



# **GUELPH WATER SUPPLY MASTER PLAN**

## **AGENCY AND MUNICIPALITY WORKSHOP #2 SUMMARY**

February 15, 2006  
Cuten Club, 190 College Avenue East  
Guelph, Ontario

City  
of  
Guelph

This workshop summary was prepared by Lura Consulting. Lura is providing third-party public consultation services as part of the process to develop the Guelph Water Supply Master Plan. This summary captures the key discussion points from the February 15, 2006 Agency and Municipality Workshop #2. It is not intended as a verbatim transcript, and is subject to review by workshop participants. If you have any questions or comments regarding the summary, please contact either:

**Dave Belanger P. Geo.,**  
Water Supply Program Manager

**City of Guelph**

Phone: 519 837-5627 x251

Fax: 519 822-8837

[Dave.Belanger@guelph.ca](mailto:Dave.Belanger@guelph.ca)

**Patty Quackenbush, P. Eng.**

Senior Project Engineer

**OR Earth Tech Canada Inc.**

Phone: 519 570-1479

Fax: 519 570-3379

[patty.quackenbush@earthtech.ca](mailto:patty.quackenbush@earthtech.ca)

**Jean-Louis Gaudet**

Consultant

**OR Lura Consulting**

Phone: 416-536-9674

Fax: 416-410-3888 x5

[jgaudet@lura.ca](mailto:jgaudet@lura.ca)



**GUELPH WATER SUPPLY MASTER PLAN**  
**AGENCY AND MUNICIPALITY MEETING #2**  
FEBRUARY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, 1:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.  
Cutten Club, 190 College Avenue East , GUELPH

---

## **1. ABOUT THE WATER SUPPLY MASTER PLAN AGENCY & MUNICIPALITY WORKSHOP**

The February 15<sup>th</sup> Agency and Municipality workshop was the second hosted by the City of Guelph Waterworks Division to receive feedback from local agencies and municipalities as part of the Guelph Water Supply Master Plan (WSMP) process. Specifically, Workshop #2 was designed to seek agency and municipal input on the summary of water supply alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and the draft implementation plan. Feedback was also sought on how to present this information to the public in the upcoming Public Forum.

Prior to the workshop, a draft report containing a summary of water supply alternatives and the preliminary evaluation was circulated to all those who registered to attend. Twelve participants attended the meeting, including representatives from neighbouring municipalities, the Grand River Conservation Authority and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. The meeting agenda is attached as Appendix A and the list of participants who registered is included in Appendix B.

This summary report focuses primarily on the feedback and comments made by the meeting participants. It provides a high level summary of the key discussion points at the workshop. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation provided by the project team is available on the project website at [www.guelph.ca](http://www.guelph.ca).

## **2 WELCOMING AND OPENING REMARKS**

### **Councillor David Birtwistle, City of Guelph**

Councillor Birtwistle welcomed the participants to the meeting and thanked them for coming. In particular, he thanked the members of the neighbouring municipalities for attending, noting that their presence and comments are important because of the sharing of groundwater resources: “we all drink from the same glass, just with different straws.” He said that the results of the workshop deliberations will be shared with the neighbouring communities and stakeholders involved in the consultation process.

### **Janet Laird, City of Guelph**

Ms. Laird commented that the Guelph Water Supply Master Plan project is critical to the City of Guelph and its future growth management efforts. The results of this project, along with the wastewater and solid waste master plans, and the growth management strategy will help to determine how best to manage the future growth of the City. She added that this consultation is the participants’ collective opportunity to provide the City with input on the alternatives for consideration before staff takes its recommendations to City Council.

### **Dave Dilks, Lura Consulting, Facilitator**

Mr. Dilks explained that Lura Consulting has been retained to assist the City and the consulting team with the public consultation and communications components of this project. He indicated that Lura’s role as a neutral third-party is to help stakeholders participate in the Master Plan process and to facilitate discussion at the meeting.

Mr. Dilks reviewed the agenda and materials available for participants and indicated that the workshop would provide an opportunity both to learn more about the work to date and provide feedback on the findings and preliminary recommendations.

He asked the meeting participants if they had any comments on the meeting record from the January 26, 2005 Agency and Municipality Workshop. No comments were voiced, and Mr. Dilks suggested that this being the case, the report would be considered as an accurate summary of Workshop #1.

