



Source Protection Committee

Wednesday, October 28, 2009, 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
Holmesville Community Centre, Holmesville

MEMBERS PRESENT

SPC Chair Larry Brown; SPC Members; Keith Black, John Vander Burgt, Don Jones, Gerry Rupke, Ian Brebner, Bill Rowat, Matt Pearson, Karen Galbraith, Marilyn Miltenburg, Jim Nelemans, Mike McElhone, Al Hamilton, Rowena Wallace, Mert Schneider

LIAISONS PRESENT

Health Liaison Bob Worsell, Source Protection Authority Liaison, Jim Ginn, MOE Liaison, Tu Van Duong, Kettle and Stoney Point First Nations Liaison, Bob Bresette

WITH REGRETS

SPC Members; Gib Dow

DWSP STAFF PRESENT

Cathie Brown, Project Manager; Jenna Bowen, Project Assistant/Recording Secretary; Mary Lynn MacDonald, Group Facilitator

OTHERS PRESENT

None

CALL TO ORDER

Larry Brown, Source Protection Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

AGENDA

MOTION #SPC: 2009-10A-01

Moved by Gerry Rupke
Seconded by Jim Nelemans

That the agenda be approved.

Carried by Consensus.

MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 30TH AND OCTOBER 2ND, 2009

MOTION #SPC: 2009-10B-02

Moved by Karen Galbraith
Seconded by Marilyn Miltenburg

That the SPC minutes from September 30th and October 2nd be approved as amended.

Carried by Consensus.

The October 2nd minutes should be amended to remove the sentence that states that the town of Wingham is not located in North Huron.

BUSINESS OUT OF THE MINUTES

There was a brief discussion regarding the rationale behind the 100 metre protection zone around wellheads. This is a standard used across North America. The pre-CWA Technical Panel confirmed this standard. While the 100 metre protection zone may have been a best estimate based on current scientific information (generalized travel time of three months to add some pathogen protection), the SPC is the body that will ultimately be developing the source protection policies.

DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None

TRANSPORTATION THREATS

Project Manager, Cathie Brown presented information about transportation threats. At several SPC meetings transportation threats have been brought up as a point of interest but they are currently not listed as a threat to drinking water in the Regulation. A technical bulletin addressing transportation threats has been released by the MOE and was provided in SPC packages.

Although Transportation Threats are not in the Regulation, the SPC may add a local drinking water threat or additional circumstances. The actual transportation corridor is not the threat. The threat is what is actually passing through the corridor. Therefore, not only would the SPC need to identify which chemicals/pathogens constitute threats, they would need to quantify which amount of a substance for a threat as well as what specific routes they travel.

If it is a chemical threat, there are several items to think about including: toxicity, quantity, method of release, and what types of vulnerable areas it is located in. If it was a pathogen, the SPC would need to think about frequency, method of release, and vulnerable area. The SPC must also get permission under Rule 119 of the CWA to add it as a threat that is not prescribed, and the Director would have to be satisfied that the hazard rating is greater than 4. A cautionary thought, is that if the SPC identifies a corridor as a significant threat, the Committee would be obliged to develop a policy to reduce it from a significant threat to a moderate one. SPC's do not have the authority to change routes on existing provincial and federal roads, only local roads. The SPC instead would need to reduce the likelihood of spills by working with municipalities to reduce speeds, create berms, etc. In future steps, the Province is supporting looking into transportation threats in the future rounds of planning.

CLUSTERS

SPC member, Bill Rowat presented information to the Committee regarding a clusters report that had prepared based on the number of threats identified in the draft Assessment Report for the ABMV region. While the CWA applies primarily to municipal systems, it has been estimated that roughly 45% of the population in the ABMV region are on private systems. Based on the information in the draft Assessment Report, the level of surety for municipal systems in the ABMV region is that they are 98.4 % safe. Therefore individuals on municipal systems are dealing with a reasonably low level of risk overall. The other 45% of the population on private systems have to rely on managing their own wells and septic systems. Scientists that have presented to the Committee in the past have said that roughly 25% of private wells test positive for coliform and that 33% of wells were above ODWS for bacteria. The SPC was advised of these facts two years ago and since then, no work on private systems has been done due to a delay in municipal guidance and funding from MOE. When the threat profiles for the large municipal systems are compared with the small municipal systems, the smaller systems have a much higher proportion of significant threats. Almost all threats are due to septic systems and agricultural activities. The question is, are these small municipal systems a good proxy for the cluster systems? Is there any reason to believe that they wouldn't have a similar threat profile? The SPC requested that a pilot study on cluster systems be included in the 2008-2009 workplan. This requested was turned down, and the SPC was advised to wait until there is guidance in place for cluster systems.

The Committee had a lengthy discussion about the need to include clusters as part of the source protection program.

MOTION #SPC: 2009-10B-03

Moved by Marilyn Miltenburg
Seconded by Mike McElhone

That the clusters report be received and given to staff to consider for the appropriate use in the clusters pilot study.

Carried by majority.

MOTION #SPC: 2009-10B-03

Moved by Mike McElhone
Seconded by Bill Rowat

That the SPC notify the MOE of the Committee's concern over the delay of the policies and procedures relating to clusters, which is delaying the SPC's ability to properly do their jobs.

Carried by majority.

