
Thames – Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee

Meeting Notice

Please be advised that a meeting of the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee has been called for the following time. If you are unable to attend please contact Erin Carroll at 519-245-3710 ext 46.

Meeting Date: November 20, 2009

Meeting Time: 9:00 am to 3:00 pm

Meeting Location: St. Clair Conservation Authority office boardroom

Proposed Agenda

Item	Time
1. Chair's Welcome	9:00
2. Adoption of the Agenda	
3. Delegations	
4. Minutes From the Previous Meeting	
5. Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
6. Business arising from the minutes	
7. Business (Starting with items outstanding from the 19 th)	
a. Conditions	
b. Threats and Risk Assessment	
c. Great Lakes	
d. Data Gaps	
e. Vulnerability Assessment	
f. Consultation Comments	
g. HVAs	
8. Information	
a. Article on Fluoride: City Councilor Wants Debate	
b. Source Protection Municipal Planners Forum	
Lunch	12:00
9. In Camera Session	
10. Other business	
11. MOE Liaison report	
12. Members reports	
13. Adjournment	3:00

Meeting Materials

Agenda Item	Description
2009.11b.7a-d,g	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Section Summaries (Conditions, Threats and Risk Assessment, Data Gaps, Vulnerability Assessment)
2009.11b. 7e	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compendium of Consultation Comments
2009.11b.7f	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• HVA maps
2009.11b.8a	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Article on Fluoride
2009.11b.8b	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Source Protection Municipal Planners Forum

SPC MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY NOVEMBER 20, 2009
Meeting #20

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, November 20, 2009 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority Board Room. The following members and staff were in attendance:

Members:

Bob Bedggood
Brent Clutterbuck
Dean Edwardson
Patrick Feryn
Paul Hymus
Carl Kennes
James Maudsley
Valerie M'Garry
Marg Misek-Evans

Sheldon Parsons
Richard Philp
Joe Salter
Charles Sharina
Pat Sobeski
John Van Dorp
Joe VanOverberghe
Teresa McLellan (MOE-Provincial Liaison).

Regrets:

Murray Blackie
Pat Donnelly
Joe Kerr
Don McCabe
Earl Morwood

Darrell Randell
Jim Reffle
Robert Olivier-FN Technical Representative
Derekica Snake-FN Liaison

Others in attendance:

Staff:

Rick Battson
Chris Tasker
Chitra Gowda
Derekica Snake

Ralph Coe
Ian Wilcox
Brian McDougall
Steve Clark



1) Chair's Welcome

Bob Bedggood welcomed the committee.

2) Adoption of the Agenda

A motion to approve the amended the agenda, noting that the SPC will start with endorsement of the recommendations of sub-committee who met yesterday and continue with the November 19 agenda (starting with the Conditions section summary) and then follow with November 20th agenda items.

moved by James Maudsley -seconded by Doug McGee seconded

“that the agenda be approved with the discussed changes.”

CARRIED.

Bob referred to November 19th meeting notes (distributed to members this morning) outlining key discussion points. There was good discussion on the Assessment Report materials considered by the sub-committee. He recommended endorsement of the November 19 sub-committee notes and decisions explaining that 14 people attended and came to good agreement on the items as recorded in the notes.

moved by Charles Sharina-seconded by Dean Edwardson

“that the committee endorse the outcomes of the November 19 meeting of the sub-committee to review materials for the Assessment Report as presented in the meeting notes.”

CARRIED.

3) Delegations

None

4) Minutes from the Previous Meeting

The minutes from November 13, having not yet been prepared and will be considered at the December meeting along with the minutes from today.

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

None

7) Business

a) Conditions

Chris explained that Conditions has not received extensive attention; this section represents a work plan for additional work as part of the amended Assessment Report.

