

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES**Meeting #11– Monday, March 23rd, 2009**

Oakbank United Church

Oakbank, Manitoba

10:00 am - 4:00 pm

1. Call to Order

Meeting #11 of the Southeast Regional Groundwater Management Plan (SRGMP) Group was called to order at 10:07 am on Monday, March 23rd, 2009 at the Oakbank United Church by Cornie Goertzen, Chair of the SRGMP.

Present:

Last Name	First Name	Agency
Anderson	Kristina	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Ball	Garth	Manitoba Conservation
Barker	Corinne	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Betcher	Bob	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Brown	Bob	RLB Consulting
Carrière	Les	Manitoba Métis Federation Inc.
Evans	Laurie	RM of Ste. Anne
Goertzen	Cornie	Seine-Rat River Conservation District
Gunning	Ed	RM of St. Clements
Holtmann	Henry	Dairy Farmers of Manitoba
Kalyta	Phil	City of Steinbach
Kopelow	Sacha	Manitoba Eco-Network
Leclaire	Maurice	RM of Ritchot
Lucko	Ken	RM of Springfield
Matthews	Rob	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Maynard	Gerry	RM of De Salaberry
McDonald	William	RM of Victoria Beach
Mihaychuk	Ron	RM of Franklin
Moquin	Claude	RM of La Broquerie
Nedotiafko	Rob	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Oswald	Barry	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Prochera	Jennifer	Red River Basin Commission
Rackham	Jay	Manitoba Conservation
Ross	Marc	Cooks Creek Conservation District

Present (continued):

Last Name	First Name	Agency
Sadorski	Shane	Manitoba Cattle Producers Association
Sawka	Earl	RM of Piney
Schaible	Frank	Holds Industrial Water Bottling License
Schellenberg	Sam	Pembina Valley Water Cooperative
Steinke	Glenn	Town of Beausejour
Summach	Dwayne	Manitoba Forage Council
Toop	David	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Trudeau	Jacques	RM of Taché
Wang	Jianrong	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Wojcikowski	Greg	Manitoba Water Stewardship
Yosyk	Alvin	RM of Alexander
Young	Dave	RM of Reynolds

Regrets:

Last Name	First Name	Agency
McCulloch	Gabriele	Canadian Gold Beverages
McRae	Curtis	Keystone Agricultural Producers
Riekman	Marla	MAFRI
Seniw	Jane	Devils Creek Watershed Coalition

2. Acceptance of Proposed Agenda

The proposed agenda was accepted.

Moved by Alvin Yosyk – RM of Alexander

Seconded by Gerry Maynard – RM of De Salaberry

Carried.

3. Adoption of Minutes of Meeting #9

The preliminary minutes were accepted.

Moved by Earl Sawka – RM of Piney

Seconded by Alvin Yosyk – RM of Alexander
Carried.

4. New Business

a. Facilitated Workshop Sessions – Issues Itemizing & Prioritizing

Rob Nedotiafko introduced Mr. Bob Brown, the facilitator for today's workshop sessions. Rob stressed that today's proceedings are an important part of the planning process, as the Group will come to prioritize the issues that have been identified to date. Bob was present at the Group's last meeting, where Group members identified the issues they felt should be addressed in the management plan. Bob has now come to design the process that the Group will participate in today.

Bob Brown addressed the Group and gave a brief synopsis of his experience and background. Bob has over 40 years of employment experience, for which about 50% has been in the public sector and 50% has been in private industry. The majority of Bob's experience has been in the area of land use planning and property assessment.

i. Small Groups Workshop Exercise: Bob Brown, Facilitator

Bob stated that he had envisioned a three step process for today, which would include; 1) Members grouped at six tables working prioritize the 37 issues in order to complete Workshop Exercise #1, 2) The compilation of a cumulative prioritization of issues based on reports received from the tables, 3) An opportunity for individual prioritization of issues during Workshop Exercise #2.

The concept of "banding" the issues into three categories was presented by Bob. He explained that rather than giving issues an individual ranking, they were to be identified in one of the three "bands" of priority. The three bands were defined as follows:

A – Priority Issue: An issue the management plan must address, that requires immediate management action or attention

B – Issue: An issue for the management plan to address – not a priority, no immediate action plan required or possible.

C – Not an Issue: Issue should not be addressed in the management plan.

Bob stated that we do not intend to have everyone split the issues equally into the three bands; any variation or combination is possible, depending on what the Group feels is correct.

Q: How do we deal with negative issues? For example, question #14 states that groundwater use should never be metered. Depending on which band we put this issue in, does that indicate that we feel this statement is true or false?

A: You are not trying to say whether this is a positive/negative statement. You are looking at whether you feel the plan should address this issue or not.

Bob informed the Group that coming out of the March 9th meeting and in combination with the issues identified by the Public at the open houses, there were 160 issues identified in total. Clearly, 160 issues were too numerous for the Group to be able to prioritize in one session, and for this reason the issues were consolidated down to 37. In order to maintain consistency, Bob stated that wording for the 37 issues was kept as close to the original wording as possible. If a Group member feels that the list of 37 issues does not include their specific concern, there is opportunity to add additional issues if needed.

