LAKE ERIE REGION SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, February 4, 2010

The following are the minutes of the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee meeting held on Thursday, February 4, 2010 at the Grand River Conservation Authority Administration Centre, 400 Clyde Road, Cambridge, ON.


Members Regrets: P. General, B. LaForme, C. Martin

Proxy Representatives: None

Liaisons: T. Duong, Provincial Liaison; P. Emerson, Source Protection Authority Liaison; D. Young, Public Health Liaison

Region Management Committee: A. Dale, GRCA; T. Marks, KCCA; B. Sloat, LPRCA; K. Smale, CCCA; E. VanHooren, KCCA

Staff: D. Belanger, Guelph Waterworks; N. Betts, GRCA; S. Cooke, GRCA; N. Davy, GRCA; K. Elder, Township of Centre Wellington; J. Etienne, GRCA; B. Fields, Norfolk County; S. Glauser, GRCA; E. Hodgins, Region of Waterloo; S. Kurli, Halton Region; T. Middleton, Region of Waterloo; L. Minshall, GRCA; T. Ryan, GRCA; D. Schultz, GRCA; T. Seguin, GRCA; S. Strynatka, GRCA; H. Waite, County of Oxford, P. Wilson, Haldimand County; A. Wong, GRCA; G. Zwiers, GRCA

Also Present: J. Annis, Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association; N. Chaloner; M. Darmon; G. Deonarine, Stantec Consulting; L. Griffith; S. Hollingshead, Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association; V. Kirsch, Guelph Mercury; J. Martin; G. Ounapuu, Lotowater; Greg Padusenko, Golder and Associates; J. Piersol, Golder and Associates; T. Shanoff, Stantec Consulting

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:

- On January 25 and 26 the Ministry of the Environment hosted the Chair and Program Manager meetings in Toronto. Attendees discussed assessment report status updates and next steps. As of January 26, three assessment reports had been submitted to the Ministry of the Environment, two of which were from the Lake Erie Region. The Lake Erie Region was also at the top for funding disbursements due to the exceptional delivery of the Stewardship Program. Staff were congratulated on their hard work.

- January 28 was the Annual General Meeting for the Catfish Creek Conservation Authority. An annual report for CCCA was distributed to the members. C. Ashbaugh commended conservation authority staff for the exceptional work they undertake with limited resources.

*K. Hunsberger joined the meeting at 1:10 pm.

- Information was circulated to members regarding a University of Waterloo graduate student’s research project regarding water governance. Members who are interested in participating can indicate their interest on the handout. M. Cecchi-Smith pointed out that members are receiving numerous requests to participate in similar research projects. C. Ashbaugh noted to whatever extent members are able to assist is appreciated.

- M. Wales asked if the subject of dead stock was addressed at the Chair’s meeting. C. Ashbaugh indicated that it was not.

- P. Emerson introduced Professor Andrew Hamilton Joseph who is visiting from Argentina, The Grand River Conservation Authority has a twinning agreement with Los Algarroboes relating to the San Roque Lake watershed in Cordoba, Argentina.

4. Review of Agenda

A revised agenda was distributed to members with the addition of item 9. a) i., correspondence from Jessica Annis, Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association. Item 10). e) was amended to follow 10) a) to accommodate the consultant’s schedule.

Moved by: B. Ungar
Seconded by: G. Rae carried unanimously

THAT the revised agenda for the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee Meeting of February 4, 2010 be approved.

5. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

a) D. Murray declared pecuniary interest on item 10) g) SPC-02-10-07 Centre Wellington Vulnerability and Issues and item 10) h) SPC-02-10-08 Southgate Vulnerability and Issues because Triton Engineering, his firm, was involved in the technical studies.
6. Minutes of Previous Meeting – January 21, 2010

Moved by: D. Parker
Seconded by: L. Perrin carried unanimously

THAT the minutes of the previous meeting January 21, 2010 be approved as circulated.

7. Hearing of Delegations

a) Stephen Hollingshead, Geological Engineer, Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association

S. Hollingshead stated that he is a delegate on behalf of the Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, and will address report SPC-10-02-01 Background on Quarrying as a Drinking Water Threat, requesting that the recommendations in the report not be supported.

The key technical recommendations that the Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association would like to address are the recommendations that excavation that breaches the aquitard protecting a municipal drinking water supply aquifer should be a prescribed drinking water threat, and that excavation below the water table is a drinking water quality threat due to the possible introduction of pathogens. S. Hollingshead noted that in the regulations, the basis of the assessment is an equation similar to Risk=Threat + Vulnerability, noting that he perceives the threat to be a source of contamination and the vulnerability to be a pathway for the contamination to reach the drinking water source. He noted that the extraction in and of itself is not a contamination. The fuel that powers the equipment for extraction is a source of contamination. The Ministry of the Environment has carried out a comprehensive list of prescribed drinking water threats and the fuels are addressed by the threats list. S. Hollingshead further noted that lakes, similar to pits and quarries, are connected to groundwater, but lakes have not been included on the threats list.

