

**FINAL APPROVED MINUTES
AS OF DECEMBER 8TH, 2008****Meeting #6 – Monday, November 3rd, 2008**
Sun Gro Centre
Beausejour, Manitoba
10:00 am – 2:15 pm**1. Call to Order**

Meeting #6 of the Southeast Regional Groundwater Management Plan (SRGMP) Group was called to order at 10:10 am on Monday, November 3rd, 2008 at the Sun Gro Centre in Beausejour, Manitoba by Cornie Goertzen, Chair of the SRGMP.

Present:

Last Name	First Name	Agency
Ball	Garth	Manitoba Conservation
Barker	Corinne	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Barron	Gerry	Manitoba Public Utilities Board
Boonstra	Bill	RM of Whitemouth
Carriere	Les	Manitoba Métis Federation Inc.
Chapman	Paul	Town of Lac du Bonnet
Evans	Laurie	RM of Ste. Anne
Goertzen	Cornie	Seine Rat River Conservation District
Gunning	Ed	RM of St. Clements
Heppner	Neil	RM of Taché
Kalyta	Phil	City of Steinbach
Keller	Greg	Manitoba S.T.E.M
Lucko	Ken	RM of Springfield
Matile	Gaywood	Manitoba S.T.E.M.
Martel	Gordon	Pembina Valley Water Cooperative
Maynard	Gerry	RM of De Salaberry
McCulloch	Gabriele	Canadian Gold Beverages
McDonald	Bill	RM of Victoria Beach
McRae	Curtis	Keystone Agricultural Producers
Mihaychuk	Ron	RM of Franklin
Moquin	Claude	RM of La Broquerie
Morris	Lawrence	RM of East St. Paul
Nedotiafko	Rob	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Rackham	Jay	Manitoba Conservation

Present (continued):

Last Name	First Name	Agency
Ross	Marc	Cooks Creek Conservation District
Sawka	Earl	RM of Piney
Schaible	Frank	Holds industrial water bottling license
Stefaniuk	Bob	RM of Ritchot
Steinke	Glenn	Town of Beausejour
Summach	Dwayne	Manitoba Forage Council
Swanson	Tim	Manitoba Conservation
Wang	Jianrong	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Yosyk	Alvin	RM of Alexander
Young	Dave	RM of Reynolds

Regrets:

Last Name	First Name	Agency
Holtmann	Henry	Dairy Farmers of Manitoba
Oswald	Barry	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Riekman	Marla	Manitoba M.A.F.R.I.

Rob Nedotiafko addressed the Group and identified the six handouts available at the door, including:

- 1) Proposed meeting agenda;
- 2) Preliminary minutes from the October 6th, 2008 meeting
- 3) Grant Melnychuk's presentation
- 4) Greg Keller and Gaywood Matile's presentation
- 5) Additional information from Greg and Gaywood's presentation at the September 29th Study Area Tour
- 6) Science Members & Local Knowledge Presentations - Summary

2. Acceptance of Proposed Agenda of Meeting #6

Rob requested that the Chair include the "Science Members & Local Knowledge Presentations - Summary" handout in the New Business section of the agenda

The proposed agenda was accepted with the outlined addition.

Moved by Paul Chapman – Town of Lac du Bonnet.
Seconded by Alvin Yosyk – RM of Alexander
Carried.

3. Adoption of Minutes of Meeting #5

The following changes were proposed to the October 6th, 2008 minutes:

- 1) Ken Lucko requested that his name be added to the list of those present, as he was present for the later part of the meeting.
- 2) Rob presented a statement from Barry Oswald, as Barry was unable to attend the meeting. On page 8 of the minutes there was a correction to Slide 1 of page 16 of Dr. Mario Tenuta's presentation. Barry would like to change the wording of this correction to read "***Check regarding slide 1 on page 16 to clarify if groundwater should be changed to surface water". The Group should be aware that Barry worked to clarify this issue, and Dr. Tenuta's slide was correct in using the word "groundwater".

The preliminary minutes were accepted.

Moved by Gerry Maynard – RM of De Salaberry
Seconded by Bob Stefaniuk – RM of Ritchot
Carried.

