

LAKE ERIE REGION SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, April 26, 2012

The following are the minutes of the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee meeting held on Thursday, April 26, 2012 at the Grand River Conservation Authority, 400 Clyde Road, Cambridge, ON.

Members Present: C. Ashbaugh, Chair; M. Ceschi-Smith, H. Cornwell, A. Dale, R. Haggart, D. Hill, K. Hunsberger*, R. Krueger, I. Macdonald, D. Murray, J. Oliver, D. Parker, T. Schmidt, G. Schneider, M. Wales, P. Wilson, D. Woolcott, W. Wright-Cascaden Members Regrets: J. Harrison, C. King, J. Laird, L. Perrin, B. Ungar Proxy Representatives: A. Henry (L. Perrin), P. Busatto (J. Laird) Liaisons: L. Ross, Provincial Liaison C. Evanitski, LPRCA; R. Geysens, LPRCA; S. Martyn, CCCA; **Region Management** Committee: C. Murray, KCCA; K. Smale, CCCA; E. VanHooren, KCCA J. Deter, GRCA; B. Fields, Norfolk County; L. Heyming, GRCA; Staff: C. Jacques, LPRCA; M. Keller, GRCA; K. Smith, GRCA; E. Stahl, WESA; G. Zwiers, GRCA Also Present: P. Hania, Toronto

1. Call to Order

C. Ashbaugh called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Certification of Quorum – 17 Members Constitute a Quorum (2/3 of members)

The Recording Secretary called the roll and certified quorum.

3. Chairman's Remarks

C. Ashbaugh welcomed members, staff and guests and noted the following:

- Two public meetings were held at the end of March as part of the public consultation on the Kettle Creek Draft Source Protection Plan. The first meeting was held in Port Stanley and the second in Belmont, where a total of three members of the public attended. Public attendance has dropped significantly since the original public meetings were held during the earlier stages of the program. This is indicative of a positive trend of increased public understanding and that staff have been successful in answering the majority of their questions and concerns.
- A second Source Protection Region (SPR) Chairs meeting was held on Monday April 16 in Toronto. The meeting began with a round table discussion between the Chairs and Program Managers, where three dominant topics were commented on:
 - 1) The importance of maintaining and enhancing the stewardship program.

2) Concerns regarding funding for the Risk Management Official (RMO) position. The potential financial burden continues to be a major concern for municipalities.

3) Decreasing attendance at public meetings, and how that is a positive achievement for the program.

Additionally, C. Ashbaugh expressed his disappointment at the Chairs meeting that source water protection was not mentioned during the election. The program was neither advertised as a success nor debated by any of the politicians. Also during the Chairs meeting, C. Ashbaugh brought attention to the potential for Source Protection Plan (SPP) extensions beyond the August 2012 deadline. There was apprehension to discuss extensions in great detail; however there are approximately six to ten SPPs that may be delayed. After the meeting, the Chairs were able to meet with the Minister of the Environment to discuss their specific concerns. All of the Chairs left the meeting satisfied with the Ministers' responses to their questions. Specifically, the Minister informally expressed that the extension request for the Grand River SPP submission date should not be problematic. His main message was that he values the quality of the product more than meeting the deadline.

- The grand opening of the new Port Rowan wastewater treatment plant took place on Friday, April 20. C. Ashbaugh commended Bob Fields from Norfolk County on an excellent job speaking at the opening. The state of the art facility cost 11 million dollars to complete, where 3.9 million was provided by the federal government. Also presented at the opening were plans for decommissioning all lagoons and generating a special project to convert the areas into wetland habitat.
- K. Smith will replace S. Brocklebank as Source Protection Program Assistant for the Lake Erie Region (LER) while she is away on a one year maternity leave.

4. Review of Agenda

Moved by:	A. Henry	
Seconded by:	M. Wales	carried unanimously

THAT the agenda for the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee meeting of April 26, 2012 be approved as amended.

5. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest made in relation to the matters to be dealt with.

