

Thames – Sydenham and Region Drinking Water Source Protection Source Protection Committee Discussion Paper

Report to Chair and members
Thames – Sydenham and Region
Source Protection Committee

Agenda # 2009.09.7a

Cc SP Management Committee

Date September 4, 2009

Prepared By Chris Tasker, Project Manager

Re: Consideration of tile drained areas in IPZ-2

Background

1. Although IPZ-2 and 3 are generally limited to the areas immediately adjacent to the watercourses (to 120 m or the CA regulation limits) they may be extended to include transport pathways.
2. Previous rules, which some interpreted as implying a limitation to anthropogenic pathways, are proposed to be replaced by a specific reference to natural and man-made transport pathways in the proposed rules currently posted for consultation. Although subtle, these changes seem to support a broadening of the interpretation to include any direct pathway (including surface runoff) which would allow runoff into the intake protection zone within the travel time used to delineate the IPZ-2.
3. At previous meetings the Source Protection Committee discussed the possibility of including tile drained lands in IPZ-2 and 3. Although there was much discussion on the subject there was not a clear direction provided. It was suggested by staff that tile drained lands be included in IPZ-2 but not in IPZ-3. Although this suggestion was not refuted there did not appear to be a strong consensus on how to deal with tile drained lands or other transport pathways.
4. The extension of the zones to include transport pathways is also relevant for WHPA-E and F on GUDI systems.
5. Previous comments by both members and staff indicate that the available mapping showing tile drained parcels is far from reliable.
6. The Essex Region Source Protection Committee has considered the same issue and has endorsed the recommendation presented in the attached report to the Essex Region Source Protection Committee.
7. The Wheately IPZ-2 (and 3 if defined) is shared with the Essex Region Source Protection Area. Similarly the IPZ-3 for Essex Region intakes on Lake St Clair are likely to extend into the Thames-Sydenham and Region. This strengthens the need for consistency with this neighbouring region.
8. This issue and the Essex report has been discussed with our peer reviewers who generally also accept the recommended methodology presented in the report. They have also struggled



with the extent of tile drained lands included and other similar areas which have been excluded from the IPZ-2's that they have been reviewing.

Discussion

1. As a result of the shared zones with the Essex Region Source Protection Committee, consistency on this issue is advisable.
2. The information needed to delineate the areas based on the Essex report is readily available and more reliable than the drainage layer used to date.
3. The adjustment of areas already consulted on presents an additional challenge. With Phase 2 consultation still being planned revision is possible.
4. A decision on IPZ-3 (and WHPA-F) can be deferred until the point where we are working on delineation of those zones
5. It will be important to consider drainage direction in determining whether adjacent parcels are included as noted in the Essex report.