4. New Business

a) Outline of Presentations handout

Rob explained to the Group that the purpose of putting this handout together was to effectively schedule upcoming presentations, and to ensure that the Group is satisfied with the number of presentations and the topics covered in the presented information. The handout was comprised of three tables with the following titles; "Completed to Date" (Science Members), "To Be Scheduled & Completed" (Local Knowledge), and "To Be Confirmed, Scheduled & Completed" (Science Members).

Rob stressed that we could continue to study information for years, but in the context of this plan we must be efficient with our time. The Group was asked to come to the next meeting with ideas for possible presentations based on what they feel is missing to date. Rob informed the Group that if anyone has ideas for presentations, they

should contact Corinne or Rob and they will work to summarize these requests for the next meeting.

Dave Young suggested that a possible presentation topic could be the taxation of works pertinent to the withdrawal and transmission of groundwater.

Gerry Barron indicated that he felt the Group would benefit from reviewing examples of the Table of Contents of other groundwater plans, in order to assess what information they feel has been missing to date.

Rob responded by indicating that at the April 21st meeting, The Coordinators provided three different groundwater management plan examples to the Group – The Assiniboine Delta Aquifer Management Plan, the Township of Langley Water Management Plan and Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan - to include in their binders, and to aid in addressing the questions of “What is this plan going to look like?” These examples were chosen in order to demonstrate different the breadth of plans.

Gerry stated that he understands that quantification is an issue for our plan, but was unsure if we have covered current land and groundwater use for the study area. Rob responded that a number of the presentations to the Group, including Bob Betcher’s and Rob Matthews’ past presentations will help provide this information as background for the report. Also, Grant Melnychuk’s presentation will also provide a better idea of planning issues, including land use, population and population growth in our study area.

The Chair asked Rob to confirm with the Group whether questions for presenters should be asked during presentations, or saved until the end of presentations. The Group approved the decision of waiting until after presentations are completed to pose questions.

b) Science Members Presentations

- i. Greg Keller, GIS Technologist/Data Management & Gaywood Matile, Quaternary Geologist, Manitoba Science, Technology, Energy and Mines made a PowerPoint presentation titled “*Two Dimensional (2-D) & Three-Dimensional (3-D) Geological Mapping in Manitoba*”

Q: Are the drill holes all water wells?

A: Yes, the majority are water wells. There are some drill holes that have been done by the Province and these are more accurate.

Q: What level of predictability do you believe you have for the 5 km grid? Can you identify or predict a) the probability of finding a particular formation when drilling; b) refined information on the formation; c) permeability; d) the probability of striking water, and e) water quantity/water quality at a certain point?

A: A) and B) There are areas of the province that have very limited drill hole information, and for these areas this is usually what limits our ability to predict formations or refined information on a particular formation. C) Probably not, although if you look at previous drill logs in the areas of interest it will give some information on this. D) No. E) No, that area is more up to Jianrong Wang and Bob Betcher's section at Water Stewardship, as they will populate the model with this type of information.

Jianrong Wang informed the Group that he has borrowed the 3D model from Greg and Gaywood and has imported it into his groundwater model. He indicated that the bedrock information is very accurate and although the Sandilands area is somewhat imprecise, generally speaking the 3D model as a whole is very accurate.

Q: Was this approach for developing the 3D model developed in-house, or was it modeled after another jurisdiction?

A: It was developed in-house. It has been presented at international conferences and is now used in numerous other jurisdictions.

Rob suggested to the Chair that Tim Swanson present his presentation before lunch, as the meeting was ahead of schedule. The Chair agreed to proceed with Tim Swanson's presentation.

- ii. Tim Swanson, Regional Forester for Manitoba Conservation made A PowerPoint presentation titled "*Southeast Region Forest Landscapes & Forest Management*"

Following the presentation, Rob pointed out to the Group that it is important to note the "footprint" of provincial forests and crown land that comprises a large portion of the study area. Rob acknowledged the provincial government process for managing land use in these

areas, especially the review of crown land lease and permit applications for proposed land use such as work camps and fuel caches, as example, in order to assess and prevent possible environmental impacts. Rob then noted that when considering Greg and Jianrong's earlier comments that the Sandilands area is an important recharge area, it is reassuring to look at the map and the large extent of provincial forests and crown land and existing processes in place to monitor and manage land use for purposes considering and working to ensure good source water protection to this recharge area.

Q: Has there been any research done specific to the Sandilands area regarding forest management/timber harvesting impacts on groundwater?

A: No, not specific to our study area.

