

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES
AS OF OCTOBER 6TH, 2008

Meeting #4 – Monday, April 21, 2008

Sun Gro Centre
Beausejour, Manitoba
10:15 am - 3:40 pm

1. Call to Order

Meeting #4 of the Southeast Regional Groundwater Management Plan (SRGMP) Group was called to order at 10:17 am on Monday, April 21, 2008 at the Sun Gro Centre in Beausejour, Manitoba by Cornie Goertzen, Chair of the SRGMP.

Present:

Last Name	First Name	Agency
Andrusiak	Julian	RM of Stuartburn
Benoit	Dan	Manitoba Métis Federation Inc.
Betcher	Bob	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Bodnaruk	Bob	RM of Springfield
Chapman	Paul	Town of Lac du Bonnet
Dugard	Mark	RM of Brokenhead
Evans	Laurie	RM of Ste. Anne - Vice-Chair of the SRGMP
Fontaine	Ronald	Sagkeeng First Nation
Goertzen	Cornie	Seine Rat River Conservation District - Chair of the SRGMP
Heppner	Neil	RM of Taché
Hinrichs	Albert	RM of Whitemouth
Holtmann	Henry	Dairy Farmers of Manitoba
Kalyta	Phil	City of Steinbach
Kopelow	Sacha	Manitoba Eco-Network
Krozkin	Alex	Sky Blue Water Inc.
Leclaire	Maurice	RM of Ritchot
Martel	Gordon	Pembina Valley Water Cooperative
Maynard	Gerry	RM of De Salaberry
McCulloch	Gabriele	Canadian Gold Beverages
McRae	Curtis	Keystone Agricultural Producers
Mihaychuk	Ron	RM of Franklin
Nedotiafko	Rob	Manitoba Water Stewardship - Coordinator
Oswald	Barry	Manitoba Water Stewardship - Lead Coordinator

Present (continued):

Last Name	First Name	Agency
Ould	Phil	Concerned Citizens of the RM of Piney and Buffalo Point
Parks	Candace	Manitoba Water Stewardship - Coordinator & Secretary
Riekman	Marla	Manitoba Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives
Ross	Marc	Cooks Creek Conservation District
Sadorski	Shane	Manitoba Cattle Producers Association
Sawka	Earl	RM of Piney
Schaible	Frank	Holds industrial water bottling license
Seniw	Jane	Devils Creek Watershed Coalition
Steinke	Glenn	Town of Beausejour
Stephens	Geoffrey	Manitoba Conservation
Summach	Dwayne	Manitoba Forage Council
Wruck	Gus	RM of Lac du Bonnet
Yosyk	Alvin	RM of Alexander
Young	Dave	RM of Reynolds

2. Acceptance of Proposed Agenda of Meeting #4

The proposed agenda was accepted.

Moved by Dan Benoit – Manitoba Métis Federation Inc.

Seconded by Albert Hinrichs – RM of Whitemouth

Carried.

3. Adoption of Minutes of Meeting #3

The preliminary minutes were accepted.

Moved by Paul Chapman – Town of Lac du Bonnet

Seconded by Shane Sadorski – Manitoba Cattle Producers Association.

Carried.

A concern was raised by Phil Kalyta, the representative from the City of Steinbach, that there was an error in a slide on page 11 of Rob Matthews and Kristina Anderson’s PowerPoint presentation titled *Water Use Licensing Process* given at the March 31, 2008 SRGMP group meeting. Phil mentioned that the annual allocation of groundwater for the City of Steinbach is currently 1,818 dam³, not 2,989 dam³ as indicated in the two

tables on the slide titled *Groundwater Use Licensing in Southeastern Region*.

ACTION: The Coordinators agreed to follow up on and clarify this information, reporting back to the Group at the next SRGMP meeting.

Candace Parks identified the six available handouts to be picked up at the door. These included:

- 1) Proposed meeting agenda;
- 2) Updated SRGMP Directory;
- 3) Updated Conversion Factor Table which included volumetric flow conversions;
- 4) A Summary of the Issues Identified by Workshop Participants in March 2008, stapled together with the verbatim Outline of the Issues Identified by Workshop Participants (March 2008);
- 5) Approved Method of Operations and Terms of Reference;
- 6) Updated Proposed Planning Process Timeline – SRGMP Group Members

Copies of the Science Member presentations were distributed to the SRGMP group just prior to their presentations.