Definitions of dense non-aqueous phase liquid, conditions, and local threats were discussed. The question was raised whether presence/absence is an adequate evaluation or whether other variables (e.g., contaminant flux/mobility) and standards (e.g., severe effect levels) need to be considered? Chris Tasker noted that this is a deeper evaluation than we have done to date, and may be revisited later on a one-to-one basis as part of determining what is to be done about any conditions which are identified, however the definition of the condition as per the rules is based on the presence in a quantity as identified in the rules.

Suggested edits/revisions:

- Source of Table 1 should be indicated.
- Noted that in paragraph below $Risk = Vulnerability \times Hazard$ the word area is missing (i.e., “Although ... vulnerable **area.**”)
- Suggestion that there should be some numerical consistency (i.e., 10 or ten). Agreed to change all to number format.
- Table first page word *hazard* should be replaced with *risk*.

b) Threats and Risk Assessment

This section is a general overview of the process. One challenge is the consultants’ consistency of enumerating threats (e.g., ensure that they have not counted multiple threats at one location/parcel). For example, WHPA – A likely contains some double counting of locations which may have more than one activity occurring on the property.

It was questioned, why in Table 2, under *Significant Threat Location*, are the numbers of significant threats for groundwater higher? Chris explained that vulnerability scores in ground water can reach 10, whereas surface water intakes generally have lower vulnerability scores (i.e., unlikely to have vulnerability score greater than eight which is required for a threat to be significant). The rules consider Great Lake intakes less vulnerable as a result of the dilution although surface

water intakes are intrinsically more vulnerable than wells. A high-level description of the types of threats will be added for clarification.

Suggested edits/revisions:

- Re-word paragraph “The Source Protection Committee.....”, to indicate that there are no identified local threats: “*The process* has not revealed any local threats or circumstances that are not on the prescribed list; however there are a few things that the Committee is considering and there may be more in the future.”
- It was noted that comment balloons should be removed from the maps as they are not legible at the scale presented in the summary.
- Remove asterisk point starting “Does not include possible threats...” on all section summaries. Make a general reference in the text where the table is described, that the table is not yet complete. Do not use agricultural as the example. It is also noted in the data gaps section.

c) Great Lakes

This section has not been written yet. It will outline next steps and a commitment to work through the process, including some general text around the Great Lakes Agreement and the Area of Concern (AOC) in Wheatley, that is likely to be de-listed.

A first meeting was held to discuss the formation of a Lake Erie working group. Formation seems probable since there are many commonalities along the Lake Erie shoreline, but will be held-off, until issues have been identified. A similar working group is less likely for the Lake Huron basin.

d) Data Gaps and Next Steps

This section is a work-in-progress/preliminary work plan.

Climate change discussion: The necessity for the *Impact of Climate Change* gap was questioned. Chris and Teresa explained that inclusion is a requirement of the MOE and a provincial priority. We currently do not know how climate change can affect water quality and even its effect on water quantity is highly uncertain. It is an identified gap. More collective work has to be undertaken before climate change impacts and adaptations can be assessed at a local level. Water budget also does not take into consideration climate change. Future scenarios consider future municipal demand with current supply estimates.

Editing/revisions:

- *Table 1:* Asterisk with no comment, there should have been a note at the bottom of the table, dependant on the submission of the addendum report, tier 3 water budget is the largest variable, don’t even know the scope of the work yet.

- Managed lands wording revision: *conditions* versus *circumstances*.
- Wording revision, Managed Land and Percent Impervious: “Methodology still being refined by province in October.” Suggested wording “Provincial guidance for evaluating this, were not developed in time for the work to be included in this report.”
- Note that Figure 1 should come prior to Table 1
- Paragraph two under Data Gaps: “In other cases... **was** not completed.” Replace was with *could not be*.

General comments:

Glossary: It was noted that a glossary, with defined terms in italics, would be helpful.

