

---

## 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 Deb Kirk at 519-245-3710 ext 46.

**Meeting Date:** September 11, 2009

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

**Meeting Location:** St. Clair Conservation Authority office board room

---

### *Proposed Agenda*

<b>Item</b>	<b>Time</b>
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	
a. AR Consultation update	
b. Threats and Risk Assessment Local Guidance	
c. Threats and Risk Assessment Tool – comments/questions	
d. Tier 1 Water Budget update	
7. Business	10:00
a. Consideration of Tile Drained Areas in IPZ-2	
b. Remodeling of Vulnerable Zones	
c. SPP Workshop and comments for MOE	
Lunch	12:00
8. Information	
a. Vulnerability Assessment Peer Review update	
b. Amendments to rules	
c. ODWSP update	
d. Communications update	
e. First Nations update	
9. In Camera Session	
10. Other business	
a. Bottled Water at SPC events	
11. MOE Liaison report	
12. Members reports	
a. Industrial/Commercial Workshop	
13. Adjournment	3:00

## ***Meeting Materials***

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Description</b>
Discussion Papers	2009.09.7a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consideration of Tile Drained areas in IPZ-2</li><li>• With Essex report attached</li></ul>
	August Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
	SPP Workshop outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Large Group session summary notes</li><li>• Case Study worksheets</li><li>• Letter Outline for SPP discussion paper comments</li></ul>
	Letter to Paul Heeney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To be distributed later</li></ul>
	Summary of rules changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To be distributed at meeting</li></ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>

SPC MEETING MINUTES  
FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 11, 2009  
Meeting #17

Bob Bedggood, Chair of the Source Protection Committee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, September 11, 2009 at the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority Board Room. The following members and staff were in attendance:

**Members:**

Bob Bedggood	Murray Blackie
Paul Hymus	Darrell Randell
Carl Kennes	Pat Sobeski
Joe Kerr	Pat Donnelly
Joe VanOverberghe	Joe Salter
James Maudsley	Patrick Feryn
Doug McGee	Sheldon Parsons
Charles Sharina	Jim Reffle
John Van Dorp	Richard Philp
Brent Clutterbuck	Earl Morwood
Marg Misek-Evans	Teresa McLellan (MOE-Provincial Liaison).

**Regrets:**

Valerie M'Garry  
Dean Edwardson  
Don McCabe

**Others in attendance:**

Robert Olivier, First Nations technical representative

**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 agenda, noting that item 8a would be dealt with prior to 7b, was requested.

moved by James Maudsley-seconded by Joe VanOverberghe

*“Resolved that the agenda circulated be approved with the noted change in the order of item discussion.”*

*CARRIED.*

3) Delegations

None

4) Minutes from the Previous Meeting

A motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting with revisions to items 6b: a mention of the discussion on comments about the vulnerable areas is to be made, 7a: comment about not being able to implement before the plan is developed needs to be revised to acknowledge the possibility of Interim Risk Management plans, and 8b: reference to an incentive program under Reg. 903 must be corrected to remove the reference to that regulation but indicate the availability of incentive programs to properly decommission abandoned wells.

moved by Charles Sharina –seconded by Margaret Misek Evans

*“Resolved that the agenda and minutes be approved with the noted amendments.”*

*CARRIED.*

5) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was identified.

6) Business arising from the minutes

a) AR Consultation update

The updated assessment report consultation schedule was presented by Chris. Phase 1 (vulnerability assessment) and Phase 2 (vulnerability assessment, issues and threats) open houses are local focus consultation sessions. It is an opportunity to be in those communities more than once. Staff will continue to update the schedule and distribute to the committee members.

b) Threats and Risk Assessment Local Guidance

Based on discussion at the previous SPC meeting, the term 'terms of reference' was replaced with 'local guidance' when referring to the TSR's direction on Threats and Risk Assessment work. The finalized document was distributed this week to consultants and municipalities involved in technical studies. The distributed guidance included revisions based on comments from the MOE which mainly focused on terminology. Due to delays in distributing, the work schedule was revised and is in line with the updated Phase 2 consultation schedule discussed earlier.

c) Threats and Risk Assessment Tool - comments/questions

No questions or comments.

d) Tier 1 Water Budget update

Chris mentioned that revisions to the tier 1 water budget are going on and may be presented to the SPC when the work is completed.

7) Business

a) Consideration of Tile Drained Areas in IPZ-2

A discussion paper on the consideration of tile drained areas in IPZ-2 and the Essex Region SPC report was distributed to the SPC in their meeting package. Chris provided the background and presented an example map for discussion purposes. At previous SPC meetings, the inclusion of tile drained areas in IPZ-2, IPZ-3, WHPA-E and WHPA-F were discussed. A definitive direction was not obtained nor documented in meeting minutes.

