



## **Source Protection Committee**

**Wednesday, April 28<sup>th</sup>, 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.  
Holmesville Community Centre, Holmesville**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

### **LIAISONS PRESENT**

Source Protection Authority Liaison, Jim Ginn, MOE Liaison, Tu Van Duong,

### **WITH REGRETS**

SPC Members; Gib Dow, Jim Nelemans, Kettle and Stony Point First Nations Liaison, Bob Bresette, Health Liaison Bob Worsell

### **DWSP STAFF PRESENT**

Cathie Brown, Project Manager; Jenna Bowen, Project Assistant/Recording Secretary; Tim Cumming, Communications Specialist; Darrell Innes, GIS Specialist; Mary Lynn MacDonald, Group Facilitator

### **OTHERS PRESENT**

None

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Larry Brown, Source Protection Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:58 a.m.

### **AGENDA**

**MOTION #SPC: 2010-04-01**

Moved by Al Hamilton  
Seconded by Marilyn Miltenburg

**That the agenda be approved.**

Carried by Consensus.

**MINUTES FROM MARCH 31<sup>st</sup>, 2010**

**MOTION #SPC: 2010-04-02**

Moved by Matt Pearson  
Seconded by Gerry Rupke

**That the SPC minutes from April 28<sup>th</sup> be approved as amended.**  
Carried by Consensus.

No letter is being sent to MOE regarding natural gas. The SPC requested that the MOE Liaison look into the matter and report back to the Committee at the next meeting. The stewardship program has been fully committed not approved, and 7 million dollars has been allocated not 17.

**BUSINESS OUT OF THE MINUTES**

None

**DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

None

**REPORT FROM CHAIR**

SPC Chair, Larry Brown, informed the SPC that due to the upcoming municipal elections, Committee members should review the SPC code of conduct. While it is not a conflict of interest for municipal councilors to indicate that they are members of the SPC, it is inappropriate to use SPC meetings as a platform to campaign at.

The SPC discussed the meeting schedule and determined that a May SPC meeting was not required. Chair Brown proposed that the next SPC meeting take place in June, and Committee members be paid two per diems for the meeting today due to all of the preparation that was required. The SPC meeting schedule for the next six months is as follows: the last Wednesday of the month in June, August, September, and October.

The Committee had a brief discussion about what the timeline is for the updated Assessment Report. The updated AR has to be passed in time for the results to be included in the SPP. It will be over the course of the next 12-14 months that the work will be done for the updated AR. Kettle Point will theoretically enter into an agreement with the Province and the ABMV region would be part of that agreement. The responsibility of the ABMV SPC will be to supervise the arrangement for a coastal engineer to delineate the IPZ's. Stony Point is not included in the regulation; therefore nothing is happening with that at this point of time.

Chair Brown informed the Committee that the quarterly meeting of SPC Chairs is taking place the first week in May in Windsor. The planned agenda for the meeting includes discussions on the risk management catalogue. This is an important document because it will indicate what the impacts of source protection plans will be. The Province has had some delays with the consultants who are preparing the catalogue but hopefully drafts

will be available soon. Other items on the agenda for the Chairs meeting includes discussion about the development of the plans and what happens to the SPC after the plans are in place.

### **COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE**

Communications Specialist, Tim Cumming provided an update on the ABMV communications plan. An extensive period of public consultation has just been completed for the Draft Proposed Assessment Report. The communication efforts that were made went well beyond the regulation requirements. In terms of public meetings, participation ranged from a couple of people to over 20 people at each meeting. Overall, there was close to 80 people in total that attended meetings. A lot of the people that came were from vulnerable areas and had received letters. Staff invited people to make formal written comments but many people were more comfortable speaking 1 on 1 with staff or SPC members. In total approximately 35 public comments were received about the report. Prior to the public meetings, notices were published in 14 newspaper publications. The notices were also printed in agriculture and free publications. Feedback we got from people: some people were concerned that they were on a map even if they weren't identified as a significant threat. They still had the concern that by being put on a map, that they would be affected in terms of property values. Some of the concern for people within the vulnerable areas but not a significant threat was that MOE would eventually expand their scope to include them as threats.

Once the draft AR is approved, proposed AR will also go out for public consultation. This will be different from: AR posted for 30 days to receive comments which get sent to the Minister along with the AR rather than being incorporated into the report.