- 7) Bob Betcher and Grant Ferguson's PowerPoint presentation titled Impacts from boreholes interconnecting multiple aquifers – A case study of Paleozoic aquifers in south-eastern Manitoba; and
- 8) Marla Riekman's PowerPoint presentation titled Agricultural landscapes and water quality.

Copies of the example management plans were handed out during agenda item 6d. They included:

- 9) Township of Langley Water Management Plan: Draft Report; and
- 10) Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan.

Preliminary meeting minutes from SRGMP Group Meeting #3 and the proposed agenda for SRGMP meeting #4 were emailed, faxed or mailed to the SRGMP Group on Wednesday, April 9, 2008.

Candace also mentioned that the actual chart papers obtained from the break-out group sessions from the four SRGMP public workshops held in March 2008 were available for viewing on the table at the back of the room. The identical information could be found in the verbatim Outline of the Issues Identified by Workshop Participants, March 2008 handout.

In addition, laminated copies of the front page and the page where the SRGMP public workshop advertisement was featured in each regional newspaper could be viewed on the back table.

A concern was raised by the Cooks Creek Conservation District that questions raised by the SRGMP Group during the science member's presentations were not recorded in the minutes. Barry Oswald replied that it was simply the degree of detail we had elected to capture in the minutes to date. However, it was decided that all the questions raised in the presentations should be recorded at least in short form.

The motion for questions directed at the Science Members during their presentations, and the Science Members answers to those questions, are to be recorded in the minutes. Accepted as presented – Carried.

4. Coordinators Report

Barry Oswald mentioned that this fourth meeting of the group may be the last one for this winter and he consequently wanted to briefly recap the planning process. He referred back to the PowerPoint presentation he gave at SRGMP Group Meeting #1 on January 21, 2008 in order to recap specifically on slide four of the presentation. The planning process was designed to have three steps;

1. Collect and study area's groundwater information (Science and Local);
2. Itemize and prioritize groundwater issues (SRGMP Planning Group and Public); and
3. Formulate management plan (Draft and Final).

Barry mentioned the SRGMP group is currently involved in the step of collecting and studying area groundwater information (step 1). He also mentioned:

- Each step includes significant work;
- Of the four meetings to date the first 1.5 meeting dealt with set-up administrative details and the following 2.5 meeting with bringing the initial science information to the table;
- Today the group would hear two additional science member presentations;
- Today's agenda item 6e would elaborate on the number of information presentations remaining;

- It is important the SRGMP group ask any questions they have of the science members while they are here and to think about what additional information should be brought to the table;
- The bulk of next winter's SRGMP group meetings will also be information gathering; and
- The importance of gathering all relevant information prior to embarking on step two, itemizing and prioritizing groundwater issues.

Regarding step two he mentioned:

- During the public workshops conducted this winter (March 2008), the public itemized the groundwater issues as they see them, this Group will do the same and agenda item 6b will elaborate on this;
- The issues prioritization task can best be tackled after the available information has been studied; and
- The SRGMP Group will likely have an entire meeting on the task of prioritizing the issues and deciding how to tackle them in the draft management plan.

Finally, regarding step three he mentioned:

- After the SRGMP Group agrees to a draft management plan it will be taken to the public in a set of workshops/open houses. The SRGMP Group will then evaluate the public's comments and appropriately incorporate them into what will then be the final groundwater management plan; and
- Item 6d will provide a couple of additional examples of groundwater management plans for your summer reading.

Secretariat's Report

Candace Parks addressed the following three points.

Agency Appointments of Representatives and Alternatives

1. Canadian Gold Beverages joined as a new SRGMP agency.
2. The Town of Niverville is officially auditing the SRGMP process.

Meeting Venues

3. Meeting #4 was to occur in Oakbank. However, complications in organizing catering for the day long meeting made the location not feasible. Steinbach was the second option but the 55 Plus Centre was not available. As a result, meetings #3 and #4 were held back-to-back in Beausejour. Over the summer break in the Group meeting schedule, Candace will investigate other catering options for Oakbank. It was suggested by a group member that Winnipeg

caterers could be arranged for Oakbank meetings. Candace replied that it preferred to use local caterers.

