

**Carlisle Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA)  
Community Liaison Committee (CLC)  
Meeting #2**

**Tuesday, April 15, 2014 | 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm  
Carlisle Community Centre**

**Meeting Summary**

**1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction**

Mr. Jim Faught, Lura Consulting, provided opening remarks and explained his role as the neutral facilitator. Eleven (11) CLC members were present at the meeting. Mr. Faught led a round of introductions and emphasized that the CLC operates on consensus basis with the goal of reaching agreement amongst members. He reviewed the agenda and noted that there would be one additional item: a review of the minutes from CLC Meeting #1.

**2. Review of Minutes from CLC #1**

No comments on the meeting minutes were received by the project team to date. A deadline of Thursday April 17, 2014 was agreed upon for providing comments, after which the final minutes will be posted online for public access.

**3. Water Conservation Presentation**

Mr. Wayne Galliher, Water Conservation Project Manager, City of Guelph, provided a presentation on the City of Guelph's Water Conservation and Efficiency Program. The presentation included:

- Background on Guelph Water Conservation Strategy and Programming
- Program Elements and Incentives
- Peak Demand Management Tools and Opportunities

**4. Water Conservation Presentation – Questions & Answers**

A summary of the discussion following the presentation is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**. Note that this is not a verbatim summary.

Q: [CLC Member] What is the ratio of private wells to City wells in this conservation program?

A: [City of Guelph] There are about 40,000 households, and under 10 homes with private wells currently. We have larger industries that maintain private wells (about 5 or 6). In many cases, we've seen industry stepping away from the source, based on the management requirements that come along with it.

Q: [CLC Member] Is the City charging more by sector for water use or is it a flat rate? (I.e. would a golf course or water bottling company pay more or less than residents?)

A: [City of Guelph] On a per cubic meter basis, all customers pay the same rate. The only difference is the basic charge affiliated with the meter or service size to the business. They would pay a higher administrative cost that comes with higher billing frequencies, etc.

Q: [CLC Member] Guelph has attracted many water intensive industries (water bottling, brewing, etc.). Does that type of industry impact your aquifer significantly?

A: [City of Guelph] Our hydrogeologist looks at proposed takings in the area. Within the City boundary, the City looks at servicing needs of new projects, proposed business and use of land. Permits to Take Water for industries are separate from the City's water taking. Approvals and the potential for interference are evaluated by the MOE.

Q: [CLC Member] Regarding your consumption data of 177 litres per capita per day, do you have data that looks at residential areas with large houses and large lots, to estimate consumption averages? Can you isolate that data as a group?

A: [City of Guelph] We've done some mapping, looking at areas with a higher winter demand than summer demand. What we see is a lot of areas where there is high demand for homes that might not have the excess income to invest in efficiencies. There are other circumstances that have to be taken into account.

Q: [CLC Member] Residential water consumption per capita is shown to be increasing slightly in one graph, presuming population growth. In the following graph it is decreasing. What accounts for this difference?

A: [City of Guelph] The first graph shows low density residential data, whereas the second graph is a roll up of total residential data (low density, high density, etc.).

Q: [CLC Member] In the event that a high water user proposes a facility within the City, how do you determine the capacity of the aquifer that needs to accommodate it?

A: [City of Guelph] Through our source water protection work, we formed tier 3 water budgets, looking to our sources and what the yield is. On an annual basis, our engineering services group does a development priorities plan that assesses what capacity is in place and what could be allocated to new growth. We have a wet year capacity and a dry year capacity.

Q: [CLC Member] We read from time to time about the aquifer being stressed. To what degree is it at risk?

A: [City of Guelph] It is not my understanding at this point that our takings are unsustainable. We are looking at new water supplies. In our approach we are pursuing water conservation as well as new well sources.

Q: [CLC Member] Have you done a cost benefit analysis for achieving your results?

