



**Source Protection Committee
Wednesday, February 23rd, 2011
Holmesville Community Centre, Holmesville**

MEMBERS PRESENT

SPC Chair Larry Brown; SPC Members; Matt Pearson, Gerry Rupke, David Blaney, Marilyn Miltenburg, Ian Brebner, Don Jones, John Vander Burt, Keith Black, Mike McElhone, Rowena Wallace, Al Hamilton,

LIAISONS PRESENT

MOE Liaison, Tu Van Duong; Health Liaison Bob Worsell

WITH REGRETS

SPC Members; Bill Rowat, Karen Galbraith, Mert Schneider, Gib Dow; Source Protection Authority Liaison, Jim Ginn; Kettle and Stony Point First Nations Liaison, Bob Bresette

DWSP STAFF PRESENT

Cathie Brown, Project Manager; Jenna Allain, Project Assistant/Recording Secretary; Tim Cumming, Communications Specialist; Abigail Gutteridge, Source Protection Technician

CALL TO ORDER

Larry Brown, Source Protection Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

AGENDA

MOTION #SPC: 2011-02-01

Moved by Don Jones
Seconded by Gerry Rupke

That the agenda be approved.

Carried by Consensus.

MINUTES FROM JANUARY 26th, 2011

MOTION #SPC: 2011-02-02

Moved by Mat Pearson
Seconded by Marilyn Miltenburg

That the SPC minutes from January 26th be approved as amended.

Carried by Consensus.

The minutes should be changed such that in the “Prohibit vs. Manage” discussion, the distinction should be made that only future ‘significant threats’ were proposed to be prohibited.

BUSINESS OUT OF THE MINUTES

Chair Brown informed the Committee that a flow chart showing the process for setting Great Lakes targets was included in the meeting materials. This chart was sent from MOE as a follow up to the letter that the SPC sent to the Minister.

Chair Brown led a discussion about removing residential DNAPLs from the enumeration of significant threats for the region. Since no quantities of DNAPLs were indicated in the table of drinking water threats, all quantities of DNAPLs were assumed to be significant. This included all residential properties in the 5 year time-of-travel. Since most residential properties would have very small quantities of DNAPLs, they would not constitute the same level threat as commercial DNAPLs. By including these properties in the enumeration, an additional 400 notification letters would need to be sent. Project Manager, Cathie Brown explained the correspondence with MOE regarding this matter. The Committee had a lengthy discussion about the removal of these threats and discussed the issue of higher quantities of DNAPLs used for certain home businesses.

MOTION #SPC: 2011-02-03

Moved by Don Jones

Seconded by Mike McElhone

That the Committee agrees that residential DNAPLs should not be enumerated as significant threats except where they may be of commercial scale, including home occupations and home industries.

Carried by Majority.

DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None

PLANHARMONY.COM – MATCHING PRESCRIBED TOOLS TO THREATS

Project Manager, Cathie Brown gave a presentation about how to match each of the seven tools to the various threats. A detailed description of each of the tools was provided including their usefulness and limitations. The appropriateness of each tool for existing threats versus would be threats were discussed. An example, using the Auburn well system was described. The Committee had a discussion about the difference between threats and conditions.

AGRICULTURE THREATS – PART 1

Jenna Allain, Project Assistant, gave a presentation on agriculture threats related to application. These include the application of agricultural source material (ASM), non-agricultural source material (NASM), commercial fertilizer, and pesticides. An overview was provided about what each of these threats are, where they can be a significant threat, what the local status of the threat is and existing legislation to manage these threats. Various policies options were put forward using the different tools available under the *Clean Water Act*.

AGRICULTURE THREATS – PART 2

Source Protection Technician, Abigail Gutteridge described agricultural threats related to storage, which include the storage of ASM, NASM, commercial fertilizer and pesticides. How they are identified as a significant threat was described. The storage threat of ASM and NASM depends on the percent of managed lands and livestock density. For commercial fertilizer and pesticides the storage threat depends on the amount being stored. Existing legislation for managing agricultural storage was discussed. There are very few properties (less than 10) with agriculture storage threats in the ABMV region.

AGRICULTURE THREATS – PART 3

Project Manager, Cathie Brown gave a presentation about all other agricultural threats. These include septic systems, fuel storage, livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas, and DNAPLs. Septic and fuel storage threats would be the same as for residential properties which was discussed at the last SPC meeting. However, farms may also store larger amounts of fuel for use with farm equipment. TSSA regulates both home heating fuel oil and the fuel for farm equipment. TSSA standards for fuel tanks on farms, and policy considerations were discussed. There are some wellheads in the region with a vulnerability score of 10 outside of the immediate 100 m zone. These areas are where most of the livestock grazing/pasturing and outdoor confinement threats exist. There are no feedlots within 100m of any of the wellheads. Different policy options outlined in the risk management catalogue for outdoor confinement, grazing/pasturing, and DNAPLs were discussed.

CORRESPONDENCE AND DELEGATIONS

Seven pieces of correspondence were included in SPC meeting materials. The first was a letter from the Town of Goderich in support of the SPC motion for county-wide septic inspections. The second piece of correspondence was a commentary by the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario on their position on the importance of water and water conservation. The third piece of correspondence was a letter from the director in response to the letter from the SPC requesting a loan program for septic inspections. The Committee had a lengthy discussion about the process for septic inspections. The next three pieces of correspondence were from the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula SPC. The first was a letter explaining their requests to the Province to amend the *Nutrient Management Act* and the Environmental Farm Plan programs to make them an acceptable assessment and action plan for farms in vulnerable areas. The other two pieces were the actual motions for these requests. The SPC felt there was a lot of material to cover in the motions and wanted a month to think about the implications of them.

MOTION #SPC: 2011-02-04

Moved by David Blaney
Seconded by Gerry Rupke

That the discussion to support the motions of the SGSNBP SPC be deferred to the next SPC meeting on March 30th, 2011.

Carried by Consensus.

The final piece of correspondence was an invitation to participate in a study by a researcher at the University of Waterloo. This is a voluntary study and the decision to participate is at the discretion of each SPC member.

MOTION #SPC: 2011-02-05

Moved by Rowena Wallace

Seconded by Ian Brebner

That the pieces of correspondence that did not require specific action be received, noted and filed.

Carried by Consensus.

LIAISON UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS

No liaison updates.

The SPC had a discussion about the increasing levels of nitrates in the raw water supply for the LHPWSS. The process for determining the IPZ-3 for the intake was explained.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING – March 30th, 2011

- Recommendations on residential threats
- Commercial Threats
- Conditions and Issues

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Brown declared the meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Larry Brown
Chair

Jenna Allain
Recording Secretary