6. Minutes of Previous Meeting – March 1, 2012

H. Cornwell noted a spelling error on page 5: 'Durham Centre' should be spelt 'Dereham Centre'.

Moved by:	M. Ceschi-Smith	
Seconded by:	M. Wales	carried unanimously

THAT the minutes of the previous meeting March 1, 2012 be approved as distributed.

7. Hearing of Delegations

None

8. Presentations

None

9. Correspondence

a) Copies for Members

i) Correspondence to Craig Ashbaugh, Chair, Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee and Roger Geysens, Chair, Long Point Region Conservation Authority from Mary Anne Covelli, Director, Source Protection Programs Branch, Ontario Ministry of the Environment Re: Submission of the Long Point Region Source Protection Area Updated Assessment Report

ii) Correspondence to Craig Ashbaugh, Chair, Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee from Kim Smale, General Manager, Catfish Creek Conservation Authority Re: Combination of the Catfish Creek and Long Point Region Source Protection Plans Under One Cover

J. Oliver commented that a decision to separate the Catfish Creek and Long Point Region SPPs from one cover was not formally noted in the previous minutes (March 1, 2012) or in this month's agenda (April 26, 2012). He wondered if the concerns have been acknowledged. M. Keller responded that the issue has been resolved and the two documents have been divided under separate covers.

b) Not Copied

None.

Moved by: D. Murray Seconded by: R. Krueger

carried unanimously

THAT the correspondence be received for information.

10. Reports

Res. No. 21-12

a) SPC-12-04-01 Committee Meeting Dates – July to December, 2012

Page 3

K. Smith provided an overview of report SPC-12-04-01, and asked SPC members for any suggestions on possible venues for the August and September 'tour' meetings.

D. Murray commented that he and D. Parker will approach the County of Wellington to see if they would be able to host one of the meetings at their museum in Centre Wellington. M. Ceschi-Smith added that she would also contact staff at the City of Brantford to inquire about possibly hosting the September meeting at the newly optimized wastewater treatment plant.

Res. No. 22-12	Moved by:	A. Henry	
	Seconded by:	A. Dale	carried unanimously

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee adopt the following meeting schedule from July to December, 2012.

b) SPC-12-04-02 Public Comments on the Draft Kettle Creek Source Protection Plan and Explanatory Document

E. VanHooren provided an overview of report SPC 12-04-02.

* K. Hunsberger joined the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

A. Henry noted that Elgin Area Primary Water Supply is greatly concerned with the Ministry of the Environment's (MOE) comments, regarding policy applicability in IPZ-2 of the Port Stanley water intake. He acknowledged that the original delineation of IPZ-2 was conducted using less advanced modeling applications; however, since that time more detailed modeling has been completed and has uncovered the potential for future significant threats (despite low vulnerability scores). The modeling indicates that the existing storage of fuel on an already identified property, as well as the future storage of fuel on surrounding properties, is a significant threat to the intake. Originally, the MOE indicated that IPZ-2 did not need to be extended, given that the properties included in the point of modeling were already located within IPZ-2 (i.e. delineating an IPZ-3 or an Issue Contributing Area was unnecessary). Recent feedback from the MOE states that policies can only be applied to the portion of the property with the existing threats and not to any areas outside of IPZ-2, despite future fuel storage now being identified as a significant threat in those areas. This creates a situation where the property owner could move their fuel storage tank over the invisible line crossing their property and policies would become unenforceable.

A. Henry felt strongly that if the Kettle Creek SPP was to proceed as written, he could not support it. He added that he cannot approve a plan that implies protecting source water without fully doing so. L. Ross responded that the MOE's concern is not the proposal to extend IPZ-2. Instead, their concern is that right now the MOE does not have sufficient documentation to support the recent modeling. The Ministry reviews policies and provides comments based on the level of information provided to them, and when significant questions are raised, more documentation is required. A. Henry added that the MOE has stated that policies can only apply within IPZ-2; however, the modeling has revealed that the threats extend beyond that boundary. The SPC should have been provided with the opportunity to move the IPZ-2 boundary based on the new modeling.