A: [City of Guelph] Yes. I shared with you the cost of \$4/L. The plan itself was developed to look at cost effective activities, and came in at a cost of \$3.12/L. We've been able to deliver our savings to date at \$1.30/L. That is less than half of the price of our plan. That includes all the program actions, salaries, soft and hard costs, etc.

Q: [CLC Member] Is that costing the lowest hanging fruit? Is that sustainable?

A: [City of Guelph] We are currently updating our Water Supply Master Plan. It will redefine the cost of infrastructure as well as what our next water conservation savings may be. I would argue that we will see impending saturation for some of the lower hanging fruit actions. We will look at other economic incentives as well.

Q: [CLC Member] What do you mean by \$8 per litre?

A: [City of Guelph] It is a means by which to compare the project when we start to look at \$40M expenditure and a savings of 5,000 m<sup>3</sup> per day.

Q: [CLC Member] You talk about bylaw enforcement being critical. Could you see a direct measureable correlation between bylaw enforcement and reduction in peak demand?

A: [City of Guelph] Yes. 2001 is the year it was first implemented. Enforcement was a larger part of the approach at that time. There was a dialogue with the community to set what the bylaws should look like. It was a change in social norms. We saw a reduction in peak demand.

Q: [CLC Member] What is your biggest infrastructure challenge in terms of your marginal litre of water?

A: [City of Guelph] Wastewater is the more energy and chemical intensive process. We see about 1.2kWhr from the point at which we are extracting, and treating water. It is largely the biggest marginal cost.

Q: [CLC Member] Has the City of Guelph used any other mitigating approaches? Do you have to follow the MOE Design Guidelines with respect to emergency storage?

A: [City of Guelph] The MOE guidelines are standard with regards to determining storage requirements. There are insurance issues and compliance issues that a municipality must consider.

C: [CLC Member] In Carlisle there is no cost to the City for wastewater. We are all doing our own treatment of water going out. We have more of an emergency storage issue.

A: [City of Guelph] Our Water Supply Master Plan looks at things like aquifer storage recovery. Storage facilities are a big expenditure.

Q: [CLC Member] How many water source wells does Guelph manage?

A: [City of Guelph] There are 23 wells in total with Permits to Take Water. We have the Arkell Spring Grounds which consists of 6 well sources located outside of the City. The water travels via gravity to a UV treatment facility. There are 21 wells within the urban boundary.

Q: [CLC Member] How do you work with your towers and water storage for emergency services?

A: [City of Guelph] We are seeking to maintain at least 75% within our towers. As we move towards 65% we are starting to impede upon what would be water available for firefighting or other emergency needs. We are looking at energy management right now.

Q: [CLC Member] Is all your water treated throughout the whole system, whether it's for firefighting, irrigation, etc.?

A: [City of Guelph] Yes, there is only one system.

Q: [CLC Member] How often do you hit that 65% level of water storage (level 2) with the conservation program in place?

A: [City of Guelph] In my 10 years with the City, we haven't hit this value. For the most part it is the Eramosa River that has brought us into restrictions.

Q: [CLC Member] Are there any hydrants for fire fighting using water from the river?

A: [City of Guelph] No.

Q: [CLC Member] How does the water level warning get communicated out? How quickly does this happen?

A: [City of Guelph] We are part of a Low Water Response Team for our watershed, chaired by the Grand River Conservation Authority. We discuss sensitivities within the watershed. Unless there is an immediate issue, press releases are made. We buy radio space, roadside signage, and use communication through local media. For bylaw enforcement, we understand it takes time for the message to get across. We usually give 3 or 4 days of notice before enforcing compliance.

Q: [CLC Member] At level 0, do you have base level restrictions that apply all summer?

A: [City of Guelph] At level 0, water conservation is purely voluntary (odd/even lawn watering, etc.). There are no restrictions to water use. At level 1, there are some restrictions as the items in level 0 become mandatory. At level 2, you see the restriction of no car washing, no lawn watering, etc. In our update of restrictions we have differentiated between things like aesthetic gardens and food gardens.