Bob Betcher asked the SRGMP Group if they were interested in written reports as supplemental background information for groundwater presentations. After some group discussion, Bob mentioned that he could get 10 reports together and create an annotated bibliography, and provide each agency with a CD containing this information. In addition, the CD could also contain mapping information contained within Bob's presentations as well as the overhead information presented by Rob Matthews prior to his PowerPoint presentation. It was suggested that the reports be placed online. Barry reminded the group that the Manitoba Water Stewardship (MWS) website would likely not be available for a few more months and once running the website would be the intended place to access this information.

5. Planning Process Considerations

Laurie Evans, Vice-Chair of the SRGMP Planning Group communicated the following points with regard to planning process considerations.

1. Number of SRGMP group meetings - is not a measure for the success of the plan. He stressed that in two+ years, many things will change and that surely the group can make a plan within the two year time frame and not drag the management planning process out too long.
2. Adhering to scope – Water, especially groundwater is an emotional issue. He emphasized that we must stay on topic; the plan can't include surface water issues such as Devil's Lake, Walkerton, drainage etc., because the interaction between surface and groundwater is not clear-cut. People living in the area must also realize that all water is a Crown resource; no individual has more rights to the water than anyone else despite where they live.
3. Science Members' Recommendations - Science Members need to tell the SRGMP Group, in layman's terms, their recommendations and the issues the management plan should address.
4. Final Groundwater Management Report – needs to be concise, include an executive summary, won't be as detailed as the science member presentations, and will likely be less than 100

pages. Everyone around the table has to take responsibility to ensure the plan is a success. Laurie mentioned that people have accused the SRGMP of not being inclusive, muzzling people and rubberstamping. He stressed that the plan must be inclusive; 53 local agencies participating in the process and workshops are the only input the plan will get from the public. The SRGMP group cannot waste time, and instead, everyone in the SRGMP Group must say “I participated” in the planning process to ensure the final plan makes a difference.

In response to Laurie’s presentation, several points were raised by SRGMP Group members:

1. It is important to worry about the timeline to ensure the plan is kept on track, but can’t prejudge surface impacts on groundwater and vice versa.
2. It needed to be said. Participating agencies need to go to the public to identify issues since the workshop attendance was minimal. Public are generally concerned when the impacts affect their pocketbook.
3. Should the SRGMP look at drafting a draft plan in the summer so that we can hit the ground running in the fall?

Laurie replied that although attendance was light at the public workshops, it is likely the SRGMP got a complete range of issues anyway. The largest misconception at the public meetings was that the public referred to “their water” which is not true because all water belongs to the Crown.

Cornie mentioned to the SRGMP Group that if anyone has an issue to bring it to the attention of the Coordinators to be put in the agenda for an upcoming meeting. He stressed that a brief, five minute presentation to the group can be very effective.

6. New Business

a. Science Members Presentations

- i. Bob Betcher - Manager, Groundwater Management, MWS made a PowerPoint presentation titled *Impacts from boreholes interconnecting multiple aquifers – A case study of Paleozoic aquifers in south-eastern Manitoba*.

Before his presentation, Bob made a comment that he was not going to provide the SRGMP Group with his recommendations per se and instead it was up to the SRGMP group to determine what the key recommendations should be to include in the management plan. Several questions were asked of Bob during his presentations - Questions (Q) and Answers (A) are as follows:

Q (Slide 7, page 4): Is it in the best interest of the public to have all wells interconnecting the two aquifers cased so that water does not flow between the formations?

A: Yes, because it removes the chance of water transfer between the carbonate and Winnipeg aquifers since water quality is different between the two aquifers. It is interesting to note though that water quality and water levels may also be different in vertically separated fracture zones within the Carbonate aquifer and an open hole in the Carbonate could also interconnect "aquifers".

Q (Slide 7, page 4): Do weather conditions influence water levels in the wells?

A: Yes, wells respond to changes in atmospheric pressure.