M. Keller noted that when the modeling was originally conducted, discussions were centered on addressing the threats that were existing at the time. Through the more recent phases of policy development, more questions have been asked (i.e. what happens if the property owner moves across the road or what happens if the spill occurs somewhere else). The need for protecting against future occurrences has now been recognized; however, the SPC now faces significant time restrictions. The legislation stipulates that policies can only apply within vulnerable areas and to update the intake's vulnerable areas would push submission of the SPP past the deadline. The most feasible option would be to work on updating the Assessment Report as quickly as possible following plan submission, and updates to the plan would follow afterwards.

W. Wright-Cascaden asked for clarification on A. Henry's main concern. She asked if the solution being proposed is an amendment to the Assessment Report that would extend the current vulnerable area, allowing policies to reach further than they currently do. M. Keller confirmed that this was correct. The desire is to extend the boundaries of IPZ-2, based on new modeling that determined that if a spill were to occur outside of IPZ-2 it would have the same effect as a spill within IPZ-2. However, additional public consultation would be required to notify newly identified landowners on whose properties significant threats would be possible. The two options include: begin making amendments to the Assessment Report now and submit the plan late, or proceed with plan submission and amend the Assessment Report immediately afterwards.

A. Henry noted that this has become a matter of principle. He asked whether or not the SPC can support a plan that does not fully protect the source water, as it is hindered by a legislative timeline. L. Ross suggested that the SPC request an extension for the Kettle Creek SPP submission, allowing time for making Assessment Report amendments. Otherwise, she felt that the SPC should submit the plan as it is currently written, and seek to amend the Assessment Report as soon as possible afterwards. She added that the length of time required to complete the amendment process will be the same; however, a complete SPP will have been submitted to the MOE for review in the meantime. A. Henry asked if the SPP is submitted as written now, and the updating process begins shortly afterward, what the MOE will allow in terms of timing. For example, if the SPP is approved in the fall of this year, and an updated version is submitted a month later, will the MOE consider the new plan or is there a 2-5 year cycle for approving updates. M. Keller noted that throughout the future of this process there will be many technical addendums and improvements to the Assessment Reports and the SPPs that cannot wait years before being considered. He strongly suggested that the MOE accept submissions of adjustments as they appear, since they will initially be occurring at a frequent rate across the province. With this in mind, it can be assumed that an update to the Kettle Creek SPP may be provided to the MOE a few months after submission of the plan in August. However, this assumption requires confirmation. L. Ross responded that she could not speak specifically to the Minister's position in terms of process. However, the legislation allows for an SPC and SPA to update an Assessment Report, and follow with an improved SPP, as new information becomes available and at a pace that they feel is appropriate. W. Wright-Cascaden mentioned that in the SPC's consideration of this issue it would be helpful to receive confirmation from the MOE that they will consider early amendments to the Assessment Report as a priority for review, if the SPP is submitted according to schedule.

A. Henry elaborated that he has two conflicting responsibilities. One is ensure that the Kettle Creek SPP secures protection for all water sources adequately upon its submission, while the other is to not delay the entire process because of one outstanding issue. T. Schmidt added that as a water supplier, A. Henry believes the Assessment Report is not appropriate for his facility and the SPP policies will not completely protect the intake. That is a strong statement for the SPC's consideration. R. Haggart agreed that if the data modeling and technical justifications are correct, then this is a very serious matter. He felt that the SPC should focus on resolving the issue as soon as possible, and that relying on the assumption

that an updated plan will be reviewed sometime in the near future, could be quite problematic. Historically, the SPC has always favored enhancing the quality of the product rather than meeting timelines, and now that the SPC is aware of this concern, they should throw their weight behind it.