### **3 OVERVIEW OF PRESENTATION**

Project Manager John Haasen of Earth Tech provided an overview presentation on the WSMP alternatives and preliminary evaluation draft report.

#### **Master Plan Update**

Mr. Haasen provided an update on the Master Plan, which included the project status and how feedback from the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) and the general public had been used to date. He reviewed the project's next steps, which are to obtain feedback from the Agencies and Municipalities and the PAC, make a public presentation on March 21<sup>st</sup> on the alternatives, make changes as needed, and then present the alternatives and recommendations to City Council in April or May.

#### **Overview of Alternatives**

Mr. Haasen provided an overview description of the alternatives, which were grouped into three categories: Demand Management/Other Alternatives; Groundwater Alternatives; and Surface Water Alternatives.

The Demand Management/Other Alternatives included:

- Water conservation and demand management aspects, such as Unaccounted for Water (UFW), pricing controls, and education;
- Re-use of water, such as implementing a dual-use (two-pipe) system or reusing wastewater; or
- Limiting growth.

Mr. Haasen noted that "do nothing" was included as required by the EA process as a benchmark from which to measure the other alternatives.

Groundwater Alternatives included using existing wells, using existing wells that require treatment, upgrading wells for optimization, and building new wells inside and/or outside the City.

Surface Water Alternatives included taking water from local water sources and using them to supplement the ground water system. Sources of local surface water include the Eramosa River and Guelph Lake, and Lake Erie was also presented as a surface water alternative, requiring a pipeline. Water treatment requirements and Aquifer Storage Recovery (ASR) systems were also considered.

#### **Groundwater Alternatives**

Tony Lotimer of Lotowater provided a closer look at the groundwater alternatives. He said that the project team's review of groundwater alternatives included an examination of all the available background information, which included a detailed assessment of existing wells and existing hydrogeological data. The review found that there is an existing capacity of 75,000 m<sup>3</sup> with an opportunity to develop 20,000 m<sup>3</sup> of additional supply. Mr. Lotimer cautioned that these are estimates based on the available data and that further testing is needed. He also noted that environmental impacts and concerns have not been addressed in great detail but would have to be with more detailed environmental studies.

## Surface Water Alternatives

Patty Quackenbush of Earth Tech presented a detailed review of the local surface water alternatives, which included water takings from the Eramosa River and Guelph Lake. Joe Gemin of Earth Tech reviewed the surface water alternative via a pipeline from Lake Erie.

## EA Evaluation Process and Recommendations

Mr. Haasen then described the process that was used to evaluate the alternatives. He noted that 34 criteria were used to score the alternatives and compare them. He showed the participants a sample EA table to demonstrate how the evaluation process worked and presented an evaluation output summary. Following the evaluation summary, Mr. Haasen presented the short-term, mid-term and long-term recommendations.

## **4 PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK**

This section presents the feedback received during the discussion portion of the Agency and Municipality workshop. The following tables summarize the comments provided.

### Summary Tables

**Table 1: Summary of Feedback on Water Supply Alternatives**

- Modelling must look at the impact of landfills (e.g., Puslinch, Eastview) on potential new water sources.
- Examine the impact of the proximity of the Mast/Snyder gravel pit to the southern well site.
- ASR should not be treated as a source, but rather as a buffer.
- System efficiency needs to be considered.
- The location of potential exploration Area A needs to be clarified on the mapping.

**Table 2: Summary of Feedback on Evaluation of Water Supply Alternatives**

- Environmental issues need to be presented more clearly and should be examined in more depth as part of the evaluation. There is a concern that alternatives may be chosen based on economics before the environmental issues have been closely examined.
- Is the pipeline feasible? Feasibility should be a key consideration.

**Table 3: Summary of Feedback on Draft Implementation Plan**

- There is concern over whether the Arkell EA will be resolved. If the EA is not resolved, then the City could lose the water supply buffer it needs in the short term. If the Arkell option is lost, then the urgency of the project and the studies could increase and the project timeline would need to be accelerated.
- Initiate talks on water supply with neighbouring municipalities sooner rather than later.
- It is critical to link this process with the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan and with the provincial Source Water Protection process.
- There needs to be ongoing linkages with *Places to Grow*.

