



NORTH SHORE OF LAKE SUPERIOR REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS

THUNDER BAY REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN (RAP) Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Annual Meeting

April 4, 2018 – 7 p.m.
Lakehead University
Advanced Technology and Academic Centre (ATAC 3004)
Thunder Bay, ON

ATTENDANCE

1. **Jim Bailey** – Lakehead University (LU) RAP Office
2. **Gary Davies** – Nature Conservancy of Canada
3. **Frank Edgson** – Thunder Bay PAC Co-chair
4. **Jean Hall-Armstrong** – Thunder Bay PAC Co-chair
5. **Simon Haslam** – Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)
6. **Gerry Henrichs** – Richardson's
7. **Amber Kivisto** – Bio-North Solutions
8. **Marek Klich** – Public
9. **Chris McEvoy** – LU – Graduate Student
10. **Phillip McGuire** – Public
11. **Samuel Pegg** – LU – RAP Office
12. **Jamie Saunders** – EcoSuperior
13. **Dave Schnell** – Public
14. **Janet Schnell** – Public
15. **Mark Serediak** – Public
16. **Drew Stajkowski** – MOECC
17. **Brent Straughan** – LU – Undergraduate Student
18. **Nathan Wilson** – LU – Graduate Student
19. **Michelle Willows** – LU – Graduate Student

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Jean Hall-Armstrong welcomed everyone and asked those present to introduce themselves.

2. REVIEW OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 7, 2018

The minutes of February 7, 2018 were reviewed. No errors or omissions were noted.

3. RAP COORDINATORS REPORT

Jim Bailey, Lakehead University

Jim Bailey provided an overview of RAP activity, pointing out that the following Beneficial Use Impairments (BUIs) were pending a change in status to “unimpaired.”

- Degradation of Aesthetics
- Fish Tumors and Other Deformities
- Degradation of Phytoplankton and Zooplankton Populations
- Bird and Animal Deformities or Reproductive Problems
- Restrictions on Dredging Activities.

He also noted the following key RAP actions which had not yet been completed:

- Develop a management plan for mercury-contaminated North Harbour sediments
- Develop and implement plans to remediate any remaining non-point sources of contaminants (stormwater) that are contributing significantly to fish & wildlife related impairments.
- Reduce the frequency of beach advisories – Chippewa Beach & Boulevard Lake.

He said he hoped that PAC sub-committees could be formed, as per the following groupings, to address BUIs which fell into each of these categories:

- Sediment Quality
- Fish Health
- Water Quality
- Wildlife Health.

He also noted that the PAC had discussed and passed revisions to their Terms of Reference at the December 6th, 2017 meeting so that objectives, member responsibilities, attendance standards and election format had been clarified. He added that the following persons had expressed their intent to continue to be part of the PAC, or to become part of the PAC:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| • Gary Davies | Nature Conservancy |
| • Frank Edgson | North Shore Steelhead |
| • Jean Hall-Armstrong | Field Naturalists |
| • *Richard Harvey | Municipal Sector |
| • Gerry Heinrichs | Richardson’s |
| • *Amber Kivisto | Bionorth Solutions |
| • Ashleigh Marchl | Resolute |
| • Bruce Pritchard | Public |

- Jamie Saunders Ecosuperior
- Dave Schnell Public
- Mark Serediak Public
- Simon Shankie LRCA
- Carl Taylor ERCO
- Chris McEvoy LU Graduate Student
- Michelle Willows LU Graduate Student
- Nathan Wilson LU Graduate Student

4. ELECTION OF CHAIR OR CO-CHAIRS

Jean Hall-Armstrong and Frank Edgson agreed to continue as PAC Co-chairs.

5. WILDLIFE SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT - Presentation

Gary Davies, Wildlife Sub-Committee member

G. Davies said that the Wildlife Sub-Committee was comprised of the following PAC members:

- Gary Davies
- Al Harris
- Richard Harvey
- Gerry Heinrichs
- Mark Serediak
- Nathan Wilson
- Michelle Willows

G. Davies said that committee objectives had been agreed upon, namely, to review and finalize Delisting Criteria for the Degradation of Wildlife Populations and Degradation of Wildlife Habitat BUIs; to prioritize actions to address these BUIs and to report upon sub-committee activities and recommendations to both the PAC and the RAP Team, which is comprised of representatives of Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC), the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), MOECC and also LU. He said the ECCC publication, “How Much Habitat is Enough” publication was integral to the sub-committee’s process of formulating Delisting Criteria for recommendation to the PAC.

G. Davies said that the sub-committee had made revisions to the Delisting Criteria mentioned above, and that further sub-committee discussion was necessary before making a recommendation back to the PAC regarding final wording. He said the sub-committee hoped to continue their work by providing concise supporting rationale for the Delisting Criteria and also completing a habitat strategy. He concluded his report by saying that the sub-committee would keep the PAC and RAP Team apprised of their activity and that once sub-committee objectives had been fulfilled, final recommendations would be made back to the PAC, especially as to final wording recommended for the Delisting Criteria.