J. Oliver noted that A. Henry is suggesting that if the SPC proceeds with the plan as written, there will still be a risk to the intake after the August 20 submission date. However, postponing the submission of the plan will have the same result. There will still be a risk to the water supply regardless of if the plan moves forward in June or if the SPC chooses to amend the Assessment Report and commence a new round of public consultation. He suggested that there might be more value in proceeding with the current schedule and work on amendments immediately afterward. I. MacDonald added that whether the plan is provided to the MOE in August or December, until it is approved and implemented, it does not provide more or less protection by being submitted early or late.

W. Wright-Cascaden commented that the SPC would be more comfortable pushing the plan forward if there was confirmation from the MOE that they will deal with updates expeditiously. L. Ross confirmed that taking either approach is legislatively feasible; however, she cannot anticipate the decision of the Minister. She offered to ask these questions internally and provide feedback to the SPC as soon as possible. M. Keller stated that all four Assessment Reports will inevitably require updating, and new versions of the SPPs will have to be submitted. He felt that choosing to postpone submission could be problematic, as more items will undoubtedly cause other delays along the way. From a staff perspective, he advised that it would be most beneficial to move forward with the Kettle Creek SPP and deal with updates immediately following. M. Ceschi-Smith pointed out that the Assessment Report is a 'living document' and therefore requires continuous updating. Given that this has been the understanding from early on in the process, does the MOE have the proper mechanisms in place to allow for edits to be made as circumstances evolve. M. Keller confirmed that the message from the MOE has been that these are working documents, and that the legislation allows for updates and improvements. However, despite this being expected, staff still need to determine the appropriate timelines and processes for accomplishing these amendments. R. Haggart added that there are other 'working documents' in existence that do not receive timely review from the MOE, and that is concerning for the future of these Assessment Reports and SPPs.

J. Oliver commented that if he were a resident of Belmont, he would be anxious to see the water supply of Belmont protected at the earliest possible date. Any postponement from this SPC due to events in Port Stanley will result in further delays for Belmont. E. VanHooren agreed, but reminded SPC members that the Port Stanley intake is facing existing threats, while the policies for Belmont are only addressing future threats. W. Wright-Cascaden added that unfortunately the *Clean Water Act* does not provide the flexibility for the SPC to approve the parts of the plan that are ready for submission, while deferring the parts that are not. M. Keller suggested that while staff are utilizing the next month for making policy revisions, they will also seek clarification from the MOE on how the amendment process works and bring that information back to the SPC at the June 7 meeting. C. Ashbaugh agreed, and concluded that it would be undesirable to delay the process at this stage. He acknowledged that this is a compromise the SPC can support under the expectation that improvements will be made as soon as possible.

D. Parker noted that OMAFRA commented that they were not in support of prohibiting the use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing in WHPA-A. He asked why the prohibition policy was kept in place. E. VanHooren responded that Belmont's WHPA-A is a community

park; therefore, the municipality is confident that prohibiting the activity would have no adverse impacts.

Res. No. 23-12 Moved by: A. Dale Seconded by: R. Krueger

carried unanimously

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee direct staff to make the recommended changes to the Draft Kettle Creek Source Protection Plan in response to comments received during public consultation of the Draft Source Protection Plan.