Translation: Translation, which would be both time consuming and costly, is something that MOE has been discussing. It is not a concern that has been brought to our attention locally (yet). There is potential that summary level material will have to be translated eventually. In some areas, there were direct requests for French translation. Translators are language experts, not technical experts, so often there is another step to make the document technically accurate.

Appendices: Chris explained that materials already distributed to the Source Protection Committee in a near final form will not be included in the materials distributed to the Source Protection Committee for acceptance at the December 11 meeting. The committee agreed that this was appropriate.

Assessment Report (AR) Timeline: Drafts ARs will be presented at the December meeting. Provided they are approved by the SPC, a limited number of the reports will be printed. The reports will then be posted, 35 day comment period. Concurrently, a pre-screening review will be conducted by MOE. Comments from public and MOE will be returned to the Committee to address. There may be some changes required in February. Schedule does not leave much time to make more than very minor changes. Subsequently, an updated Assessment Report will be posted and get submitted to the Source Protection Authority for a 30 day comment period. After the second review period, the AR is to go to the director with comments received in the second posting. The director will identify additional requirements (should be things SPC has already identified as gaps). Amended report will have to go through the same process again.

Municipalities will get copies of report (on CD) at each review period. Teresa will clarify whether or not there is an appeal period for the Municipalities.

An inquiry was made as to who is going to tell the municipal council about all this? Chris T. responded, that the Authority staff has asked the municipalities if they would like Council presentations, and to-date they have not taken up that offer. If there is a request, Chris and the Authority staff will work to accommodate.

What is the process for getting these reports on the web? Assessment Report are required to be posted on the web site, however they are very large files which will be broken down into sections which are as manageable as possible. It will also be on disk. If someone requests, we would be



happy to send them a CD/DVD. It was suggested that a button be added on website, for someone to click to request a copy of the Assessment Report.

e) Vulnerability Assessment (from November 19th Agenda)

This section summary was accidentally skipped over on the 19th, so it was covered on the 20th.

The committee enquired as to the reason for the difference in significant recharge areas in the upper parts of the Sydeham compared to the lower parts and the areas south of these in the Thames watershed. Chris explained, that the criteria for significant recharge are based on a comparison between the recharge in a location compared to the recharge over the larger watershed. As a result the significance of an area is dependant on which watershed it is in and the average recharge of that watershed. Base flow is used as a measurable indication of the recharge in a watershed. Soil, land use and slope are used to distribute the recharge in a sub-watershed (based on base flow) across the sub-watershed. Each grid in the sub watershed is then compared to the average of the larger watershed to determine if the recharge in the grid is significant.

Suggested edits/revisions:

- WHPA-A shows up two times.
- End of paragraph below Wellhead Protection Areas: “Four areas...,” should be three areas.
- First sentence below Intake Protection Zones: “An intake protection zone...,” need to clarify “for a water system”.
- Second paragraph below Intake Protection Zone: IPZ, number 1 missing.
- “Severe regulatory event...,” which would be under the Conservation Act.
- Second last paragraph page 1: “Where the in-water portion...,” needs better clarification and description of the various parts of the IPZ.
- Second last paragraph page 1: “Residual travel time” needs to be better defined.
- Last paragraph, page 2: Vulnerability should be explained as the vertical dimension, and measures the degree of susceptibility. May need a couple extra sentences (e.g., elaborate on ISI score.)
- Range of score 2-10, explain that 2 is low 10 is high.
- Page two bottom, left-hand column type: replace *them* with *then*
- Under Highly Vulnerable Aquifers “The data was also reviewed.... such as sand and gravel mapping.” Clarify sand and gravel is a subset of surficial geology.
- Mapping on last page, why is there no Walpole, Wallaceburg info, when there was data in Mark Helsten’s presentation? Chris Tasker will look into this absence of data and verify that the correct map was used.

f) Consultation Comments

Consultation comments will be included in the consultation summary after next round. There have been many comments at the open houses that have nothing to do with Source Protection. When comments are made, there will be follow-up.

g) HVAs

Presentation by Linda Nicks on highly vulnerable aquifers (HVAs), with emphasis on the mapping challenges faced in the region. “Kriging” process (a GIS term for interpolation of data between data at available points) was developed to represent studies across region however the studies did not match up well along the borders. Final HVA mapping presented is a hybrid product of ISI, and surficial geology (specifically the sand and gravel layer). Review of both data sources and professional judgment also incorporated into mapping product. Linda is still finishing up last details in the report, assuming successful peer review; this will be part of the Lower Thames Assessment Report.