**Table 4: General Feedback**

- There should be a recommendation on well-head protection, rainwater collection, stormwater storage, and overall planning.
- Reconcile the text of the report and the maps.

## Questions and Comments Regarding the Presentation:

Immediately following the presentation, Mr. Dilks asked participants if they had any questions or comments directly related to the presentation. The following identifies the participants' questions (identified with 'Q') or comments (identified with 'C'), along with responses from the project team in *italics*.

- Q1: There was discussion in the report on surplus water uses from Guelph Lake and the downstream impacts. Why was there no discussion on the impacts of water takings to areas downstream of the Eramosa treatment plant?
- A: *The impacts were looked at by the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) in a different study. As long as the taking is according to the permit, then no impacts would be expected.*
- Q2: This alternative did not increase the taking?
- A: *No, it was the same as the permit specifies.*
- Q3: What are the linkages between this study and the Wastewater study?
- A: *That has been an issue from day one, and a Request for Proposals has been issued to retain a consultant. It could be that both water supply and wastewater are growth limiters. There will be some useful information from the wastewater study to come, but it likely will not affect the short-term recommendations for the WSMP.*
- C1: I don't see many environmental issues being addressed in the presentation of the alternatives. I am concerned that we may choose alternatives based on the economics before having looked closely at the environmental issues. I would be concerned about putting forward an alternative that could have a severe environmental impact.
- A: *This report presents a high-level look at the alternatives and their impacts. The reviews of wells outside the city and the other alternatives were conducted with a broad brush, and so we are recommending areas for further study, starting with the business case and EA studies.*
- Q4: Could we have more environmental information in the report at a medium level that presents the obvious environmental issues around certain alternatives?
- A: *The environmental issues are being looked at and will be included in the technical memos. But the level of detail in the technical memos is not foolproof and more investigation is needed, as no fieldwork has been performed. We have looked at groundwater takings to see what impact it had, and found that takings of less than 10% were not measurable. We also looked at the GRCA report, which says that takings carried out under a permit are unlikely to have an adverse impact.*
- Q5: You mentioned in your presentation about the pipeline that there is already some infrastructure in place. Who funded that and put it in place?
- A: *The Province initiated this work in the 1960s and was brought about by the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo who were looking for alternate water supplies. The Cities approached the Interior Water Commission to establish a water supply in the Lake Erie basin. Infrastructure was built, but the project died when the regional government was formed and the planned town of Townsend did not materialize. It was a large investment that is being maintained by the County. Many of the facilities were given back to the municipality. The current capacity is 1.2 billion m<sup>3</sup> a day. It is currently operating at 13 million m<sup>3</sup> to satisfy the water requirements of Jarvis, Hagersville and other communities in the area, to provide potable water to the industrial park in the area, and to provide 60 to 70 million litres a day to Stelco.*
- Q6: Could that be brought back to serve here? Is that feasible?
- A: *Yes.*
- Q7: Are the criteria that were used to determine new well sites based on what the aquifer could yield, or did you look at hazardous waste sites that are nearby?
- A: *We did look at information on contaminated sites.*
- Q8: The Eastview Road landfill is close to one of the sites, and the Downey Road well is also near the Puslinch landfill. I am concerned that the model has not considered landfill sites.
- A: *Our understanding is that the risk of the landfill to the well is small.*

- Q9: I have the same concern. If you mark the leachate plume of the landfill site, it could intersect the zones for the new sites.
- A: *That is a valid concern, and we will look to see if the well is too close.*
- C2: The landfill is a large and influential site, and we do have studies on that.
- Q10: Does the Mast/Snyder gravel pit have dibs on the water, or do citizens get the water before it sits in the pit?
- C3: We are currently developing policy for protection areas. If a capture zone is near a landfill, then that use would be prohibited.
- C4: There has to be integration with the other policies and acts. The Clean Water Act is a trump card that supersedes other legislation.
- C5: You need to ensure that you do not mistake ASR as a water source. This water is taken from the everyday supply. This is not an additional supply but instead is a buffer. We recently did a water supply pilot test in Waterloo Region. We pilot tested our system for two years, and there are things we did not see then that we see now. There were things that were not evident then but there are issues now that affect the efficiency of the system. The pilot test was one well, and we now have a chain of wells, and wells can interfere with each other. We have a good system, but there were things we did not expect and can hopefully fix some of them.