c) SPC-12-04-03 Amended Grand River Source Protection Area Assessment Report

E. Stahl provided an overview of report SPC 12-04-03.

D. Parker noted that in Section 10.1.2 (page 10-4) the reference to Orangeville should be changed to Acton.

A. Dale asked if the new definition of 'urban' used for scoring IPZ-3s applied to only Brantford and Ohsweken or across the board. E. Stahl responded that Brantford and Ohsweken were the only two areas where an IPZ-3 was delineated where the vulnerability scores were equal or higher than eight; therefore, in this case the new definition of urban only applies to their protection zones. A. Dale wondered how the alteration affected Oxford County and Hamilton. E. Stahl explained that there were very small areas (i.e., trailer parks) in Oxford and Hamilton that were being picked up by the definition of 'urban' and resulting in a vulnerability score of 8. Those areas would require significant threat policies. This seemed unreasonable after staff examined the aerial photography and determined that the areas were far from urban. It was then decided that the modeling could be updated to more accurately reflect the reality of the land use hence the new definition of 'urban'. M. Keller elaborated that IPZ-3 scores are calculated by looking at soil type, slope, proximity and runoff potential. The potential for runoff is higher in urban areas; therefore, a GIS layer that defined 'urban' was used to locate areas with high run-off potential and subsequently determine where the vulnerability scores would be 8 in the IPZ-3. It was discovered that this layer was outdated, and areas in Oxford and Hamilton were incorrectly being categorized as urban. Once this was changed, those areas no longer required significant threat policies. P. General asked if the delineation of IPZ-3 was changed, and M. Keller confirmed that no changes to the delineation were made, only the vulnerability score.

D. Parker indicated that dealing with landowners around the Davidson well has proven to be a challenge for the Town of Acton, and wondered how that will affect policy implementation in the LER. M. Keller responded that he is unsure where those property owners are located; however the portion of the Acton WHPA that extends into the Grand River watershed is very small. Wellington County is responsible for implementing the policies for that small area, while Halton Hills will be responsible for implementing the policies for the rest of the Acton WHPA.

Res. No. 24-12 Moved by: A. Henry Seconded by: D. Murray

carried unanimously

Page 8

THAT the Amended Grand River Source Protection Area Assessment Report (April 26, 2012) be submitted to the Grand River Source Protection Authority, as required under Section 19 of the Clean Water Act.

d) SPC-12-04-04 Cross-Boundary Policy Harmonization Dufferin County

M. Keller provided an overview of report SPC 12-04-04.

D. Murray noted that the feedback from the Townships of Amaranth and East Garafraxa still indicates that they are not in support of the policies the CTC is moving forward with. However, they have demonstrated support for the approach of the LER. He felt finding a middle ground still might be possible, and that the issue should be resolved internally between the two SPCs, otherwise solving the disagreement will become the responsibility of the MOE.

Res. No. 25-12	Moved by:	D. Murray	
	Seconded by:	D. Parker	carried unanimously

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee send a letter to the CTC Source Protection Committee requesting additional time be made available to achieve greater harmonization of policies relating to the Orangeville drinking water systems for the affected municipalities in Dufferin County.

W. Wright-Cascaden asked what the CTC's timeframe was for moving forward with their policies. D. Murray replied that they have already begun the process for plan submission and are engaged in public consultation. Within their current timeframe, the CTC will submit their SPP by the August deadline and finding a solution for Dufferin County will not be accomplished. M. Keller added that the CTC have combined the SPPs of their region under one cover. With the resolution [above], the Lake Erie Region is suggesting that the CTC could consider separating the Credit Valley SPP from the other two, and submit it at later date once the issues in Dufferin County have been resolved.

D. Parker asked if the most recent recommendations and policy revisions made by Amaranth and East Garafraxa came forward at the CTC's public meeting in Mono on April 17. M. Keller replied that the policy amendments and suggestions were not formally discussed. The CTC's public meetings are designed as open houses for people to communicate with CTC staff oneon-one. They include a high level presentation about the source protection program, but there is no formal comment period. D. Parker commented that with no formal comment period many of the CTC SPC members are probably not aware of what the two townships are considering in their policies. He wondered if members from each SPC could assemble for a meeting to discuss items beyond what staff have already brought to their attention. D. Murray responded that through corresponding with a few of the CTC's SPC members, reaching a common ground has been considered by the CTC at some level. Members from each committee having a meeting would be beneficial, but would likely require attendance from the MOE as well. Currently, the two SPCs are miles apart in policy approaches.

R. Haggart asked if Amaranth and East Garafraxa have presented their concerns directly to the CTC SPC. M. Keller confirmed that they have. D. Murray added that the dialogue between the two regions continues, but an agreement is not being reached. He suggested that a skilled arbitrator might be required to facilitate the meeting and help mediate the situation. C.