Consistency with the neighbouring Essex Region SPR needs to be considered, especially in the IPZ at Wheatley which extends into the Essex Region, and the possibility that IPZ-3s from Essex Region intakes which extend into the TSR. A map of the South-Kent intake at Erie beach showing

tile drained areas and farm parcels adjacent to the IPZ-2 was presented as an example. Outdated tile drain data from OMAFRA and obvious data gaps were noted as a serious concern.

A discussion took place on the Essex Region's decision on including the first farm parcel touching the IPZ-2, assuming that the tiles and overland flow drain towards the IPZ-2. It was recognized in the example map that despite including the first farm parcel, watercourses on those parcels that are known to drain away from the IPZ-2 would not automatically be assumed to be included. Concerns and comments were raised on making assumptions instead of using available data, using the watershed boundary instead of OMAFRA's tile drain layer, possibilities of a site specific investigation to determine which direction a tile drain flows, consideration of the tile drain outlets and impacts at unique situations such as the Wallaceburg intake where extensive pumping schemes exist. It was agreed that, in order to increase the precaution taken in considering the first parcel adjacent to the IPZ-2, those parcels not be restricted to cultivated land parcels only. It was also decided to include the first parcel and not consider the watershed boundaries as tiles in many areas may flow in the same direction rather than following the limited relief of the land. This will have limited impact on land use as Risk Management plans could account for flow that is confirmed to be directed away from the intake.

A motion was proposed to adopt the Essex Region SPC's decision with the amendments of extending the IPZ-2 to all properties adjacent to the watercourses and waterbodies setbacks (or CA regulated limits), and to revisit unique situations such as the Wallaceburg intake.

moved by Doug McGee –seconded by James Maudsley

*“Resolved that Essex Region SPC's decision on inclusion of tiled drained areas in IPZ-2 be adopted and approved with the noted amendments and that the SPC will revisit unique situations.”*

**CARRIED.**

A comment was raised to ensure that when the revised IPZs are presented to the public through the open house consultations, information on why the first property adjacent to the setbacks were included be provided as well as clarity to definitions for terms such as storm sewersheds, drains, tile drains and transport pathways.

## b) Remodeling of Vulnerable Zones

This item was discussed after item 8a. The remodeling of Ridgetown is still being considered by the consultant. The St. Marys municipal staff concerns about the peer reviews comments on the uncertainty in the St Marys model. They have requested that remodeling of the St. Marys well head protection areas be undertaken to reduce the considerable uncertainty. Further background information was provided. The model was developed prior to the county groundwater studies and brought into the Perth groundwater study. It was later brought forward into the source protection technical studies. Although reviewed by MOE at that stage it is likely that it was not fully considered

as it predated that study. The high pumping rates used in the model result in additional conservatism in the zones, however it may not adequately balance the uncertainty in the model. If the modeling is to be redone a new model will be required. Discussions with St. Marys staff suggested that it is best to proceed with improvements to the model. The costs will need to be determined, but it is expected that the additional expenditure can be accommodated within available technical funding provided by MOE. It is estimated to take about two months to remodel the WHPAs. Although the GUDI wells WHPA E and F may be delineated in an addendum or updated Assessment Report, a work plan to do so would be provided in the current assessment report. This same option is not available for the improvement of the WHPA-A through D. This raises the question of whether to include existing lines in any of the consultation. Clarification from MOE regarding the inclusion or exclusion of WHPA - A to D for GUDI systems in this assessment report will be sought.

A decision by the SPC on whether to consult or not on the St. Marys wells was requested. A motion was made to not consult on the St. Marys well system as it was generally felt that if the municipality was not comfortable with the delineation, the consultation should be put off.

moved by Pat Feryn-seconded by Pat Donnelly

*“Resolved to not consult on the St. Marys WHPAs until improved modeling reduces the uncertainty in the delineation of the zones.”*

*CARRIED.*

### c) SPP Workshop and comments for MOE

The chair walked the SPC through the comments on the discussion paper that arose from the source protection planning workshop held at Ridgeway on August 17, 2009. A discussion on the comments took place. Revised wording for some of the comments was discussed. It was suggested to provide a preamble stating that the comments pertain to the source protection plan. It was also suggested to group the comments in themes such as sustained funding, resources and training, incentives, monitoring, education and awareness, research and technology, and liaison. There was considerable discussion as to the level of detail of the committee's review of the comments. It was decided that the committee continue with a review of the comments, but not focus on the wording of the comments. From the subsequent review, suggestions were made as to grouping of comments and comments which the Source Protection Committee felt were not necessary to highlight.

