



**Source Protection Committee  
Wednesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011  
Holmesville Community Centre, Holmesville  
**Draft****

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

**LIAISONS PRESENT**

Source Protection Authority Liaison, Jim Ginn, MOE Liaison, Jennifer Arthur,

**WITH REGRETS**

SPC Members; Bill Rowat, Kettle and Stony Point First Nations Liaison, Bob Bresette, Health Liaison Bob Worsell

**DWSP STAFF PRESENT**

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

**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: 2011-03-01**

Moved by Gerry Rupke  
Seconded by Karen Galbraith

**That the agenda be approved.**

Carried by Consensus.

**MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011**

**MOTION #SPC: 2011-03-02**

Moved by Mike McElhone  
Seconded by Don Jones

**That the SPC minutes from February 23<sup>rd</sup> be approved.**  
Carried by Consensus.

**BUSINESS OUT OF THE MINUTES**

At the last SPC meeting, a letter and motions were received from the Saugeen Grey Sauble Northern Bruce Peninsula (SGSNBP) Source Protection Committee. The SGSNBP SPC asked that other SPC's consider supporting them in their motions. The motions pertain to the *Nutrient Management Act* (NMA) and Environmental Farm Plans. They have requested that the province amend the NMA to require a nutrient management plan/strategy for farms with over 5 NU in vulnerable areas. They have also requested that modifications be made to the protocol for environmental farm plans to make it an acceptable action plan for farms in vulnerable areas. The Project Manager explained that as plan development moves forward, there are tools like provincial instruments that may not be adequate in managing threats. One approach would be to amend the provincial legislation so that they cover some of the scenarios that fall under the CWA. The likelihood that this will happen before the first plan is put in place is fairly low.

**MOTION #SPC: 2011-03-03**

Moved by Gerry Rupke

Seconded by Rowena Wallace

**That the motions and letters from the SGSNBP Source Protection Committee, be noted and filed.**

Carried by Consensus.

**DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

None

**CHAIRS MEETING UPDATE**

SPC Chair, Larry Brown updated the Committee on the topics that were discussed at the most recent chairs meeting in Mississauga on March 7<sup>th</sup>. The chairs were interested in meeting to get sense of direction on how plan development was going across the province. It seemed that every region has very embryonic policies at this point and a breakout group session was held to discuss policies and policy ideas for different threats. Three groups gave presentations on their policy approach which indicated that each region has a different approach to policy development that handles their local situation. Chair Brown felt that the approach the Committee has chosen is still appropriate for the ABMV region. A presentation on DNAPLs was also provided at the chairs meeting and some of the details from that presentation were discussed.

**UAR/AAR UPDATE**

Project Manager, Cathie Brown gave a presentation about the progress of the updated/amended AR. Since submitting the AR in June of 2010, a workplan was submitted in October for the updated AR (UAR). Feedback on the workplan was received in December identifying certain tasks as being out of scope for the UAR. Other tasks were identified as in-scope and important to complete for the UAR. These included tasks such as the IPZ-3 and transport pathways. Feedback was also received on how the

AR should be amended in order to meet the requirements of the regulations and technical rules. Many of the amendments were related to changing the descriptive language in the text to match the language in the *Clean Water Act*, its regulations and the technical rules. The intent of the original wording in the report was to make it a document that was more user-friendly. However, MOE found the language to be misleading in some cases.

The changes made to the shape of the IPZ-1 for Goderich was described. Some changes to the water budget were also required since the Tier 2 Water Budget was not finalized at the time that the AR was originally submitted. A significant rewrite of chapter four was required along with a redrafting of many of the maps. Extensive amendments were made to chapter three, and the touching up of typos and explanations was required in some of the other chapters. Chapter six was completely rewritten to reflect the future work that will be required.

Tasks that were required for the updated AR are transport pathways and the IPZ-3. The methodology used to identify transport pathways and the threats existing around them was discussed in great detail. Since transport pathways (private wells) inside of WHPAs require an adjustment to the vulnerability scores around them, there are implications for the number of significant threats to increase. In the ABMV region there about 90 transport pathways that increase the score from 8 to 10, and about 90 that go from 6 to 8. Work is currently underway to identify any potential threats on these properties.

