



Source Protection Committee

**Wednesday, September 30, 2009, 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
Holmesville Community Centre, Holmesville**

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

LIAISONS PRESENT

Health Liaison Bob Worsell, Source Protection Authority Liaison, Jim Ginn, MOE Liaison, Tu Van Duong, Kettle and Stoney Point First Nations Liaison, Bob Bresette

WITH REGRETS

None

DWSP STAFF PRESENT

Cathie Brown, Project Manager; Tim Cumming, Communications Specialist
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 9:33 a.m.

AGENDA

MOTION #SPC: 2009-09-01

Moved by Gerry Rupke
Seconded by Don Jones

That the agenda be approved.

Carried by Consensus.

MINUTES FROM AUGUST 26th, 2009

MOTION #SPC: 2009-09-02

Moved by Jim Nelemans
Seconded by Ian Brebner

That the SPC minutes from April 29th, 2009 be approved as amended.

Carried by Consensus.

The minutes should be amended to include the correct position titles of the MOE employees, Heather Malcolmson and Tim Fletcher under the Others Present section on page 1. The correct titles for Heather and Tim should read: Manager, Source Protection Planning, MOE and Team Lead, Standards Development Branch, MOE respectively. Additionally, Bill Rowat should be removed from the list of SPC members present.

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None

DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None

ASSESSMENT REPORT REVIEW

Project Manager, Cathie Brown introduced the draft Assessment Report and explained how the review process would work. The peer review committee delays have in turn delayed the water budget chapter of the AR. The tier 2 water budget will likely be done before the year end. However, it will not be completed in time for SPC approval and public consultation. Overall, the AR is a very long and technical document, and is still in a very rough draft format. For the November SPC meeting, there will be an executive summary added to the Reports. This will provide a high level overview of the AR contents that should be very public friendly.

CHAPTER 2 OF AR: WS CHARACTERIZATION

Project Assistant, Jenna Bowen introduced the watershed characterization chapter of the AR and led the review discussion. The following comments were brought up for review:

- The lack of evidence for filtration of septage contaminants from cottage septic systems reaching Lake Huron quickly. In fact, a study conducted on Georgian Bay showed opposite results. Suggestion to change wording in the text to reflect more accurate information.
- References made to various small creeks around the SP region should be shown on one of the maps.
- Wording around non-agricultural sources of water contaminants (e.g. golf courses) should be changed to “potential” sources.
- More information should be provided for the location of aquifers in water quality tables for overburden aquifers.
- More than just the Exeter landfill site exists in the AB SPA. Text should be updated to reflect this.
- Update the “Drinking Water Sources” section of report to reflect the true number of residences connected to the pipeline in Lambton County.
- Map 2.16 does not show any monitoring wells.

- Various comments were given about the existence and/or location of drinking water systems listed in tables.

All other minor comments and suggestions were handed into staff on comment sheets.

Chapter 4 of AR: Ausable Bayfield

Project Manager, Cathie Brown introduced the chapter on vulnerability, threats and risks for the Ausable Bayfield report, and led the review discussion. The following comments and questions were brought up for review:

- Q: Why aren't livestock numbers based on nutrient units? A: Methodology for this is changing; farms are identified using MPAC data.
- Q: Some tables (e.g. page 4-12, table AG-BR3) have nothing in them. Will they remain like this or is data still being gathered? A: All tables need to have the numbers updated. Some have blank cells because there are no entries to be made (we will insert NA or "0"). For others there are no issues or conditions that have been identified. Therefore the tables will state this.
- Q: Water quality standards are not met on a certain percentage of time. Is this not an issue? A: While standards were not met 100% of the time, they were met on very high percentage of the time (all greater than 95%). Some of the criteria could be due to operational problems rather than water quality problems. Staff will look into this and note it in the chapter.
- Non-compliance with ODWS should be explained in each report.
- There was a lengthy discussion regarding the number of threats that have been identified in wellhead protection areas. Using the precautionary principal, there was concern about threats being assumed and overestimated and the public's perception to the high numbers of threats calculated. It was explained that the threat enumeration includes the number of "potential" threats. Even if these threats do not exist, if there is the potential for them to exist, they have to be counted. Policies will need to be written for all potential threats but those policies will not be implemented unless the threat actually exists. It was decided that the beginning of the chapter should include a more detailed description of what a threat is and the assumptions that are being made in the report.
- It was suggested that bullet points be used to list the information pertaining to well systems in order to keep all information consistent throughout the report.
- The shading in tables showing threats instances should be lightened so that numbers are more visible.

DRY RUN

Project Manager Cathie Brown led the Committee in discussion about the Dry Run Exercise in Source Protection planning. It was explained that earlier in the month a group that included planners, a building inspector, a municipal CAO, and conservation authority staff met to conduct a dry run exercise. This meeting resulted in 2 different types of products. One was an overall discussion about the planning document and policies in general, and the

second was the development of actual policies. Policies were also developed by local working group members in June.

Comments that came out of the discussion were that a better understanding is required of the risk management plans. There was also the comment that in the discussion paper there is different types of language being used that has different meaning to different groups which needs to be clarified. The policy suggestions from working group members and the planning group were provided to the SPC in package materials.

The SPC had a lengthy discussion about existing policies and questions were raised about whether existing plans can be initiated as a result of source protection (e.g. nutrient management plans). The Committee also discussed the issue of transportation threats and how to address them in the assessment report. Questions were raised about the need to add transportation corridors as a local threat. It was agreed that elevating transportation corridors would be discussed at the next SPC meeting.

The Committee concluded that there should be more clarification about where funding for plan implementation will come from and that planning regulations (due to come out in December) will be as flexible as possible.

CHAPTER 5: CLIMATE CHANGE

Project Assistant, Jenna Bowen introduced the climate change chapter of the AR and led the review discussion. The following comments were brought up for review:

- Most of the small settlements in the AB SPA are not supplied with drinking water from municipal well systems. The text in the report should be amended to state this.
- The text for the two reports (AB and MV) is very repetitive. This should be changed to reflect information that is more localized to the SPA that is being discussed.
- Information on the water quality in each region is worded quite strongly to suggest large impacts from climate change. This should be amended to reflect the potential for impacts rather than the assumption.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee was informed that there have been meetings scheduled with working group members from Oct. 19-21 to review and make comments on the draft AR.

Chair Brown declared the meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Larry Brown
Chair

Jenna Bowen
Recording Secretary