

MINUTES

HALTON-HAMILTON SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING #3-11

Halton-Hamilton Source Protection Committee
Mountainside Room, Brant Hills Community Centre
2255 Brant Street, Burlington
June 14, 2011 9:30am to 5:00pm

SPC Attendees:			
Turlough Finan	Susan Fielding	Melanie Horton	Peter Ashenhurst
Gavin Smuk	Barry Lee	Chris Shrive	Nick DiGirolamo
Doug Cuthbert	Teri Yamada	David Simpson	Andrea Doherty
Paul Attack	Dave Braden	Glenn Powell	
Regrets SPC/Other Regrets:			
Judi Partridge	David King	Kathy Menyes	Bob Edmondson
Other Attendees:			
Diane Bloomfield Project Manager HHSPR	John Westlake, MOE Liaison	Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor & Associates	
Virginia Bancur Project Assistant HHSPR		Diane Saturno, Ruth Victor & Associates	

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
11 con't	<p>The Lake Ontario Collaborative is expected to be finished their modeling report by the end of June. The peer review of the model used for the Lake Ontario Collaborative work will be finished in the fall. The report being finalized does not have all the Halton and Hamilton scenarios in it. IPZ-3 delineation for the Halton and Hamilton intakes will not be finalized until Environment Canada completes the modelling. City of Hamilton uses a model developed by Environment Canada to assess impacts from Hamilton Harbour on their intake and would like to use it for source protection. Hamilton Harbour discharges could impact the Hamilton and the Halton intake water quality.</p> <p>To be able to include specific policies for a significant threat within an IPZ-3, the IPZ-3 must be included in the Assessment Report. Therefore, an update to the Halton Region Assessment Report is required.</p> <p>It was suggested that we invite Rodney Bouchard to present an update on the modeling work the Lake Ontario Collaborative is doing. Since the Lake Ontario Collaborative report will not be finished by the proposed meeting date, the appendix used by the CTC will be distributed to HHSPC members once the CTC posts their updated AR on June 17.</p>	Rodney Bouchard was contacted during the meeting and June 27 at 2:30 pm was set for the presentation. Staff to e-mail the CTC appendix prior to June 27 for SPC review.
12.	<p>SPC Planning Staff Policy Development Meeting – Diane Bloomfield</p> <p>The development meeting was well received by planners, project managers, and a few SPC chairs attending. There were presentations on source protection plan formats that are being developed by some areas as well as breakout sessions for discussion on policies and tools. The attendees requested more such meetings. It was a good way to share ideas on policy development.</p>	
13.	<p>Review of proposed policy directives – Ruth Victor Until 12:30 pm lunch break and continued at 1:30 pm following in-camera session.</p> <p>Ruth provided a brief refresher on the guiding principles for policy development, plan scope and objectives, and tools and their legal status. Monitoring policies were introduced and the recently released Conservation Ontario/MOE Support Document for Developing Monitoring Policies (dated June 13, 2011) distributed.</p> <p>A brief overview of each prescribed threat and strategic policy background information and policy directives were provided. The directives included in the background documents dated May 20, 2011 were developed through previous discussions with the Planners' Working Group and the SPC. A meeting was held on June 7 with the planners to review the directives as written and to refine them to what, in the opinion of the planners', were practical and implementable policies. The directives with highlighted changes were presented to the SPC for consideration and revision. All changes are recorded on the Evaluation Framework spreadsheets attached (dated June 30, 2011) and discussion summarized below. No changes on the form to a policy directive indicate the HHSPC accepted the directive as written.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Threat 1 – waste - an appeal should be expected if the policy aims to prohibit waste sites.</p> <p>- policies need to be in official plans because otherwise it may be brought forward at a hearing that the municipality did not believe it was an important issue.</p>	