Each table was asked to identify a leader to keep track of the table's consensus on each issue. Each table will submit one worksheet, and over the lunch break the Coordinators will work to summarize what the six tables identified as A, B and C issues.

Q: If at our table of 5 people, 3 say an issue should be an "A", and 2 say that it should be a "B", what should we put down?

A: The table's sheet should reflect the overall consensus. We will have space for individual concerns and opinions during this afternoon's workshop session.

-----LUNCH-----

ii. Individual Exercise for Group Members: Bob Brown, Facilitator

Bob Brown addressed the Group and explained that each Group member will receive an "Individual Workshop Exercise #2" worksheet. On this worksheet, the six table's priority rankings have been summarized, along with an overall Group ranking, for each issue. Each individual Group member must now fill in the final column with their own Agency's priority ranking for each issue, which may or may not be similar to their table's ranking.

b. Individual Exercises for Group Members: Agency Representatives Report Back to the Group

Bob Brown asked all Group members to identify any further issues, concerns or comments they may have.

Glenn Steinke, Town of Beausejour

- Added into table 6's comment section: Concerns regarding nanofiltration / reverse osmosis for water treatment. 20% of water coming out of the ground is wasted using this technology
- There is a need to identify more sustainable means of water treatment

Gerry Maynard – RM of De Salaberry

- Feels that today's exercises were very good.
- Is satisfied that the issues have been identified

Jianrong Wang – Manitoba Water Stewardship

- Rated question #14 (metering of groundwater) as a high priority issue personally, as the only data obtained to

date for the 3D groundwater model is from licensed users.

- The amounts given on licenses do not reflect actual use; it is the maximum they are licenses to use.
- Feels that more accurate numbers are necessary for calibration of the 3D model.
- Last time he made a presentation to the Group, geothermal use was included in the total use. Next time he will separate this use out, as the water used for geothermal power is returned to the system.

Shane Sadorski – Manitoba Cattle Producers Association

- There is a need to differentiate between actual metering and the fee associated with it.
- Metering can be used for the purpose of data collection, and this does not necessarily mean a fee needs to be added.
- Word of caution for items 2 and 33: sweeping statements such as “industry” and “economic activity” need to be avoided.
- One heavy industrial use may have a large negative impact on groundwater, and another economic activity may result in good impacts such as the retention of wetlands.

David Toop – Manitoba Water Stewardship

- A number of these issues tend to be generic to every groundwater plan that has ever existed.
- We may want to address issues that make Southeastern Manitoba special and that differentiate this area from others

Claude Moquin – RM of La Broquerie

- Metering of use is important for us to learn how much is being used

Sacha Kopelow – Manitoba Eco-Network

- Is finding it difficult to get across Manitoba Eco-Network’s position on a number of these points. For example, question #13: Banded as A. Feels it should be included, but because MB Eco-Net believes it should be prohibited

Bill McDonald – RM of Victoria Beach

- Feels that the ranking for #4 should be increased, as all surface water ends up in rivers and lakes, and sometimes in the groundwater
- Issue #14, crossed out both “nevers”, and believes this should be an A issue.

Kristina Anderson – Manitoba Water Stewardship

- Would like to see the plan move away from sweeping visionary statements and more towards specific statements

Earl Sawka – RM of Piney

- Feels the most important issues are metering and abandoned wells

Cornie Goertzen – Seine-Rat River Conservation District

- Hopes that through this study we can gain a little more knowledge, but that this process will continue
- We are looking at a strategy for the next 10 years, and hopefully over that time the province can continue to look into how much capacity there is, and how to use less water

Frank Schaible – Holds industrial water bottling license

- Has lived in the Sandilands area since 1976. Now there are test wells in the area, feels that we are going in the right direction

Bob Betcher – Manitoba Water Stewardship

- Felt that a few issues were missing:
 - o Develop and maintain a groundwater model and apply it to work being done in our area
 - o No mention of livestock issues – very surprising, considering the location
 - o Nothing included regarding a water budget, which is one of the requirements in the Act for a watershed plan
- How do we develop policies for allocating groundwater, knowing that we see 10 year cycles for surplus/deficit?

Jennifer Prochera – Red River Basin Commission

- Felt this was a good exercise, but a difficult one

- Some of the issues have more than one point within them, so it was hard to give them a value
- This is a good start, but there are some other issues that need to make it into the plan before it's drafted

Laurie Evans – RM of Ste. Anne

- Not sure how much this exercise will help those people who will be drafting the plan – we went through a lot of work to get rid of two C issues!
- Hopes that the Coordinators will heavily consider the individual worksheets
- Feels that we must try and be very narrowly focused in writing the plan

Phil Kalyta – City of Steinbach

- Agrees that metering for data is extremely important.
- The issue of charging fees is beyond our scope here.