### **PROPOSED ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Project Manager, Cathie Brown provided an overview of the Proposed Assessment Report. DWSP staff were thanked for all of the work that they have put into developing the reports. Several changes have been made to the reports since the Committee last reviewed it. Hydrogeologist, Brian Luinstra was invited to speak first on the changes made to the water budget chapter.

Since the Committee last reviewed the report, the Tier 2 water budget has been added. The entire water budget is a screening process to determine whether there is any stress on water quantity in the region. Out of the whole region, there was only one subwatershed that was determined to be under moderate stress. It is the area known as the Goderich-Bayfield gullies. Baseflow monitoring data from 2007 was incorporated into the tier 2 water budget which helped to refine the existing model and better estimate recharge. Information on water demands was determined using data from MOE on permitted and actual water takings. Through this process it was determined that a single water user is causing moderate stress at the very northern edge of the subwatershed boundary. This meant that a Tier 3 water budget was required for each of the municipal supplies located in the subwatershed. Since most of the municipal well systems are located in the southern portion of the subwatershed, this did not seem necessary. It was therefore recommended that the subwatershed be redefined for

the Tier 3. The area was split into 2 subwatersheds, and the northern half was expanded to include the Century Heights well supply. With the subwatershed redefined, a Tier 3 only became necessary for the Goderich subwatershed and the Century Heights system.

The Tier 3 water budget will require evaluation of what potential impacts there are on the Century Heights well system. If it is shown that there is a stress on the well supply, then every water taker in that area is considered a potential water quantity threat and the SPC would have to develop policies for this. This work will be completed for the updated AR.

For completion of the Tier 2 water budget, a future use scenario and a drought analysis was required. In this case, the model assumed no recharge for 2 years, and a 50% increase in water takings. The model showed that even under these circumstances, the percent water use would still not trigger a moderate stress. The thresholds used in the water budgeting process represent conditions between 2007 and 2009. It is very difficult to know what the future will bring. Therefore, the water budgets will need to be updated periodically following completion of the source protection plans.

Project Manger, Cathie Brown, followed up the water budget presentation by describing the changes made the remainder of the AR. While, some minor errors may still exist, all of the major problems have been addressed. The livestock density maps have been completed using the methodology approved by MOE. The old methodology was used for livestock density within HVA's and SGRA's and thus, density is very low in these areas. Inside of the WHPA's and IPZ's, staff drove past all of the barns that MPAC data identified as having livestock. The presence or absence of livestock was determined and the new methodology for calculating livestock density was applied. Livestock density is still relatively low within these areas as well. Additional changes to the AR included: updating the language around drainage, updating the introduction to chapter four, and sourcing tables.

The Committee discussed the contents and timeline for the updated AR, and the number of threats identified in the report. It was reiterated, that the number of threats in the report are the original numbers that were estimated through desktop exercises to identify potential threats. These numbers are being verified, through surveys and field verification and will be amended in the updated AR. The high number of DNAPLs is due to the fact that any quantity of DNAPL is considered a significant threat. Therefore, all properties within the 5 year time of travel are considered to have a significant DNAPL threat. These numbers will be greatly reduced in the updated AR.

The next step is for the SPC to approve the removal of the word 'draft' from the reports. Once approval is received, the reports will be posted in newspapers and internet on May 5. The final comment period would then close on June 4<sup>th</sup> and any comments received will get sent to the Minister of the Environment with the final Proposed Assessment Report.

**MOTION #SPC: 2010-04-03**

Moved by Gerry Rupke  
Seconded by Karen Galbraith

**That the proposed AR be approved and sent forward to the SPAs for a 30 day comment period prior to being submitted to the Minister of the Environment.**

Carried by consensus.

**LIAISON UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS**

Source Protection Authority Liaison, Jim Ginn informed the Committee that the SPA's are looking forward to receiving the approved Assessment Reports. If any further input is received by the public, this will be considered by the SPA.

MOE Liaison, Tu Van Duong informed the Committee that the SPC's natural gas concerns were forwarded to the technical staff at MOE. The individuals that developed the threats table are looking at what the chemical of concern would be for natural gas and the Liaison will report on their findings at the next SPC meeting.

**AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING – June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

- Preparation of the Plan Process
- Risk Management Catalogue

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Brown declared the meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

---

Larry Brown  
Chair

---

Jenna Bowen  
Recording Secretary