Chris noted that HVAs and SGRAs need to have a hydrologic connection to drinking water systems (any system, including private wells) to be considered as vulnerable areas. Water well records indicate that there are wells located throughout the region so none of the HVA or SGRAs would be excluded for lack of connection to a drinking water system. The work that Linda did is similar to the professional judgement that was undertaken in the vulnerability assessment of the WHPA however much more work due to the extensive area being considered in the region. Focus was on highly vulnerable areas only while local WHPA review would have considered low and moderate as well.

It was questioned whether MNR aggregate resource mapping of licensed areas was used? No, that data source was not used as part of this analysis. Air photos were used in the interpretation therefore active pits gave an indication of the presence of a sand/gravel deposit; however, commercial viability does not indicate value of aquifer. Intent is not to target the gravel pits, but to compare two records: water wells bore hole logs and sand and gravel from surficial geology.



8) Information

a) Article on Fluoride: City Councilor Wants Debate

Comments on the addition of Fluoride came up at the open house in London and in past events. Individuals in the community are making it into a Source Protection concern by making the weak connection between water that is flushed and that subsequently shows up in the drinking water. It has been identified as a naturally occurring "issue" in groundwater. From discussion with City of London staff, the Medical officer of health is still recommending that fluoride be added.

b) Source Protection Municipal Planners Forum

Chris summarized a regional Municipal Planners Forum held on October 14th. The forum was held in order to re-engage/engage the planning community (including planning consultants and building department). The attendees felt that the timing was good, with the completion of the technical work, and the shift into Source Protection Plan.

At the forum, it was discuss whether or not we are at a stage where a more formal working group is required? Most participants responded that the forums were appropriate at this time. It was noted, however, that the working group will be required at Plan development time.

The members inquired as to which municipalities were represented at the forum. Given all the things that are on planners' desks, how does this fit in the priorities? Marg suggested that planners should be engaged now, since SP will effect land-use applications. They should be involved in the consultation process.

Teresa commented that Jennifer Arthur, of MOE planner, has offered to be engaged in policy decisions and working groups.

Responsibility to disclose: Included in the package is a report to the UTRCA board regarding disclosure or vulnerable areas. If someone inquires about a particular parcel, how the UT will be letting them know that they are within or near a proposed vulnerable area. We are consulting on this material with people who are thought to be significant threats in these vulnerable areas as well as inviting all current property owners to Ph1 and 2 consultations. It therefore seems appropriate to also include those who are inquiring or making application about a property within one of these areas to be given the same opportunity to consider this in their land use plans. At this point all we can tell people to be aware and to make their own decisions as the Source Protection Plan may have future impacts on them.

9) In Camera Session

None



10) Other Business

11) MOE Liaison Report

Nothing additional to report beyond that which was brought up at the previous 2 meetings this month.

12) Members Reports

It was questioned: Are we to refer inquiries to the website (e.g., largest Ontario oil and gas company for sale)? Chris responded yes.

Clarification was sought on where are we at Phase 1 and Phase 2 consultations? Chitra responded that Lower Thames phase 1 and phase two 2 were completed Nov. 9 and Nov. 10. In St. Clair Phase 1 and 2 consultation is complete except for Wallaceburg. Upper Thames Phase 2 has not been done. Oxford consultation is planned for January or February of 2010.

Adjournment

Next meeting December 11, 2009 at the SCRCA office.