Q: [CLC Member] What is the impact of the bylaw? What is the penalty? Is it significant enough?

A: [City of Guelph] There is a \$130 fine for a first offence. For a second offence there is a court summons and recommendation of a higher fine. We consulted with the public on this fine amount. From a phone survey roughly 60-70% said \$130 is a high enough amount. There are only a handful of tickets issued annually. We have seen a real change in social norms.

Q: [CLC Member] How often have you reached level 2 in the last few years?

A: [City of Guelph] 2012 was the last time due to drought. The Eramosa River sub-watershed shows a 3 or 4 year cycle where we reach level 2.

Q: [CLC Member] For the majority of the time during peak summer months, are you in level 1?

A: [City of Guelph] We are usually between level 0 and 1. Last year we had a wet summer and we did not go above level 0.

Q: [CLC Member] How do you meet the emergency storage requirement?

A: [City of Guelph] There is capacity in the distribution system.

Q: [CLC Member] Have you ever had to add to the emergency storage?

A: [City of Guelph] In the south of Guelph, a new tower was constructed because capacity was needed to service development in that area. There are three towers in the distribution system.

*Post-Meeting Note: The City also has 5 in-ground reservoirs to provide potable water storage.*

Q: [CLC Member] What are the new technologies that you are using for water supply and storage to meet emergency storage needs?

A: [City of Guelph] We continue to have the capacity that we need for those items (supply and storage). In the south end of Guelph we have a new water tower. New development is happening in that area. Overall, we have three water towers and we are trying to make the most of those given that it is an expensive undertaking to add to the system. Our Water Supply Master Plan is looking at a number of sources. We want to find new well sources for future population growth within the urban boundary. We have contaminated sources in the city and we are seeking public acceptance on cleaning the source. We

are also looking at seasonal water takings and storage from the Eramosa River when flows might be high. The order and priority of these projects is still under discussion.

Q: [CLC Member] What is your ratio of number of storage facilities per capita in Guelph?

A: [City of Guelph] We have 3 towers for approximately 126,000 people. The towers are somewhere between 5 and 10 mega-litres in capacity.

Q: [CLC Member] Do you use the Eramosa or Speed River with a standpipe for emergency supply? Why not?

A: [City of Guelph] No. We do take from the Eramosa collector system. However, we supercharge the aquifer during high flow times of the year. With changes in flow seasonally, it would be a question of ensuring reliable capacity in the system.

Q: [CLC Member] Key points I am understanding are: it is critical to understand the capacity of the aquifer before making decisions; it is critical that the City has bylaws in place that are enforced and fair to all residents. Is there another key point that I missing?

A: [City of Guelph] The last point is that there is a need for social research to see what fits on a community by community basis. There is also the question of cost.

Q: [CLC Member] When you want to enforce bylaws, can you remotely monitor for breaches of the bylaw?

A: [City of Guelph] We do not have an automated reading or real time data. District metered areas allow us to see if there is a higher night flow and need to investigate further. For now we are informed by concerned citizens of breaches to the bylaws.

Q: [CLC Member] Regarding financial incentives for residents on upgrading water technology how did that work?

A: [City of Guelph] Primarily it is funded from our water and wastewater operation budget. It is applied to the water bill. You would see a rebate appear on your water bill.

Q: [CLC Member] Were there any groups that would not participate in the conservation program? How did you deal with that?

A: [City of Guelph] With any program there are non-participants. However, based on where we are people have undertaken actions. We are looking to invest in data (online billing etc.) and we are striving to reach mass customization.

Q: [CLC Member] What was your peaking factor in 2006 when Council approved this plan?

A: [City of Guelph] For the last 5 years it would be somewhere between 1.3 and 1.4. In 2001 we enacted the outside water use bylaws and it was probably closer to 1.6.

Q: [CLC Member] How much did you bring it down in that first year?

A: [City of Guelph] Projected production was decreased by 3 MLD.

