and the CA, to increase engagement, information sharing and discussion in local water management decisions. We are still at the development stages and will be reaching out to the parties in the next few months to a year. Existing responsibilities and enforcement of legislation for the municipalities, province and conservation authority will not change.
- Q. There is a Memorandum of Understanding between the MECP and CAs as to who is the lead or non-lead on source water protection. How does that factor in the decision-making process? I know that MECP is the decision-maker [relating to water taking permits]. What is the consulting period and comment period?
- A. Through regulation, the province recognizes the heightened interests of municipalities and conservation authorities in local water taking decisions and notifies them of any water taking applications in their areas. The province

considers any concerns raised through this comment process. Additionally, there is an established process through the Environmental Registry (<https://ero.ontario.ca/>) which provides opportunities for the public to comment on applications.

- Q. On your maps there are strong dividing lines between the Township of Guelph/Guelph-Eramosa and the Region of Waterloo. There are a number of permitted water takings along Highway 24 and the Speed River. How have the lines been drawn and threats to water quantity identified in one area versus another? Cambridge's wells are also along this line. Is there a duplication or overlap with what a neighbouring municipality will need to do? Is this process being done twice?
- A. There is a Tier 3 Study being done for Waterloo Region and there are other Tier 3 Studies occurring in southern Ontario. In our area, these have started as individual projects with borders defined by surface watersheds or known hydrogeologic features. When we found more information and determined the radius of influence on wells, the results showed there is an overlap. There was a lot of work done to make sure both Tier 3 models are consistent in providing results in the overlap area. The model shows the WHPAs are connected, but lines can be drawn based on the direction of flows as there is a natural groundwater divide in the area of the overlap.

When we look at drafting policy we have included the Region of Waterloo in the process through the implementing municipal group. There is also an Implementing Municipalities Working Group (IMG) as part of this project, that includes representatives from Waterloo and Halton regions. We established the IMG to address questions of overlap among others. We are also ensuring that municipalities that aren't system owners but are impacted also have input.

- Q. Does the buffer zone include Xinyi Glass?
- A. I'm unsure of how far the boundary extends. However, large water takers caution us to be current on our modeling. We will likely need to look at both models together to determine permits within the buffer zone.
- Q. There are a number of dams on the Eramosa and Speed Rivers. Eden Mills Millpond Conservation Association Inc. manage one dam with a permit. Do others have permits?
- A. MECP will confirm.
Added following the meeting: Permits to Take Water are only required for dams that were built or underwent substantive operational changes after the Ontario Water Resources Act came into effect in 1961. There are number of dams in the Grand River Watershed that exempt from PTTW requirements due to their age but

are subject to approvals under the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act overseen by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.

- Q. Eden Mills Millpond Conservation Association Inc. report water takings [relating to the dam permit] to the Ministry reporting center based on instruction. We were told by the ministry that they only wanted us to report flow-through, not water storage; is this what is required from all municipalities? Are dam water takings modeled differently than consumptive takings?
- A. Yes, dams are considered non-consumptive and therefore modeled differently than consumptive water taking. The information required from non-consumptive uses is consistent for all users.
- A. Water used in dams is not being removed from system. Controls are in place to ensure significant downstream flows.
- Q. With regard to the Threats Management Study, are the appendices available?
- A. At the time of issue, the appendices were too big to attach, but they are available on the website. Note: The Guelph-Guelph/Eramosa Threats Management Strategy and Water Quantity Policy Discussion Paper and appendices are available online on the [Water Quantity Policy Development Study](#) (located under the Guelph and Guelph/Eramosa Tier 3 page).
- Q. With regard to impacts, you said the project team looked at current, future and drought conditions for wells. How was this done for non-municipal takings? Which scenario was used for municipal wells? What was the baseline?
- A. The baseline was current conditions. Non-municipal takings were at current conditions.
- Q. Will non-agencies be able to obtain or see how that model works to use it themselves?
- A. The Project Team's vision is that the model could be available for different proponents to use in the future, however, the details about how that may work have not been worked out. Collectively, we feel it is a good use of the model.

MECP will confirm.

Added following the meeting: To support policy implementation, the project management team is developing a Tier 3 model management framework that will include a mechanism for the regulated community to access the model and/or data layers.

- Q. It's important to protect water recharge. The Green Belt is now being called the Blue Belt. Is this being taken into consideration? A simple way to protect recharge water is to develop an Oak Ridges Moraine Model.
- A. From a source protection perspective, we now know where we need to protect recharge and we know what we can do (e.g., policy tools). We will move forward to determine what that means in detail. This will include looking at how these lands develop moving forward. Municipalities will grow, but we want them to do so in a way that minimizes impacts on groundwater recharge.

The Wellington Official Plan already provides protection for the Paris-Galt Moraine through moraine specific policies.

3 Group Discussion – Promising Policy Tools

Following the presentation, participants were split into three small groups to discuss the promising policy tools and options available. The following is a list of discussion points raised by the group;

- The province and municipalities already have tools in place, but there is not enough enforcement;
- Third-party monitoring of water taking (rather than self-reporting by permit holders) may be required;
- Reuse should be considered over discharging dewatering directly to surface water;
- Increase stakeholder and public engagement in the discussion around PTTW issuance.
- Allow for public input in the permitting process;
- Should be priority of use for municipal and agricultural use first;
- Collaboration should exist between non-municipal large water takers that are of high interest similar is to what is done between municipalities. There is a significant amount of data collection that should be communicated;
- Questions around how effective policies in other Source Protection Plans have been; and

A number of members indicated they could not provide comments at this time as the Discussion Paper is at a higher level and further details would be required as there were some difficulties finding the documents. All members were encouraged to provide additional feedback on the promising policy tools following the meeting.

4 Closing

Follow-up

Participants were invited to direct any additional questions or comments to either Susan Hall (shall@lura.ca) or Ilona Feldmann (ifeldmann@grandriver.ca) by **July 13, 2018**.

More information about the Guelph-Guelph/Eramosa Tier 3 Water Budget and Risk Assessment, including technical reports, presentations, executive summary, existing FAQ, a project outline for the policy development study, and a glossary, are available at www.sourcewater.ca/GGET-Tier3

Next Steps

The project team will circulate a draft copy of the workshop summary. CLG members are to provide any feedback on the workshop summary within two weeks of receiving the draft.

Over the summer the policy framework and policy approaches will be drafted and presented to the Lake Erie Source Protection Committee on October 4, 2018. Drafting of water quantity policy text expected to begin in the early fall. The next CLG meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2018.