Q (Slide 13, page 7): Does soft water flow up the well until the pressure stabilizes?

A: Yes.

Q: What are the consequences of mixing of hard water from the carbonate aquifer with soft water from the Winnipeg formation?

A: Interconnection of the aquifers may introduce soft water (or saline water) into the Carbonate aquifer but if water levels in the sandstone decline then hard water from the Carbonate may flow down the well into the sandstone. In this case, owners may need to install a water softener to reduce the hardness.

Q: Could the Group get the maps in colour because it is difficult to determine the isobars in a black and white map?

It was decided by the group that the maps could be added to the CD that contains the background report information discussed earlier in the meeting.

A comment was made pertaining to slide 17 on page 9 that the province needs to ensure that information about salt water intrusion needs to be given to the right people, to ensure abandoned wells around Ile des Chênes are properly sealed since two to three salt water wells are discharging into a freshwater wells.

Q: Are fluoride and barium only located in areas with higher salt concentrations?

A: Fluoride is also found in soft water areas. Barium in the Winnipeg formation is not correlated to soft water but is found within an area extending from about La Broquerie to Blumenort.

Q: Why, since wells interconnecting multiple aquifers is not allowed under the Groundwater and Water Well (GWW) Act, does the province continue to allow these types of wells to be drilled?

A: Discussions in the past were along the lines “we already have up to 2,000 interconnecting wells so unless we are prepared to deal with those wells it would not be reasonable to require new well owners to pay additional money to install wells that separate the two aquifers”. This position has been undergoing a re-examination recently and it is likely that once the revisions to the Act and Regulations are complete that interconnecting wells will no longer be allowed. The issue of modifying the existing wells is a difficult one since this may cost up to \$4 million and a great deal of inconvenience to individual homeowners.

The comment was made that it was important to address this issue in the SRGMP management plan considering an expenditure of \$4 million to modify the approximately 1,500 uncased wells in the region is worth the effort to protect groundwater in the area.

-----Lunch-----

- i. Marla Riekman – Landscape Stewardship Specialist, Manitoba Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives made a PowerPoint presentation titled *Agricultural landscapes and water quality*.

Several questions were asked of Marla during her presentations – Questions (Q) and Answers (A) are as follows:

Q: What is the definition of “unimproved organic soils”?

A: Organic soils may be improved through drainage or removal of peat; however, there is no clear definition of “unimproved” vs. “improved” organics. Generally, if a producer is able to grow a crop on an organic soil, then it has been “improved”.

Q: How do we know how much P to add to fields if the total P found in soil is greater than 60 ppm, according to the Olsen P soil test method?

A: A field should never achieve 60 ppm because further application of manure will lead to adding more P than you need. The goal is to add the amount of P that can be removed by the plants and not to add too much. If a soil test exceeds 60 ppm (only likely on soils with a history of manure application), then P must be added based on the regulatory thresholds (2X crop removal of P₂O₅ (phosphate) if soil tests between 60 and 119 ppm Olsen P, 1X crop removal of P₂O₅ if soil tests between 120 and 179 ppm Olsen P, and no P application is allowed on soils testing greater than 180 ppm Olsen P). Following the regulation thresholds will result in a “balance” of soil test P at around 120 ppm Olsen P. At this level, only 1X the crop removal of P₂O₅ will be added to the soil, meaning that a producer adds the same amount of P as is removed in the crop year, so the soil test level should not increase.

Q: Is the presence of P in groundwater a concern?

A: No. Bob Betcher interjected that there are no phosphorus guidelines for drinking water. Barry Oswald mentioned that nitrogen is a greater concern from a water quality perspective.

Q: What does P do to a person then?

A: Bob Betcher – nothing from a drinking water perspective. For nitrogen, drinking water from a groundwater source cannot exceed 10 mg/L; a similar guideline does not exist for phosphorus.

Q: For Bob Betcher: Do nutrients leeching in the soil only impact the top layers and not the deeper aquifers?

A: Bob Betcher – Nitrate is stable in an oxidizing state which occurs in the upper part of shallow aquifers. If the nitrate goes deeper, it will naturally denitrify in sandy aquifers, providing a degree of natural protection. In fractured bedrock aquifers, nitrate may be more persistent.