### **Feedback on the Recommendations:**

Mr. Dilks asked participants for any feedback they had on the alternatives and recommendations presented in the report. The following identifies the participants' questions (identified with 'Q') or comments (identified with 'C'), are listed below with responses from the project team in *italics*.

- Q1: The Ontario Ministry of the Environment is having difficulties with some of the technical material with the Arkell Springs EA. If this situation is not resolved, how will that affect the short-term recommendations?
- A: *It could have a significant impact. The City assumed that the water from Arkell Springs would provide the buffer needed for the short-term. If we lose that, it would increase the urgency of the project and studies, and the overall timeline for the project would have to be accelerated.*
- Q2: What impact would the Arkell decision have on the development of Guelph and on the provincial targets in *Places to Grow*?
- A: *In the short term, we have the capacity for growth. But we are in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of 9 in the Arkell project. In order to do testing, we need to take wells offline, and Arkell is supposed to provide the buffer.*
- C1: I don't see anything related to the City's plans for well-head protection. There should be a recommendation to protect or capture rainwater and for well-head protection. The City is looking to include an industrial park in the zone of the Downing well, but they have no restriction for development in the zone of influence. The City is putting its industrial park where it should be getting its water.
- C2: The talks with the surrounding municipalities should happen sooner than later. We need to talk to the partners before the last minute.
- Q3: Have the other townships started looking at growth planning? Have they responded to *Places to Grow*?
- C3: Puslinch has a growth management plan, and most of the growth will be in urban centres in the north. They are moving away from urban-style development because they do not have the services for it. Growth numbers can be combined with others' in the County.

- A: *Places to Grow assumes 60% of growth in the Region will take place in Guelph and 40% in the other areas. But if it is regional growth, then that could be a good thing.*
- Q3: *Places to Grow includes a lot of linkages. It is not a policy, but instead is a mandated growth target. It has a lot of gaps in the water and wastewater areas.*
- A: *We can answer what we can and direct you to where more information is required. But the municipalities need to work together. When it comes to groundwater, political boundaries are only lines on a map.*
- C4: One area of concern is that Arkell is right beside Halton, so it will be interesting to see how the Arkell project moves forward.
- C5: Reconcile the map and the text. For example, some of the written descriptions of boundaries do not match the map. Also, a road has been drawn through the middle of a wetland complex.

### **Follow-up Discussion:**

After the participants had provided feedback on the draft report, Mr. Dilks asked Mr. Haasen and Mr. Belanger if there was any other feedback they would like to hear. Mr. Haasen commented that he would rather hear feedback now than later, as this will allow them to provide a more polished package for the public meeting. Mr. Belanger said that he appreciated hearing the concerns and issues that were raised during the meeting, such as with the landfill and wetlands. He commented that some of the numbers might change as refinements are made to the report. He also noted that if the project is able to identify depth zones, then they may be able to use less surface water. He said that if ground water cannot be used, then surface water has to be used, which would have more impact. He commented trade-offs have to be recognized, and that you have to look at what benefits everyone and has the least amount of impact.

Mr. Cavalcante observed that Guelph's water issues are not very different from the Region of Waterloo's, which is quantity and quality. He says that it is easy to get the quantity, but quality can be a challenge. He urged the City to get involved in the regional discussions on water, because it is an issue that the City will have to deal with sooner or later. Waterloo Region has begun to work with Haldimand County. He said that the advantage of the City becoming involved now is that they would then have a say in how the process is conducted and can make sure that its interests are considered. If the City gets involved at a later date, then they will have to abide by the process rules already in place. Mr. Cavalcante said that he supports the recommendation for the City to work with neighbouring municipalities and urges that this be followed.

Mr. Lee wanted to know what would happen next with the report. He commented that he had just received the report on the previous Friday. He asked how the project team was going to get into greater detail with the other stakeholders and if they were going to go to the respective councils to get further detail. He also asked if the Province was involved in this project and what kind of involvement they had. He said that the Province should be involved.

Mr. Haasen answered that the Ministry of Environment had been invited and were confirmed to come but had cancelled at the last moment. With respect to the additional information, Mr. Haasen said that the report was considered a briefing document and that technical memos will be included in the appendix. The draft report will be sent to local Councils in April.