C: [CLC Member] We have a high peaking factor around 4 or 5. We are a small population with a high peaking factor.

#### 4. Memorandum of Understanding

Mr. Faught facilitated a discussion on the status of the Memorandum of Understanding and role of Community Liaison Committee.

### **Proposed Changes to the MOU**

- CLC members explained that an informal meeting was held where a consensus amongst the CLC was reached on the proposed changes to the MOU.
- Mr. Faught expressed that the MOU should be structured within the bounds of the EA process. As a result, the proposed changes need to be discussed further and include representation and agreement by all parties: the CLC, the City of Hamilton, and WSP. The MOU forms the guidelines that everyone will operate under.
- WSP explained that the new well is part of a Schedule 'C' Class EA process and the EA now follows through with what the Master Plan had identified. The project is looking at well supply, storage and water conservation.
- The project team reiterated that the CLC was not established as a voting structure; it is sharing of information two ways.
- WSP explained that from a Class EA perspective, the conceptual design must be included; it is a requirement of the Schedule C process. Phase 3 of the 4 phases in the process is design.
- CLC members expressed that the underlying problem is that there has been no evidence to substantiate a need for water supply or storage.

### **Role of the CLC**

- CLC members indicated that they thought they would be full participants in the decision making process. The lack of mission statement and feeling that a decision had already been made has caused frustration and skepticism amongst members.

### **Issues Management Protocol**

- Mr. Faught committed to producing an issues management and response protocol that will outline how the project team will approach inquiries going forward, including timelines. A one-window correspondence approach will be managed by Lura.

### **Water Data**

- CLC member inquired about if there has been a refresh on the Master Plan since 2004.
- The City indicated that there was an addendum made in 2006, generally it is a 10 year window.
- CLC members were interested to know if water usage statistics have been updated for current water usage. It was expressed that there is uncertainty about the data from the 2004 report. CLC members are unsure if the problem has been adequately addressed.
- WSP indicated that the project is still in Phase 1 and 2 of the Class EA process and the problem statement can be updated.

### **Further Site Testing**

- CLC member inquired about plans to do more tests prior to the next meeting.
- City of Hamilton indicated that nothing is scheduled.

## **5. Next Steps**

Mr. Faught suggested that a sub-committee be formed with members of the CLC, WSP and City of Hamilton to finalize and agree upon the MOU. Sub-committee volunteers representing the CLC are: Frank Gallant, John Quinn, and Peter Cooper.

Proposed potential dates for the next CLC meeting were May 27<sup>th</sup> or June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2014, with the proviso that the project team needed enough time to gather and review the relevant data. LURA indicated they would send out a poll with 3 potential dates to CLC members to determine the preferred date. The Project Team will provide a draft agenda for review comment. *Note – following the meeting it was determined that additional time would be required to gather and review the relevant data, as well as answer outstanding questions – two new dates in June were proposed to CLC members – those are currently under review.*

Mr. Faught thanked all attendees for their input and assured CLC members that the issues management protocol will be developed so timely responses to inquiries can be made.

## Appendix A: List of CLC Meeting #2 Attendees

### CLC Members in Attendance

Gary MacDonald  
Frank Gallant  
Phil Vespa  
Jim McEntee  
Dave Mercer  
Judi Partridge  
John Quinn  
Kenn Lendrum  
Peter Cooper  
Barb Hoekstra  
Gwen Todd  
Karen Belaire

### Project Team Staff in Attendance

Sharon MacPherson-Nemeth	City of Hamilton
Mark Bainbridge	City of Hamilton
Dan McKinnon	City of Hamilton
Bert Posedowski	City of Hamilton
Andrea Bazzard	City of Hamilton
Carmen Ches	City of Hamilton
Sophie Augurusa	City of Hamilton
Alec Cranmer	WSP
Pat Becker	WSP
Carissa Cautillo	WSP
Jim Faught	Lura Consulting
Liz Nield	Lura Consulting
Leah Winter	Lura Consulting