A question was asked by a Group member about mapping nutrient concentrations as a way to see trends in manure management. There was some interest raised about accessing information in areas where manure management plans are registered and the location of intensive livestock operations.

Geoffrey Stephens, an Environmental Officer from Manitoba Conservation representing the Eastern Region, commented that some of this information was confidential.

Further to this, a SRGMP Group member mentioned that they would allow access to this information. Nevertheless, Barry commented that prohibition of this information is unfortunate for planning processes such as the SRGMP. He asked about the possibility of providing the producers a choice on whether to keep the information confidential, or to let their information be used for resource planning purposes.

Geoffrey said he would take this suggestion back to his supervisor to check on this possibility of this option in the future.

ACTION: Geoffrey agreed to clarify this issue and provide information to the Coordinators to report back to the Group at the next SRGMP meeting.

Bob Betcher also agreed to do a future presentation on water quality.

b. Issues Identification: Public Workshops and Agency Submission Request

Rob Nedotiafko discussed the handout that comprised two attached documents – the first titled “*Summary – Issues Identified by Workshop Participants, March 2008*”, the second titled “*Outline – Issues Identified by Workshop Participants, March 2008*”. The first document included the Coordinator’s summary of issues originally identified by members of the general public who attended SRGMP workshop in March 2008. The issues were summarized in relation

to four key headings or common themes. The second document outlined verbatim the priority issues that were identified by workshop participants. Rob mentioned that the Coordinators assured workshop participants that all the information compiled at the workshops would be taken to the SRGMP Group for review and consideration for incorporation in the draft plan.

The main summarized themes that came from the workshops were “Groundwater Quality”, “Groundwater Quantity”, “Management Actions & Strategies to Address Issues” and Plan Utilization/Implementation”.

In addition to asking about the issues, the participants were asked to identify strategies needed to address these issues and to determine potential solutions.

Rob mentioned to the SRGMP Group that this information was now in their hands to consider.

During the break in the SRGMP Group planning process (from May to late September 2008), Rob requested that each agency formulate and prioritize in *writing*, on agency letterhead, the issues that the management plan should address. Letters should be brought to the next SRGMP Planning Group meeting in October, 2008 or forwarded by mail or email to the Coordinators.

A small group discussion followed regarding the pros and cons of water use for bio-diesel.

c. Study Area Tour: Fall 2008

Rob discussed the possibility of organizing a tour of the study area in late September or early October 2008. Rob asked the Group how many Agency representatives would be interested in participating in such a tour. Roughly 20 SRGMP Group members expressed interest in the tour. Rob outlined that the tour would likely take a full day to complete, from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, originating from a pick-up/drop-off point in or near Winnipeg. The travel cost would be covered by MWS. Potential tour stops could include:

1. The Winnipeg Floodway;
2. The Bird's Hill area;
3. A quarry in Garson and Tyndall area;
4. The Sandilands area;

5. Observe active drill rigs and pumping test at provincial well sites; and
6. The City of Steinbach's groundwater supply system.

The tour would be limited to only one representative from each agency for efficiency and cost. A tour date of September 29th was agreed to by the Group and tentatively set.

Once the tour date and itinerary is confirmed and communicated to the SRGMP Group, Barry asked that everyone be diligent in RSVPing to either Rob or Candace so that MWS can be confident of the numbers.

Following the tour date, Rob then proposed that the next SRGMP meeting be held early in the month for the months of October, November and December. Starting in 2009, the SRGMP Group meetings would likely revert back to meeting dates in the latter part of the month for the months of January, February, March and April 2009.

d. Groundwater Management Plan Examples

Rob briefly presented two example management plans provided to the Group. The Assiniboine Delta Aquifer (ADA) plan was already included in the SRGMP binder. The two new plans included the "*Township of Langley Water Management Plan: Draft Report*" and the "*Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan*".

Rob explained that the purpose for providing these plans to the Group was to demonstrate groundwater management planning in other jurisdictions and to provide examples for how information is brought together in a planning process and compiled in a final management plan document. Rob mentioned that there are many examples of groundwater management plans online. The plans were chosen based on the amount of information incorporated, or addressed in each plan. For example the Sacramento plan is very detailed and is 134 pages long, in contrast to the Langley and the ADA plans which comprise 64 and 30 pages respectively. The ADA plan is the most general of all the three plans, Rob suggested considering the following questions when reading these plans.

