



Source Protection Committee

Friday, October 2, 2009, 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
Huron County Health Unit, Clinton

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, Marily Miltenburg, Jim Nelemans, Mike McElhone, Al Hamilton

LIAISONS PRESENT

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

WITH REGRETS

SPC Members; Gib Dow, Rowena Wallace, Mert Schneider; Kettle and Stoney Point First Nations Liaison, Bob Bresette

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 9:47 a.m.

AGENDA

MOTION #SPC: 2009-10-01

Moved by Karen Galbraith
Seconded by Matt Pearson

That the agenda be approved.

Carried by Consensus.

DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None

CHAPTER 4 OF AR: MAITLAND VALLEY – VULNERABILITY, THREATS & RISKS

Project Manager, Cathie Brown introduced the Maitland Valley version of the Vulnerability, Threats, and Risks chapter of the AR, and led the review discussion. The Committee was informed that all DNAPL threats will change due to new guidance provided by MOE. Originally only properties that were thought to have a significant amount of DNAPL's (e.g. commercial properties) were counted. Now all properties within the 5 year TOT are counted because they have to potential to store DNAPL's. Threat enumeration in tables throughout the report will also change with updated information.

The following comments and questions on the chapter were brought up for review:

- Q: Do septic inspection programs reduce the number of septic system threats? A:
- No. The AR is just an inventory of the potential threats. It does not take into account any type of management programs that have already taken place.
- Much of the material appears to pertain to the whole SP region (e.g. two intakes are mentioned for both SPA's but each SPA only has 1 intake). It was suggested that the reports be amended to be more specific to the SPA that is being discussed.
- More information should be provided to explain how IPZ's are estimated.
- The permitted capacity for Century Heights well is higher than the design capacity. This needs to be amended to reflect accurate information.
- There are frequent references to the lakeshore or shoreline. Need to change this to specify the Lake Huron shoreline.
- A lengthy discussion was had about spills on Highway 21 being included as a threat and what kinds of mitigation would be needed to reduce the threat. The
- Committee was informed that the Port Blake Water Supply Committee is planning to write a letter to the SPC requesting highway 21 be included as a threat. The MOE liaison will provide further information to the SPC on transportation corridors and adding threats.

CHAPTER 4 CONTINUED.....

These further comments and questions were received:

- Imperial units in the report should be converted to metric units.
- There was a discussion about the location of intake protection zones for the
- Goderich intake and why they were located where they are. Further clarification to be provided at next meeting.
- Need to be consistent throughout the report when describing units (i.e. cubic metres per day vs. m³/day).
- Q: Will there be contact with municipalities to verify information about municipalities and well systems? A: Staff are doing their best within the time limits to confirm that the most up to date data is included in the reports.
- Harriston and Palmerston populations and design capacities do not match up with the information provided about the Town of Minto.
- There is a new well commissioned for Auburn. This should be looked into.
- There was a discussion about clusters and the threats associated with cluster system. It was requested to have clusters added as an agenda item for the next meeting.

Additional minor comments and suggestion were handed into to staff on comment sheets.

WATER BUDGET, SGRA's, & ADDRESSING LIMITATIONS

Hydrogeologist, Brian Luinstra presented information on the water budget, significant groundwater recharge areas (SGRA's), and addressing limitations in the AR.

Water Budget

The process for the water budget is to have a peer review committee (PRC) that signs off on the decisions regarding methodology used. Changes the PRC requested on methodology for SGRA's have delayed the completion of the water budget chapter. The tier 2 water budget is currently being completed. The only remaining task is to look at drought and how it will affect wellheads. The draft chapter will be prepared before the November SPC meeting. The PRC will likely review and sign off on the water budget in January 2010 and that version will go to the Minister.

SGRA's

For SGRA's, the maximum vulnerability score possible is a 6, and the maximum threat is moderate. Therefore, there is not as much prescriptive power of the SPC to deal with threats in these areas. However, once they are delineated the implications could be broader from the Planning Act since SGRA will become officially protected areas. A detailed description of the methodology used to delineate SGRA's was provided. The model currently removes any areas without well records from SGRA delineations. Brian made the recommendation, and the Committee agreed to not remove areas without well records from the SGRA delineations.

Addressing Limitations

MOE has recognized that not all technical work will be completed in this area (e.g. no region in Ontario will have a tier 3 water budget for this round of the AR). Therefore, MOE has given the option of providing this information in an updated AR. What *is* required for this round is a list of the limitations that the region has, and a workplan for how to deal with those limitations.

Limitations include any major threat that has the ability to impact an intake in an extreme storm event; therefore an IPZ-3 for Goderich is required. Under current guidance rules in the IPZ-2 for the ABMV region, there can't be a significant threat. If a threat has the ability to impact an intake in a major storm than this will be significant and override the IPZ-2. For example, modeling the Goderich sewage treatment plant outfall will be required to see if it would impact the intake under certain conditions.

What must also be provided in the AR is a plan for delineating the contributing areas to a particular issue. The updated AR must provide this delineation. Issues in this region include a radionuclide issue in Seaforth. The SPC will be presented with what the assumed cause of the issue is, and what plans there are to deal with it at the October meeting. Issues may also exist outside of WHPA's. For example, there are nitrogen issues with the sinkholes. This will also be discussed at the next SPC meeting.

NEXT STEPS AND CONSULTATION

Project Manager Cathie Brown led the Committee in discussion about next steps and consultation on the Assessment Reports. The Assessment Report is due to be submitted to the Minister of the Environment on June 8th, 2010. During the month of May, the reports will need to be with the Source Protection Authorities where it will collect any additional comments for 30 days prior to submission. Therefore, the SPC will need to finalize the draft of the AR by the end of April, 2009. Public consultation will run from January to the end of March, 2010 and during this time, several public meetings will be held. Between now and the SPC meeting in November, staff will be working to increase the accuracy and completeness of the reports. Changes will be tracked and highlighted for SPC review.

At the October SPC meeting there will be a discussion about transportation threats, the tier 2 water budget, plans for issues planning, clusters issues, pathogens speaker, and a draft workplan.

CORRESPONDANCE AND DELEGATIONS

Two items of correspondence were included in SPC package materials. The first was a letter to the Minister on behalf of the SPC regarding the Source Protection Planning discussion paper. The SPC encouraged the Minister to keep policies as open and flexible as possible. The second item was a letter prepared by the Trent Conservation Coalition SPC regarding a special project application for a goose management program.

LIAISON UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS

Ministry of Environment Liaison, Tu Van Duong informed the Committee that the comment period for SP discussion paper was now closed. The Committee was also informed that a technical bulletin on geothermal wells has been published and is available if the SPC is interested.

Health Liaison, Bob Worsell informed the SPC that the septic re-inspection program has gone back to Huron County Council for discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Brown declared the meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Larry Brown
Chair

Jenna Bowen
Recording Secretary

