



**Source Protection Committee
Wednesday, April 27th, 2011
Holmesville Community Centre, Holmesville**

MEMBERS PRESENT

SPC Chair Larry Brown; SPC Members; Matt Pearson, Karen Galbraith, David Blaney, Mert Schneider, Ian Brebner, Bill Rowat, Don Jones, Marilyn Miltenburg, John Vander Burgt, Keith Black, Mike McElhone, Al Hamilton

LIAISONS PRESENT

Source Protection Authority Liaison, Jim Ginn, MOE Liaison, Tu Van Duong, Health Liaison Bob Worsell

WITH REGRETS

SPC Members; Rowena Wallace, Gerry Rupke, Gib Dow, 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; Donna Clarkson, Source Protection Technician; Mary Lynn MacDonald, Group Facilitator

OTHERS PRESENT

Kate Monk, Lands and Stewardship Coordinator, ABCA; Brian Luinstra, Hydrogeologist, Huron Geoscientists

CALL TO ORDER

Larry Brown, Source Protection Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:34a.m.

AGENDA

MOTION #SPC: 2011-04-01

Moved by Don Jones
Seconded by Matt Pearson

That the agenda be approved.

Carried by Consensus.

MINUTES FROM MARCH 30TH, 2011

MOTION #SPC: 2011-04-02

Moved by Ian Brebner
Seconded by Mert Schneider

That the SPC minutes from March 30th be approved.

Carried by Consensus.

BUSINESS OUT OF THE MINUTES

None

DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None

STEWARDSHIP – EARLY RESPONSE

Kate Monk, Stewardship and Conservation Lands Supervisor for ABCA, provided a report on the Early Response (ER) stewardship program. The ER program follows the Early Actions (EA) program and is effective from December 1st 2010 to December 31st, 2012. In this phase of the program, MOE is requesting increased involvement from Source Protection Committees. Last summer the SPC approved the recommendations to target threats identified in the Assessment Report with ER funding. A proposal was submitted based on those recommendations and the ABMV Region was approved for \$256 thousand to grant landowners, and \$52 thousand to deliver the program. The terms of reference for the program was provided in SPC meeting materials and the Committee was asked to approve them.

The threats that are targeted for funding were outlined in the ER terms of reference. However, 25% of the funding can be used for other threats that were not identified in the proposal. Staff are required to undertake a site visit at the outset and completion of a project. The same project review committee for the EA funding is being proposed for the ER funding and would include: Kate Monk, Doug Hocking, Tim Cumming, Jayne Thompson, and Donna Clarkson. The role of the project review committee is to review each application for funding, approve applications by consensus, and keep minutes on each review. The committee will report back to the SPC about how the funding is being rolled out. If an appeal is made, a letter will go to the Chair of the SPC. Then an appeals committee (consisting of the Chair, alternate Chair, and a third SPC member) will meet and review the appeal. A discussion was had about the amount required for delivery of the program.

MOTION #SPC: 2011-04-03

Moved by Karen Galbraith

Seconded by Don Jones

That the terms of reference for the early response program be approved as presented.

Carried by Consensus.

The Committee discussed the status of the Early Actions program. The program was to end in December of 2010. However, a change to the program was made such that any remaining funds from Early Actions could still be delivered until 2012. Ontario Soil and Crop is no longer administering the EA stewardship funds for farmers so staff can now deliver about \$300 thousand to farmers. Staff are looking for help from SPC members,

particularly the agriculture representatives, to promote this funding. This funding is available to any farm within the 2 year time-of-travel.

AMENDED ASSESSMENT REPORT

Project Manager, Cathie Brown gave a presentation on the amended assessment report. There are two types of revisions that were made to the Assessment Report; updates (UAR) and amendments (AAR). Amendments were required directions provided by the Director, whereas, updates come from requirements stated in the regulations and technical rules.

A workplan to complete the updated assessment report was submitted to the Province in October. The Ministry provided feedback on the workplan and amendments that were required in December and January. The original deadline for the amendments and updates to be completed was April 30th but an extension was granted until May 30th. The amended/updated assessment report is now posted online for public comment and final versions to be submitted to MOE will be provided at the next SPC meeting in May. The hard copies will be printed in a book format with a CD containing all of the maps, rather than using all of the binders again.

The amendments to the Assessment Report were outlined and included: more explanation of methodologies used to delineate managed lands, livestock density and impervious surface area; more technical language throughout, a change in the delineation of IPZ-1 for the Goderich intake, clarification in the water budget about SGRAs, and correction of typographical errors. Additionally the enumeration of significant threats was updated to remove commercial dumpsters and residential DNAPLs. This greatly reduced the number of significant threats. Since chapter 6 of the AR outlined the tasks that were to be included an updated AR, this chapter was completely rewritten to reflect work that will be done in future rounds of planning. These tasks include: great lakes targets, issues, clusters, moderate threat policies, and local threats.