1. How much information is addressed and incorporated in the Plans – background information, issues, management actions and strategies to address issues, approaches for plan implementation?

2. How will information for the SRGMP come together to form a final plan document?
3. How will issues and strategies and actions to address issues be addressed in the SRGMP?
4. Implementing the final management plan – what is to be done (management actions and strategies to address issues) by who, how, when and associated costs?

Addressing these questions, Rob drew the Groups attention to “*Table 1. Summary of the WMP Core Recommendations*” in the “*Township of Langley Water Management Plan: Draft Report*” which provides an example for how planning process information can be organized and presented in a final management plan. The table also illustrates legislation, policy or guidelines can be that corresponds to each key recommendation and in which year each recommendation would be implemented.

Rob suggested that, as a first generation plan, the SRGMP final plan will likely be less than 50 pages in length, possibly reflecting the limited extent of identified issues or the limited amount of regional groundwater resources information available at this time.

A Group member asked who was going to implement the final recommendations.

Rob replied that the final plan would be provided to the Minister of Water Stewardship and therefore, the ultimate decision to move forward with the management plan rests with the province. Bob Betcher interjected by saying that the plan should include actions that local groups can undertake and achieve because the province won't be able to do everything in the plan itself. Bob also commented that illustrating the participation of local groups in the plan will lead to increased “buy in” from the province for implementing the plan.

e. Planning Process Schedule: 2008/2009

Rob informed the Group that the proposed timeline for the SRGMP planning process has changed now that four Group meetings have been completed to date. He referenced the Updated (April 2008) Proposed Planning Process Timeline and forecasted that, considering the current schedule, the final management plan would be completed by April 2010.

There will be a total of 16 meetings in order to complete the process of bringing science members and local knowledge information to the Group, issues prioritization, and draft plan and final plan preparation. Rob asked which agencies would be interested in making a short, local knowledge presentation to the rest of the SRGMP Group. Five agencies expressed an interest.

As a next step, Rob asked all interested agencies to submit a formal request to Rob, expressing their intent to present, in order to properly prepare upcoming Group meeting agendas in the fall.

There was some discussion about the timeline and the target deadline. Barry hopes that the SRGMP can remain on a 2-3 year schedule. Some opinions were raised that by the SRGMP Group that the overall timeline could be sped up if the local presentations could be compressed into one meeting instead of three as noted in the updated timeline.

Concerns were raised again that the Minister of Water Stewardship may not implement any of the recommendations. Barry stressed that having such a large group reach consensus regarding the SRGMP would be difficult for the Minister to ignore.

Another concern was raised that not many First Nations are at the SRGMP table and that they may not be satisfied with the draft plan once it is completed.

Barry reassured the Group that the Coordinators have made numerous attempts by mail, phone and fax to invite the four First Nations within the study area, as well as First Nations east of the study area (Shoal Lake and Buffalo Point First Nations), to the table.

Once the draft plan is completed there will be a four month vetting period. The Coordinators intend to deliver and present the draft management plan to the Chief and Council of each First Nation initially contacted to participate in the process, regardless if they are at the table or not.

Several Group members were of the opinion that interested First Nations such as Sagkeeng First Nation and Brokenhead Ojibway Nation are regularly attending the meetings and the SRGMP Group should not have to continually solicit participation from the other First Nations to join the SRGMP.

With regard to the updated timeline, Barry mentioned that the timeline is “proposed” and still open for changes. If anyone had suggestions to modify the timeline, bring up your concerns at the next scheduled meeting in the fall.

7. Other Business

No other business.

8. Next Meeting

The SRGMP Group agreed to have the SRGMP meeting #5 on Monday, October 6, 2008 from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm.

Oakbank is the first choice to hold this meeting. However, if the venue is not available, arrangements will be made to have the meeting in Steinbach. Exact details of the meeting location are TBA.

9. Adjournment

The Chair thanked the Group for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 pm.

APPROVED