The methodology used to delineate an IPZ-3 was described in detail. The IPZ-3 identifies any properties that could release a contaminant in a large storm event that would overwhelm the treatment capacity of the intakes. Currently there are approximately five properties still being considered as part of the IPZ-3 process. Once this is finalized, it will be incorporated into the reports and presented to the SPC.

Work for the Tier 3 Water Budget is being deferred to the next round of planning. This was prompted due to a proposal to make more changes to the technical rules which would alter the methodology for the water budget. The issues declared by the SPC (sinkholes and radionuclides in Seaforth) are also being deferred until the next round of planning. All of the threats enumeration tables in chapter four of the AR will be updated based on consultation with landowners. The final aspect of the UAR/AAR is climate change. All of the data on climate change has been considered, however, it does not provide any policy direction.

It was announced that GIS Specialist, Darrell Innes has moved on to a new position and has been replaced by one of the GIS staff for ABCA, Aaron Clark. Due to these staff changes, there have been some delays in the timelines for the UAR/AAR. An extension was requested from the province from April 30<sup>th</sup> to May 30<sup>th</sup>. In order to meet all of the consultation requirements the UAR/AAR will need to be posted on April 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> to meet the May 30<sup>th</sup> submission date. The SPC will take a look at the draft reports in April. The Committee discussed strategies to elicit public comment on the reports and what format they would like to receive the reports in.

### **COMMERCIAL THREATS**

Source Protection Technician, Abigail Gutteridge provided the first presentation on commercial threats which included DNAPLs and organic solvents. Threats backgrounder reports for commercial threats were provided in SPC package materials. Where these threats can be significant, applicable legislation, local perspective of the threat and policy considerations were discussed. DNAPLs are quite different from all of the other threats since they can be significant in any quantity anywhere within the 5 year time-of-travel. Locally, there are 13 WHPA's in the region have commercial properties with significant DNAPL threats. No commercial properties with organic solvents threats exist in the region.

Project Manager, Cathie Brown provided the second presentation on commercial threats which included salt (application and storage), snow storage, aircraft de-icing and commercial fuel storage. Areas where these threats can be significant, applicable legislation, local perspective of the threat, and policy considerations were discussed. There are no existing salt, aircraft de-icing, or snow storage threats in this region. An industry representative on the SPC spoke to the requirements for salt application and storage and industry best practices. Errors in the salt threat backgrounder were identified and concerns were raised about the validity of these reports. The Committee discussed policy ideas for the existing large fuel storage threats

### **ISSUES AND CONDITIONS**

Project Assistant, Jenna Allain provided an update on conditions and issues in the region. Definitions of conditions and issues were provided and the Committee was updated on the local status of both. No conditions have been identified in the region and issues work has been deferred to future rounds of planning.

### **OVERVIEW OF PLANNING PROCESS**

Project Assistant, Jenna Allain provided an overview of the planning process. Two reports were included in SPC package materials. The first report describes the origin of the municipal planning groups and the materials discussed at each of the meetings with these groups. The second report describes the workplan for policy development. The process is divided into three phases. The first phase is the early development of policies with working groups and SPC input. Draft policies will be developed for the SPC summit in August where they will be discussed with Ministry or subject matter experts. The second phase will be pre-consultation, when a second draft of the policies will go out for consultation with all bodies, such as municipalities, that will have responsibility for implementation. The third phase is the formal consultation period, which will involve formal notices to municipalities, First Nations, and effected persons. Communication with the public will also take place.

### **POLICY DISCUSSION**

Reports on policy recommendations for both septic system and fuel storage threats were included in SPC packages. The Committee broke into small groups to discuss the ideas about the recommendations. Feedback on each recommendation was shared by each of the groups to the entire Committee and notes were taken for the refinement of these

policies. This feedback will be used to create the “rough” Draft SP Plan for Phase 1 of the planning process.

**CORRESPONDENCE AND DELEGATIONS**

Two items of correspondence were included in SPC package materials. The first was an article from the CBC about the problem of home oil tanks leaking. The second was correspondence from a member of the public that has expressed concerns with details of the Assessment Reports. Chair Brown directed staff to provide a letter response to Mr. Powell.

**LIAISON UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS**

None

**AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING – MAY 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011**

- Recommendation on Commercial Threats
- Transport Pathways
- Strategic Action Policies

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Brown declared the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

---

Larry Brown  
Chair

---

Jenna Allain  
Recording Secretary