UPDATED ASSESSMENT REPORT

Hydrogeologist, Brian Luinstra gave a presentation on the updated Assessment Report. There were three major components required for the updated AR: transport pathways, delineation of an IPZ-3, and updated information on local climate change impacts. Transport pathways (eg: abandoned wells) were considered in each of the Wellhead Protection Areas in the ABMV region. Since they are a direct conduit to underground aquifers, they can impact the vulnerability of an area. The Committee was reminded about how WHPA vulnerability scoring is achieved. For the transport pathways exercise, all properties known to have a private well within a WHPA were considered. Any wells with records were removed from the inventory. During a 2007 well location study conducted by DWSP staff, all private wells that staff were allowed access to, were located (using GPS) and photographed. The photographs were reviewed, and wells that were out of compliance had a 30 m buffer drawn around them, and the vulnerability score adjusted. Thirty metres was chosen because it is a standard setback distance for wells. Any wells which staff were unable to access had a 60 m buffer drawn around them since the exact location of those wells could not be determined.

For the delineation of the IPZ-3, only high level guidance was provided by province. The ABMV region used a threats based approach by looking at any properties near a watercourse and screened them for potential threats that could reach one of the intakes in a 100 year storm event. All properties within 120 m of a watercourse were included at first and screened out if: the property was a natural area, did not have any structures on it, or had only below grade storage (as this is more of a groundwater threat).

After screening all properties within the region, only five properties of concern were identified: three in Goderich and two in Grand Bend.

At the Lake Huron Primary Water Supply System (LHPWSS) two possible threats which could be considered part of the IPZ-3: a marina and sewage lagoons. Spill scenarios were looked at for these two potential threats by considering the concentrations of contaminants and their environmental fate. The methodology for determining dilution/dispersion factors was explained. For the Grand Bend wastewater treatment plant, the dilution factor is very low because of mixing in both the river and the lake. No parameters of concern would reach thresholds for issues established by the SPC. For the LHPWSS, no IPZ-3 delineation was required.

The three properties in Goderich identified as potential concerns were a marina, the sewage treatment plant (STP) outfall, and salt storage on the pier. Field verification was conducted at these sites and the marina fuel storage was below grade, and no more bypasses or large storage was found with respect to the STP. However, salt storage on the pier requires further investigation. Based on the calculations completed, a salt spill at the pier would have the potential to exceed aesthetic standards. For the Goderich intake, delineation of an IPZ-3 is also not required since salt storage is already in the IPZ-2. The salt storage is currently considered a moderate threat but the Committee could declare it as a significant threat. The actual risk of the spill occurring and the implications for declaring it as a significant threat were discussed at length.

MOTION #SPC: 2011-04-03

Moved by Bill Rowat

Seconded by Mike McElhone

That the salt storage in Goderich be included as a significant threat.

Motion was lost.

It is noted that SPC members Matt Pearson and Al Hamilton declared a conflict of interest and abstained from voting.

The third task for the UAR is the consideration of climate change. Based on climate and precipitation data from the region, there is significant variability in rainfall occurring from year to year. Overall, there is an increase in precipitation. Some of the wording in the climate change chapter was clarified to reflect these observations. An increase in precipitation means more water in the system. This could result in some water quality issues. SPC discussed the issue of great lakes water levels dropping. The International

Joint Commission has been very concerned about diversions out of the Great Lakes, and an international agreement has been reached to stop any new diversions.

INDUSTRIAL THREATS

Project Manager, Cathie Brown provided a presentation on industrial threats. Industrial threats include waste disposal and industrial sewage. The details of each of these threats was reviewed, where they can be a significant threat was explained, and potential policy options for these threats was discussed. The local status of these threats was provided and existing management measures (e.g. Certificates of Approval) were described.

Industrial sewage includes large septic systems, sewage treatment discharges, tanks, sanitary sewers and pipes, combined sewer discharges, industrial effluent discharges, and discharge of untreated stormwater from a stormwater management pond. There are only 6 existing significant industrial sewage threats in the ABMV region and they are all large sewer pipes. There is also one existing stormwater retention pond threat in Clinton where the score is 10. All of the other circumstances will require policies for future threats only. Policy ideas for grappling with these threats includes: inspections, monitoring, spills contingency planning, and amending Certificates of Approval to meet certain conditions.

POLICY DISCUSSION – AGRICULTURE THREATS

ABCA Planner, Geoff Cade, introduced the policy recommendations for agricultural threats that were included in SPC package materials. The policy recommendations are a result of the early engagement with municipal staff and stakeholders. Three documents were included in meeting materials, two deal with ASM, NASM, pesticides, chemicals and fertilizers, and the other deals with outdoor confinement areas and grazing. The SPC broke into two groups to discuss each of the recommendations in detail. A roundtable discussion was had at the end to share comments and concerns about the policies. Comments were recorded and the policies will be further refined and presented to the SPC again at a later meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE AND DELEGATIONS

There were two pieces of correspondence included in SPC meeting materials. The first was an email from Mr. Powell and the second was the letter responding to him. Another letter has just been sent back to Mr. Powell containing the consulting reports detailing the vulnerability scoring and threats around it.

MOTION #SPC: 2011-04-03

Moved by Ian Brebner

Seconded by Matt Pearson

That the items of correspondence be received, noted and filed.

Carried by Consensus.

LIAISON UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS

None

AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING – MAY 25th, 2011

- Recommendation on Commercial Threats
- Strategic Action Policies
- Presentation on enforcement and penalties of plans

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Brown declared the meeting adjourned at 3:13 p.m.

Larry Brown
Chair

Jenna Allain
Recording Secretary