Ashbaugh agreed and wondered if the MOE could partake. M. Keller confirmed that Ministry staff have been approached on this matter and are looking into the role they could potentially play in finding a solution in Dufferin County. L. Ross added that the liaison officers have been made aware, but the MOE has not been formally requested in writing by the SPC to participate. C. Ashbaugh wondering if the SPC should pass a motion to formally ask for the MOE's assistance in mediating the discussions between the two SPRs. M. Keller responded that the SPC might not wish to restrict the options available by stating specifically what will be done in the resolution. Staff still have a long way to go before determining the most effective means for facilitating productive discussion.

A. Dale suggested that the resolution moved by D. Murray be sent as correspondence to the Source Protection Programs Branch Director, and the appropriate people/agencies be copied. The letter would highlight the need for mediation, and act as an invitation to the MOE to participate as arbitrator. W. Wright-Cascaden noted that the original hope was to not involve the Ministry. Therefore, it might be more beneficial to hire a professional mediator for facilitating the discussions, who would have a neutral standpoint to eliminate bias. D. Murray added that inviting a Chair of another SPR to mediate could be another option. SPC Chairs are experienced and knowledgeable in source protection and capable of dealing with these types of issues. C. Ashbaugh felt that a Chair from another SPR could eliminate complete neutrality. R. Haggart asked if Amaranth and East Garafraxa are receptive to the idea of a mediated meeting. Sending the letter would most likely prove effective; however, if the SPC triggers a situation that the municipalities are not comfortable with, the purpose is defeated. D. Murray concluded that the original goal was to work out the issues strictly between the two SPCs, without outside influences, while recognizing that if an agreement still cannot be reached; other options will be have to be explored.

A. Henry asked if water quantity issues in the rest of the LER will further complicate the situation for municipalities when the province releases Great Lakes regulations (i.e. the interbasin transfer issue). This will likely become an additional responsibility of the already overburdened RMOs. M. Keller agreed that this was possible, and could become another complicating factor for policy implementation.

J. Oliver noted that in the process of reducing cross-boundary conflict, Norfolk County council reviewed Oxford County's draft policies. Several of Oxford's wells are actually located in Norfolk, and Oxford has indicated that the policies protecting those wells will be those written by Norfolk instead of Oxford. He asked for clarification that this policy applicability was correct (i.e., if the wells of municipality A are located in municipality B, it will be municipality B's policies that will apply to those wells). M. Keller confirmed that this was correct. J. Oliver asked if this particular methodology was laid out in the *Clean Water Act*, or if the LER decided on this approach individually. M. Keller responded that it is partially a product of the LER's unique process, but also because of how Part IV powers are designed. The RMO by default does not have any authority beyond a municipality's jurisdiction; therefore, they legally cannot implement policies outside the municipal boundaries even when their own wells are located there. However, the *Clean Water Act* does allow for arrangements to be made between municipalities for sharing or delegating RMO powers. For example, under such an arrangement, the authority could be passed onto Oxford to enforce policies for their wells located in Norfolk.

Res. No. 26-12

Moved by: A. Henry Seconded by: R. Krueger

carried unanimously

Page 10

THAT Report No. SPC 12-04-04 Cross-Boundary Policy Harmonization Dufferin County be received for information.

e) SPC-12-04-05 Source Protection Plan Development Update

M. Keller provided an overview of report SPC-12-04-05.

Res. No. 27-12 Moved by: I. MacDonald Seconded by: A. Dale carried unanimously

THAT Report No. SPC 12-04-05 Source Protection Plan Development Update be received for information.

11. Business Arising from Previous Meetings

None

12. Other Business

a) Question and Answer Period

None

13. Closed Meeting

Not applicable

14. Next Meeting – Thursday, June 7, 2012, 1:00 pm Grand River Conservation Authority Administration Office, 400 Clyde Road, Cambridge, ON

15. Adjourn

The Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee meeting of April 26, 2012 adjourned at 3:42 pm

Chair

Recording Secretary