There was extensive discussion on how important incentive programs are to the implementation of Source Protection. It was noted that incentives are already proposed as a tool for source protection and therefore do not need extensive comments. Generally, comments need not be directed at support of aspects already covered in the discussion paper. The sustained funding of these programs is however crucial and not discussed in any way in the discussion paper. As such this point needs to be brought to the ministry's attention.

It was agreed that the chair work with the project manager to group the SPC's comments into relevant themes as per the committee's discussion. The proposed comments will be emailed to the Source Protection Committee for their review and comments. Any comments or concerns on



concepts or intent are to be submitted to Chris by the end of the day September 16 2009. This will allow those comments to be considered in the final letter and comment being completed the following day. The Chair will take the revised comments along with the materials developed through the workshop, to the Chair's meeting and then delivered to the MOE.

The SPC broke for lunch from 12:15 pm to 12:45 pm and returned to continue the review of the draft comments.

## 8) Information

### a) Vulnerability Assessment Peer Review update

Chitra provided an update on the vulnerability assessment peer review process and the effects on the scheduling of phase 1 assessment report consultation open houses. Most vulnerability studies are peer reviewed with the exception of the Oxford and the Thames Centre wells.

Additional wind analysis undertaken for the Wheatley and the Erie Beach intakes was accepted by the peer reviewers.

Additional work for the Ridgetown wells to address peer reviewers' comments on the hydraulic conductivity, boundary conditions and recharge values will affect the timing of the assessment report consultation schedule for this system.

St. Marys staff who participated in the peer review raised a concern about the peer reviewer's comments on the high level of uncertainty related to the delineation of the St. Marys WHPAs. The St. Marys WHPAs were delineated with high pumping rates as per the direction of the municipality. This added some level of conservatism to the WHPAs. A concern was raised about the vulnerability assessment peer reviewers commenting on past groundwater studies that are already peer reviewed. The VA peer reviewers understand that the model was brought forward from before the county groundwater studies, however the municipality's concern needs to be repected.

Item 7b was then discussed.

### b) Amendments to Rules

Chris provided information on proposed amendments to the Clean Water Act technical rules and noted the removal of rules pertaining to the Wallaceburg intake. Instead, proposed rule 15.1 allows the Director (MOE) to make exemptions to the rules. The proposed changes allow for the submission of an Assessment Report with GUDI WHPA-E and F, IPZ-3 and Tier 3 Water Budget as workplans rather than as completed work. Similar flexibility for planned systems may need to be requested.

There are some changes in the three maps, on impervious surfaces, managed lands and livestock density, to be produced as part of the characterization report. For the livestock density map, it is proposed to count livestock on farmlands, which poses a problem time-wise. More guidance on the





production of the maps is needed. Proposed rule 15.1 may be used to come up with simpler, alternate methodologies.

c) ODWSP update

Nothing new to report.

d) Communications update

Open house consultation work is going on, including preparation for remaining phase 1 open houses as well as the phase 2 open houses across the region. Bob B. encouraged the SPC members to attend the public open houses. The currently planned open houses at Stratford, London and Mitchell were identified in the consultation update discussed earlier.

e) First Nations update

Derekica S. provided an update. Derekica worked with each First Nation community in the region to produce panels and brochures on education and outreach purposes through a stewardship program, with the theme of 'Where does my water come from?'. She is trying to obtain First Nation representatives support letters from the Southern First Nation Secretariat.

9) In Camera Session

None

10) Other Business

a) Bottled Water at SPC events

Pat D. encouraged the SPC to support his suggestion that we request that tap water be provided at Source Protection Committee events and that bottled water not be provided. Although a motion was discussed it was determined that the committee's consensus was enough direction for staff to act upon. It was reported that the location used for the workshop automatically provides bottled water unless directed not to. In the future we will need to make that request at each venue. It was suggested that fellow committee members and staff consider doing the same for events being hosted by others.

11) MOE Liaison Report

Teresa M. mentioned that the MOE newsletter could be sent to SPC members. The TSR was selected



to be the source protection region that the Assistant Deputy Minister (Drinking Water Management Division) and Chief Drinking Water Inspector, John Stager, would visit to gain insight into ground level work. He wants to see the work which is being done and meet with the technical team who is involved with the work.

## 12) Members Reports

*Carl Kennes* mentioned he would attend the industrial/commercial workshop at Mitchell on September 15 2009.

Bob Bedgood mentioned that the next meeting is on October 2, 2009 and to indicate to Chitra whether you can attend or not.

## Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.