Marek Klich said that criteria were used to list various items as impaired at the outset of the RAP process. He suggested these same criteria be used now to determine whether sufficient improvement had been made to warrant a change in status to “unimpaired.” Gary Davies replied that there had been such change over time, since the beginning of the RAP program in the late eighties, that in reality, it was necessary to bring community perspective to the decision-making process. He said the Wildlife Sub-Committee would bring recommended Delisting Criteria to the broader PAC at a future meeting to ensure their perspective was included.

6. PREPARATION FOR APRIL 18TH MEETING WITH TRANSPORT CANADA

J. Hall-Armstrong said that Transport Canada (TC) representatives had agreed to meet with the PAC and other organizations involved in the RAP on April 18th. J. Bailey said that TC had told him that their representatives would include the Regional Director General for Ontario and that senior personnel from ECCC would also be attending. He said he had also been told by TC that a representative of the Thunder Bay Port Authority (PA) would attend. Drew Stajkowski added that MOECC would be sending representatives as well.

J. Bailey suggested formation of a PAC Sediment Quality Sub-Committee in order that a small group could focus intensively on matters pertaining to sediment contamination and North Harbour. He said this group could report deliberations and make recommendations back to the PAC.

N. Wilson said that context was necessary for a successful meeting. He said he would like to know the objective of Transport Canada in agreeing to participate. J. Hall-Armstrong replied that TC had likely agreed to attend at the urging of MP and Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour Patti Hajdu, with whom she had corresponded and also met, in person.

J. Bailey said that the April 18th meeting provided opportunity to clarify several fundamental aspects of the North Harbour situation, such as:

1. Is the Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan (FCSAP) applicable in achieving North Harbour remediation?
2. Are funds available through FCSAP, and if not, are there alternative funding mechanisms or avenues that should be pursued?
3. Which organization(s) will lead cleanup? Is a shared lead between a couple of agencies or organizations possible?
4. Are there other "stakeholders" who are responsible for the surrounding area/site itself, or who should be involved in addressing the contaminated site?

5. Can the industries responsible play a role in resolution of the North Harbour situation?
6. North Harbour cleanup and development of a sediment management strategy is listed as a “deliverable” within the Canada-Ontario Agreement Respecting the Great Lakes Ecosystem. How will this item be acted upon?
7. Can LU assist in developing a sediment management strategy?
8. Can the Public Advisory Committee play a role in ensuring ongoing dialogue and progress for North Harbour?
9. How can a cooperative arrangement be arrived at between the harbour bottom owner (TC), the harbour manager (PA) and the various other agencies and organizations who might assist, such that cleanup will be accomplished?
10. Can “first steps” be established?
11. When can we next meet in order to continue dialogue and progress?

D. Stajkowski said he would like to know the level of commitment of the organizations attending.

G. Davies said that he hoped the April 18th meeting was only the first meeting. He said he favoured a smaller, focused working meeting and that broader public attendance at another meeting could come later. He also said that if there was time, a tour of the North Harbour site and the harbour in general would be very helpful. He said attendance by the various meeting participants in Thunder Bay provided opportunity to educate them about the North Harbour situation.

J. Saunders pointed out that a sediment management strategy for North Harbour was part of the Canada – Ontario Agreement. He said he would like to see a timeline for completion of this strategy. He said he thought a strategy had already been developed a couple of years earlier, complete with cleanup options, and that according to these earlier plans, a cleanup project should already be going to tender.

A. Kivisto said that it would be ideal if a smaller group from the PAC was convened to assist in the North Harbour situation and with matters related to sediment across the harbour. She said she was glad the April 18th meeting was going ahead but that it would not end there. She said such a group could bring continued focus to the North Harbour situation.

J. Bailey asked for volunteers for the Sediment Quality Sub-Committee and the following people said they would participate:

A. Kivisto
N. Wilson
F. Edson
J. Hall-Armstrong
M. Serediak
J. Saunders

Committee members agreed to meet in advance of the April 18th meeting to formulate the April 18th agenda, set out specific meeting objectives, suggestions and questions for tabling.

Several people voiced the opinion that the North Harbour situation would not be resolved in one meeting and that a key objective should be to have the various participants agree to attend ongoing meetings aimed at resolution of the North Harbour situation. They said a follow-up meeting should be held as soon as possible after April 18th to maintain momentum. PAC members decided that the April 18th meeting should be a business-like meeting focused on the several, difficult, core questions which needed resolution. They said they felt broad public attendance would only hinder discussion. A decision was made to limit PAC representation on April 18th to a couple of people.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

8. NEXT MEETING

June 6, 2018

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35.