PLANNING FOR ISSUES

Hydrogeologist, Brian Luinstra presented information to the Committee on drinking water issues. In keeping with the process passed by the SPC, in order to add a drinking water issue into the Assessment Report a water quality threshold must be exceeded. The SPC must then contact the operating authority for the system to determine whether they agree or disagree with the issue (can the treatment process manage the raw water issue).

If the operating authority does not feel it is affecting the operation of the system, it is not considered an issue. If the operator agrees that the exceedance is beyond the capacity to treat, then the contributing area for an issue must be determined, and a workplan for dealing with the issue must be included in the AR.

In terms of the first round of the AR, two possible issues have been identified. The process for adding these identified issues into the AR is anticipated to begin in the first quarter of 2010. The work will be completed in time for an amended AR, in time for consideration for the first Source Protection Plan

The first issue currently being considered is a radionuclide issue in Seaforth. This issue is well documented but it is unknown whether it is naturally occurring or anthropogenic. Naturally occurring issues are not acted upon because it is too difficult to find the contributing area and no planning policies are possible. Some sampling has been completed. An analysis of the data to determine if it can be correlated to a human cause has yet to be done.

The second issue being considered is nitrates associated with sinkhole areas. There is a significant portion of land south of Seaforth that drains into sinkholes. Well sampling (non-municipal wells) in the area has shown nitrate exceedances. Since the vulnerable area is either an HVA or an SGRA there is no operating authority with which to undertake the second step in the process. Data for this issue will therefore come back to the SPC for consideration.

The hydrogeologist recommends that these possible issues be included in the AR, within the Addressing Limitations chapter in order to move forward.

ASSESSMENT REPORT: WATER BUDGET

Hydrogeologist, Brian Luinstra presented information on the Water Budget. SPC members received a draft copy of the water budget for the Ausable Bayfield SPA. Results from the Ausable Bayfield report will be almost identical for the Maitland Valley report. The draft chapter contains the Tier 1 water budget which the SPC has previously reviewed. The new information is the part that pertains to the Tier 2 Water Budget. The gullies between Bayfield and Goderich are the only areas that have been identified as being under moderate stress. While the Tier 2 Water Budget is included in the draft report, it has not been approved by the peer review committee yet. Early results indicate that a Tier 3 budget is unnecessary. A drought scenario is needed to confirm this. The draft version of the Maitland Valley Water Budget will be emailed to the Committee.

ASSESSMENT REPORT UPDATE

Project Manager Cathie Brown and Project Assistant, Jenna Bowen gave an update on the status of the draft Assessment Report. Staff are in the process of calling all municipalities to confirm information about their drinking water systems. The final draft will come in a 3 volume set for each SPA. The set will comprise of a text portion, a map book, and an appendix. Each volume will be several hundred pages long. Since staff are anticipating the sets to be quite large in size, they will be hand delivered to SPC members prior to the next

SPC meeting. The goal at that meeting will be for the SPC to feel comfortable enough with the reports that they would approve them for public consultation. Once consultation begins, the Project Manager and Project Assistant will visit all municipalities to review the information in the reports that pertain to them. The Communications Specialist will be leading a series of public meetings. At the March 2010 SPC meeting staff will bring forward all of the recommended changes from the public. The drought scenario (if completed) for the water budget will also be brought forward in March. Some things that may not be completed for the November drafts will be completed for the March version. At the March meeting, the SPC will decide what to do with information and this will be incorporated into the reports for the April SPC meeting. The reports will then go to the SPAs for an additional waiting period. Any additional correspondence received during this time will be attached to the version that gets submitted to the Minister. In June, the packages will go to the Ministers office.

DRAFT WORKPLAN

Project Manager, Cathie Brown provided the Committee with a draft workplan for 2010-2011. The budget includes allocations for; public consultation, information management, pilot studies, water budget drought scenarios, and other recurring costs. Separate funding will be provided for First Nations work.

CORRESPONDANCE AND DELEGATIONS

SPC members were provided with one piece of correspondence. This was a letter from the director of the Source Protection Programs Planning Branch at MOE regarding an update on the risk management measures catalogue.

LIAISON UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS

Kettle and Stoney Point First Nation Liaison, Bob Bresette informed the Committee about a new EBR posting regarding the inclusion of Kettle and Stoney Point in the Source Protection program. The posting indicates that MOE regulations will be forthcoming that will provide guidance on how the work will be carried out. There is a 30 day comment period for the current posting, and a meeting is being arranged for November between MOE, CA staff and first nations to discuss the partnership.

MOE Liaison, Tu Van Duong informed the Committee that the first Assessment Report has been posted for public consultation for a 35 day period by the Mattagami Region. It is available online for anyone wishing to view it.

SPC Member, Karen Galbraith shared her experiences at the Walkerton Clean Water Centre with the Committee. Karen, along with three other SPC members, attended a workshop at the Centre, which is a world renowned facility. The presenter shared four case studies of drinking water contamination. The case studies indicated that pathogens were the greatest threat to drinking water, and that the events were usually preceded by some sort of dramatic change – typically whether related.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING – NOVEMBER 25, 2009

- Approval of Draft Proposed AR
- Pathogens Speaker

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Brown declared the meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Larry Brown
Chair

Jenna Bowen
Recording Secretary