Tim indicated that this area of the province has the longest harvesting history in the province and that some of the oldest planted stands that are now 50 or 60-years old are being managed.

Q: When you have a forest fire, is there a timeline for harvesting and replanting?

A: It depends on the fire, but there is usually a 2 year window for commercial forest products.

Q: After 2 years you will be able to see what vegetation is coming back?

A: Yes, you will see regeneration very quickly. It depends on the severity of the burn amongst other factors, such as soil texture. The biggest problem for regeneration in this area is that coarse-textured soils do not hold water very well, and if there is even a mild drought, we may see the die-off of young saplings.

Q: How do you address both undeveloped and developed peat bogs?

A: Once an peat mining operation has depleted an area, the bog is put back into its natural state. Manitoba Forestry starts the

regeneration process with a retirement plan that includes bringing the groundwater levels back up and seeding it back to natural species.

Q: Therefore, the site is considered a forest until it is developed for peat mining, while being developed it is considered a mine, and then it is considered a forest again?

A: Yes.

Q: What are the threats that forestry activity may pose to groundwater? Are there obligations for industry to report contamination events and obligations for remediation?

A: Yes, there is always a potential for contamination. There are obligations for fuel storage, requirements for handling, and any spills over a certain size have to be reported. Natural resource officers check for compliance with regulations for fuel handling, fire, camp installation, proximity to watercourses, and camp locations.

-----**Lunch Break: 12:20 to 1:20 pm**-----

Rob informed the Group that the third presenter, Rob Butler, had not yet arrived and the Group should proceed under the assumption that he will not be presenting today.

iii. Grant Melnychuk, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs made a PowerPoint presentation titled "*The Land Use Planning Framework in Manitoba*";

Q: For Development Plan (DP) review, up until now how have they satisfied PLUP (Provincial Land Use Policy) 4.b.4?

A: The review of DPs includes reviews by provincial departments. For example, if Manitoba Water Stewardship felt that there was a certain area that may be of concern regarding groundwater quantity/quality; they could recommend certain inclusions in the DP.

Q: How have they considered geothermal heating? Subdivisions that use geothermal heating may impact groundwater quality, and this

does not have to be large scale, it just has to be several homes in close proximity.

A: The Provincial Land Use Policies (PLUPs) are currently under review, and the new version of the PLUPs is looking at this issue. If they were to encourage or discourage geothermal heating, then DPs would have to include this. I will get a better answer for this concern from my colleagues.

Q: I assume that these growth numbers are based on the latest census results? There are certain areas that have significantly grown since then.

A: Yes, unfortunately census information is dated almost immediately upon its release.

Q: The presentation references “significant aquifers”. How is this determined? Is that a management issue?

A: These are areas that have a large, definable aquifer footprint, for example the Assiniboine Delta Aquifer, the Oak Lake aquifer, the Winkler aquifer, as well as the aquifers present in our study area.

A group discussion followed regarding the importance of considering the SRGMP’s recommended action plans and strategies when RMs and communities are reviewing DPs. It was voiced that there is a joint responsibility between Manitoba Water Stewardship and all stakeholders within the study area to implement the plan and to ensure that everyone does so equally. It was also suggested by a Group member that it would be beneficial for Grant Melnychuk to possibly return closer to the end of this process in order to give recommendations on how aspects of the groundwater management plan could be incorporated by RMs into development plans and/or zoning bylaws.

A few Group members voiced concern regarding the recommendation that all RMs incorporate a common ‘clause’ concerning groundwater protection into DPs. Group members expressed concern that common planning rules would affect certain RMs more than others, and that blanket rules for the whole study area may discourage population growth in some areas.

Q: Why must an RM adopt a DP that is consistent with the PLUPs, and then afterwards the PLUPs no longer apply?

A: The PLUPs are more “guiding principles” and some will not apply to certain areas. The PLUPs are transformed into local land use policy and not all PLUPs apply to all areas. Therefore, when a DP is adopted in a given area, policy decisions are reviewed against that DP. When a DP is up for review it must be reviewed against the most recent PLUPs.

5. Next Meeting

The Chair suggested that the Group schedule the January meeting. The group decided on January 26th, 2009 and the Coordinators will work to organize the meeting in Oakbank. The start time will be 10:00 am.

6. Adjournment

The Chair thanked the Group for attending and the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 pm.