Dwayne Summach – Manitoba Forage Council

- Would like to reiterate some of Shane Sadorski's comments regarding sweeping statements.
- A lot of this is in the context of sustainable yield, which isn't defined. We need to be able to determine yield by getting the data needed to do this well.

Les Carrière – Manitoba Métis Federation

- Who will be responsible to take on some of these tasks – Water Stewardship, Conservation Districts, etc.?

Ed Gunning – RM of St. Clements

- As long as this plan does not negatively affect development, this is a good first step

Garth Ball – Manitoba Conservation

- As this is an information gaining exercises, it is natural to get a mish-mash of ideas. The details will be developed over time
- The document will have to be fairly dynamic – there is a need for adaptive management

Dave Young – RM of Reynolds

- Feels that this has been a good exercise, and is surprised with the level of consensus.

- This is not the end of the road – we will have to get back to tackling 3 or 4 central issues this fall.
- The issue of a water budget is absolutely important, but it was not on the list because the Group members did not bring it forward.
- Feels that the study area should be divided into sub-basins, and each area should be looked at individually for allocation.
- We must ensure that: 1) protect the rights of existing water users, and 2) make sure that protection is within the means of the individual user to realize.
- This is an area with an enormously valuable resource and climate change will most likely make it more valuable.

Alvin Yosyk – RM of Alexander

- Intensive Livestock Operations do two things – withdraw a lot of water and pollute a lot of water. This issue must be brought up next fall.

Rob Matthews of Manitoba Water Stewardship addressed the Group, noting that following his discussions with other “Science Experts” who are present today, he found that the Science Experts have fewer concerns than the overall Group’s average. Rob also addressed the issue of metering, highlighting that for those people with septic fields, the metering information may be of use to them in order to track how much water they are using and therefore discharging. Currently in rural settings water is a free resource to use, but it is not free when you look at discharge.

c. Planning Process: Next Steps

Rob Nedotiafko thanked the Group for their effort during the workshop exercises today. He stated that the goal of today’s exercises was to prioritize issues with the hope that the Group would be able to decide if they were ready to go forward with the next step in this process, writing the first cut draft plan.

Q: Are you planning to include in the plan those issues that were brought up by Bob Betcher and others today?

A: (Rob Nedotiafko) Absolutely. We are going to create a scanned record of everyone’s ratings / priorities from exercise #2. We are

going to do our best to include all the points that were raised today. Next fall you will be able to look at the first cut draft plan, and make sure that we have considered everything.

Q: As there are a number of people missing, would you consider circulating this exercise to those that are missing, for them to complete the exercise, and then possibly meet again to further discuss any additional feedback? Perhaps then we could ask the Group whether they felt the drafting of the plan should go ahead.

A: (Rob Nedotiafko) We could possibly circulate the exercise to those not present and ask for individuals to reply back by a certain date.

A: (Barry Oswald) It is going to become harder to make this decision the longer we wait. Let's try and make this decision today and move on. From our perspective as Coordinators, we are not aware of other information we can bring to the table. We always try to keep the meeting agendas full. It seems to me that we are done for this year.

The Group discussed the idea of circulating exercise #2 to those members not present, giving them the option to submit it at a later date. A Group member stated that we should not hold a meeting in April simply for the sake of a meeting. The Group indicated that they felt a meeting in April was unnecessary.

Q: Can we have an indication of when the first cut draft plan will be ready, and how much time the Group will have for review?

A: (Rob Nedotiafko) We would give the Group at least a month to review the plan before our first fall meeting. If the Coordinators would work to have the first cut draft plan available for the beginning of September, the Group would then have a month to review the plan before we reconvene at the beginning of October.

A show of hands indicated that the Group was in favour of not holding a meeting in April, and reconvening in early October.

Q: May we provide comments on the first cut draft plan before we reconvene?

A: (Rob Nedotiafko) Yes, feedback is welcome. If you have any issues, please share them with the entire Group. Simply "reply to

all” to an email from Corinne or me, as the entire Group will benefit from hearing issues and concerns.

Rob Nedotiafko informed the Group that the SRGMP website has been developed and now up and running. If “SRGMP” is searched on Google, the website is not an immediate hit; however technical people are working to fix this. Currently the approved versions of past minutes are available. The first cut draft plan will not be posted on the website, and will be considered ‘in-house’. The website may be accessed at the following address:

<http://www.srgmp.ca/>

d. Other Business

No additional business was identified by the Group.

5. Next Meeting

Rob Nedotiafko mentioned that in keeping with our past fall schedule for meetings, we will aim for meetings in October, November and December to be held early in the month. Group members confirmed October 5th, 2009 as the next meeting date.

Barry Oswald addressed the Group, stating that it is the priority of the Coordinators to get the first cut draft plan circulated to the Group a minimum of one month before the next meeting. Barry requested that all Group members come to the October meeting having reviewed the first-cut draft plan and prepared to begin the task of editing it.

6. Adjournment

The Chair thanked the Group for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 pm.