Mr. Belanger said that the City would be interested in making presentations to neighbouring Councils if the Councils wanted them to. He added that the public meeting would be advertised in other municipalities to invite people from outside of Guelph. He said they would also be distributing the project newsletter in neighbouring municipalities as well.

Mr. Dilks asked if the meeting participants had any advice on how to get the information out to the public. Ms. Walters commented that members of the public have been asking about the wastewater plan and that the project team should be prepared to answer questions on the links between the sewage plan and the water supply plan and

on why the two plans are being prepared separately. Ms. Baily noted that the general public is very interested in this project and that *Places to Grow* will likely come up at the public meeting.

## **5 NEXT STEPS**

David Dilks thanked everyone for their participation and feedback at the workshop. He asked participants to let the project team know if their jurisdiction would like to have a meeting to discuss the report.

Mr. Haasen asked that the participants send in their comments in to the project team by March 3<sup>rd</sup>, and if they think of something past that, to send comments to Ms. Patty Quackenbush.

It was noted that the public meeting would be held on March 21<sup>st</sup>, and participants were encouraged to help promote participation at this meeting.

## APPENDIX A: AGENDA

**City of Guelph Water Supply Master Plan:  
Agency and Municipality Workshop #2**  
February 15, 2006, 1:00 – 4:00 p.m.  
Cutten Club, 190 College Avenue East, Guelph

*Meeting Focus: To receive feedback from agencies and municipalities on the summary of water supply alternatives, the evaluation of these alternatives, and the draft preliminary implementation plan.*

### PROPOSED AGENDA

- 12:30 p.m. Registration and Refreshments
- 1:00 p.m. Agenda Review and Introductions – David Dilks, Facilitator
- 1:05 p.m. Review of Draft Meeting Summary from Jan 26<sup>th</sup>/05 Workshop #1
- 1:10 p.m. Opening Remarks – Janet Laird, City of Guelph
- 1:20 p.m. Master Plan Update – John Haasen, Earth Tech
- Project status & schedule
  - How PAC & agency/municipality feedback has contributed to date
  - Next steps
- 1:30 p.m. Water Supply Alternatives, Evaluation & Preliminary Implementation Plan – John Haasen, Earth Tech
- Overview of water supply strategy alternatives and analysis
  - Evaluation results
  - Draft preliminary implementation plan and recommendations
- 2:15 p.m. Break
- 2:25 p.m. Working Session – Discussion
- Thinking about the information presented by the Project Team...**
1. What feedback do you have on the summary of water supply alternatives (Draft Discussion Paper, Section 5)? What would you add or change?
  2. What feedback do you have on the evaluation of alternatives (Draft Discussion Paper, Section 6)? What would you add or change?
  3. What feedback do you have on the draft preliminary implementation plan? (Draft Discussion Paper, Section 7) In particular, what recommended alternatives would you support and why? What would you do differently and why?
  4. Do you have feedback on any other aspects of the Draft Discussion Paper?
  5. What advice do you have for presenting this information to the upcoming Public Forum?
- 3:55 p.m. Next Steps – David Dilks
- 4:00 p.m. Adjourn

## APPENDIX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

The following is a list of participants who signed in at the Agency and Municipality Workshop #2:

Name	Affiliation
Angela Janzen	Town of Milton
Mark Paoli	County of Wellington
Ken Gagnon	Township of Guelph/Eramosa
Stan Denhood	Township of Puslinch
Lynda Walters	Clean Water Coalition
John Yan	Wellington Dufferin Guelph Health Unit
Ken Cornelisse	Ministry of Natural Resources
Colin Baker	Halton Region
Sam Ziemann	Region of Waterloo
Jorge Cavalcante	Region of Waterloo
George Sousa	Grand River Conservation Authority
<b>City of Guelph</b>	
Councillor David Birtwhistle	City of Guelph
Councillor Laura Baily	City of Guelph
Dave Belanger	City of Guelph
Janet Laird	City of Guelph
Brian Pett	City of Guelph
<b>Consulting Team</b>	
John Haasen	Earth Tech
Joe Gemin	Earth Tech
Patty Quackenbush	Earth Tech
Dave Dilks	Lura Consulting
Jean-Louis Gaudet	Lura Consulting
Tony Lotimer	Lotowater Geoscience