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
<p>13. Cont'd</p>	<p>Threat 2 – sanitary sewers and pipes – the word “enhanced” is vague and should be removed. Halton Region uses a risk based condition assessment model to prioritize work on sewers. Inspections should be a priority where they cross vulnerable areas where the threat is significant.</p> <p>Threat 2 – small septic systems – discussion on #6 and what level in Halton Region would be responsible for the municipal financing program – mandatory inspections will be completed by the local municipalities; sanitary sewers are the responsibility of the Region. Upgrades to septic systems can be expensive and the landowner may need assistance to get the work completed without delay. The Minister of the Environment will not likely support a policy that requires provincial funding. The policy directives as written are open and allow flexibility.</p> <p>Threat 2 – large septic systems - #1 is worth consulting on with MOE.</p> <p>Threat 2 – sewage treatment plants - #3 – which municipal level in Halton Region will be responsible for implementation? – stormwater sources are the local municipal responsibility but sanitary sewers are Halton Region’s responsibility and would benefit from the program. Clarify that the program would be implemented by the local municipalities.</p> <p>Threat 3 and 4 – ASM – #7-As long as the requirements of the risk management plan are consistent with standards in the provincial instruments then Halton-Hamilton policy directive is consistent with the proposed OFEC plan. - an incentive program similar to #5 under small septs should be added</p> <p>Discussion on inclusion of small farms – MOE has indicated that any amount of E-coli in a water supply is not acceptable. One cow can release bacteria that can get into a well water supply and a person could die from it. It depends on the well construction and the geologic setting. The risk is high.</p> <p>Threats 8/9 – fertilizer - #8 pre-screening of land applications and building permits would not identify the application of commercial fertilizer so “land application” should be removed from the policy directive.</p> <p>Threats 10/11 – pesticide – directives #6 and #7 are not necessary and should be removed.</p> <p>Threat 12/13 – road salt – should policies developed by the Smart About Salt program be used as Halton-Hamilton policies? – Halton Region had been asked and said no. Road salt will never be a significant threat due to the method of calculation used by the MOE.</p> <p>Threat 15 – fuel - #5 policy directive is too restrictive. It does not permit mobile retail outlets which could be used to fill industrial or farm equipment. Directive should be removed.</p> <p>Threat 16 – DNAPL – clarify wording in #2 to be specific to DNAPLs.</p> <p>Threat 17 – Organic Solvent - #3 – a disclosure report will be necessary for the pre-screening – add recommendation to amend official plans.</p>	<p>John Westlake to prepare an MOE response to why one animal is considered a threat.</p>

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
	<p>Threat 21 – Livestock lands – The <i>Nutrient Management Act</i> does not capture grazing therefore an additional policy directive should be added to not allow livestock grazing within a WHPA-A. The city of Hamilton is considering such a by-law to limit livestock use of land within 100 m of a municipal well.</p> <p>- risk management plan should refer to best management practices in Streamside Grazing, 2007.</p> <p>Transport Pathways - #7 and #8 – Hamilton may already have by-laws in place that address these policy directives.</p> <p>- a policy to restrict the construction of closed loop earth energy systems should be included to address the threat from the installation and the chemicals used. The chemical used in the system has changed and is no longer a concern.</p> <p>Climate Data - #1 – the province should also be encouraged to continue to collect data through their monitoring networks. Therefore, it is not just climate data that is collected. The directive should include hydrological and hydrogeological data. Also, the data should not only be collected, but should be shared and interpreted. Municipalities are already doing this.</p> <p>Contaminants of emerging concern were mentioned for inclusion of policies. They are not monitored for now in water supplies because their concentrations are very low and it is very expensive analysis. Only an education and outreach policy can be included in the Plan. MOE suggested that the topic be included in a cover letter to the Minister when submitting the Plan, rather than putting it in policy.</p>	<p>Chris Shrive to report back to SPC on the status of the City's by-law to prohibit livestock within 100 m of a municipal well.</p> <p>Chris Shrive to discuss the City's current requirements for municipal water connection and prohibiting new wells in an urban area with Diane.</p>
14.	<p>Discussion on policy approach and development – Ruth Victor</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy approach, development, implementation tools, implementing body 2. Format of Source Protection Plan – it has been suggested by the Planners' Working Group that the policies be arranged by tool, i.e. all education and outreach policies together, followed by incentive policies, etc., and within each tool have the policies arranged by implementing body. This format is considered the best for municipal implementation. It was suggested that this could be difficult for a farmer to understand what policies affect his property. Staff are discussing with the editors how policies can be linked by threat and the following are considerations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Include the threat number in the policy code; 2 Colour code the policies – for example, all threat #1 policies would be brown; or 3 Use symbols for each threat – for example, all threat #1 (waste) policies would have a garbage can beside them. <p>The electronic version will be searchable and possibly can have hyperlinks. The hard copy version is more of a challenge. It was suggested that more than one table may be required, sorted in different ways.</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Background Documents will be revised to include discussion at the Planners' Working Group and the SPC meetings and the revised policy directives. These documents will be posted on the SPC website once finalized. - Review of work schedule until the end of June 2012. 	<p>Staff to post revised Background Documents once edits are finalized.</p>