Currently, pits and quarries are addressed in the vulnerability assessment as either preferential pathways or increasing the vulnerability of the area. It is the Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association’s position that this is the best approach. On behalf of the OSSGA, he noted that they do not believe that the recommendations are substantiated or consistent with the Ministry of the Environment’s science, and asks the committee to consider not supporting the recommendations. S. Hollingshead noted that Jessica Annis, the author of the correspondence from the OSSGA, was also in attendance if anyone has questions or comments.

A. Henry clarified that at this stage of the assessment, many of the threats are hypothetical based on windshield surveys and land use zoning being cross-referenced with the threats tables. At this point, threat does not necessarily translate to risk. He expressed concern regarding whether aggregate extraction is being accurately characterized in the vulnerability assessments and whether associated activities are being assessed properly, and noted it would be prudent to seek guidance from the Ministry of the Environment.
M. Goldberg pointed out that the motion was put forward because it was thought this was an oversight, noting that the threats list was actually developed quite quickly, and was modified with additions as recently as December. He identified that there are intrinsic threats related to previous land uses in and around the pits and quarries. He further noted that lakes are a naturally occurring feature, and the purpose of this discussion is to address man made activities that breach the aquitard.

T. Schmidt noted that the definition of drinking water threats is not exclusive to the threats list provided by the Ministry of the Environment. Any activities that have the potential to adversely affect the quality of drinking water can also be identified. J. Laird concurred and noted that only a portion of the definition of drinking water threat was shown in the presentation. The full definition includes the “potential to adversely affect drinking water” which allows for a potential time lapse in the risk equation.

M. Wales asked what the difference would be between a farm irrigation pond and an aggregate extraction site, noting that the spreading of manure in a gravel pit is unlikely and that pathogens from previous farm operations would not survive to the next land use. He noted that there is always the risk of past practices affecting current land use; he is not supportive of labeling extraction as a threat at this point in time, but would be open to further discussion.

J. Oliver suggested that the potential water quantity threat posed by quarry operations that breach the aquitard should also be considered. He asked for comment on whether a pit or quarry operation that breaches the aquitard could adversely affect the municipal water supply. S. Hollingshead responded that water extraction for pits or quarries is noted as a potential water quantity threat by the Ministry of the Environment.

M. Goldberg cited atrazine as a commonly used chemical that would remain in the soil for a long period of time and could be introduced to the water through aggregate extraction.

D. Woolcott asked how many aggregate sites extract below the water table. S. Hollingshead responded that approximately one third to one half of all aggregate sites extract below the water table as well as above. He advised that although this is a rough estimate, the number is significant.

D. Parker referenced two aggregate operations in Flamborough and Melancthon, and noted that if the companies agreed to stay out of the aquifer, he could support the OSSGA's position. Rather than looking at how things were done in the past, D. Parker suggested his focus will be on future uses.

S. Hollingshead noted that although he does not dispute many of the members' comments, he asks that members carefully consider keeping the threats and the vulnerability separate, as opposed to mixing the two, as the current report proposes.

8. Presentations

None
9. Correspondence

a) Copies for Members

i) Correspondence from Jessica Annis, Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association to Craig Ashbaugh, Chair and Members of the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee Re: Report No. SPC-10-02-01 Background on Quarrying as a Drinking Water Threat

b) Not Copied

None

Res. No. 06-10 Moved by: R. Krueger
Seconded by: J. Harrison carried unanimously

THAT the correspondence be received as information.

10. Reports

a) SPC-02-10-01 Background on Quarrying as a Drinking Water Threat

L. Minshall provided an overview of report SPC-10-02-01 Background on Quarrying as a Drinking Water Threat.

A. Henry suggested that the first two recommendations are within the prescribed process for assessing risk although there is a potential flaw because there is no hazard rating for an activity that increases the vulnerability of the wellhead protection area or intake protection zone. He suggested that asking the Director to develop a hazard rating for an activity that increases the vulnerability of the intake protection zone or wellhead protection area would address this flaw. He noted that the last two recommendations are essentially addressed in the Source Protection Plan draft regulation and he is supportive of putting these recommendations forward.

L. Minshall emphasized that the action of breaching the aquitard is the item of concern because it is assumed to be releasing pathogens into groundwater that are always presumed to exist in surface water. A. Henry noted that there remains, however, no assessment of activities that modify the vulnerability. Transportation corridors are another example of this, and it is not being addressed.

R. Seibel pointed out that most quarries have been digging below the water table for years, and the aquitard acts as a protective barrier to the aquifer. He noted that the second recommendation does not focus on the aquitard and by including excavation below the water table all excavation activities in the province could be affected. He noted that he is particularly concerned with the wording of the second recommendation. L. Minshall clarified that the wording was intended to limit the recommendation, not expand it, and could be reworded to clarify.

M. Wales noted that seasonal water tables can vary and supports rewording the second paragraph. Further, he referred to the first recommendation and asked how large of an
area would be affected considering the size of the aquifers. He wondered if any parameters such as those used by the IPZ1, or WHPA A would be applied. L. Minshall responded that, as with other threats, extraction would only be a threat in a wellhead protection area, and the closer it is, or the more vulnerable the geology, the more of a threat it is. Excavation below the water table that breaches an aquitard wouldn’t be a threat unless it is in a wellhead protection area.

B. Ungar asked what is considered the release of pathogens. L. Minshall responded that the Ministry of the Environment has two approaches to determine hazard scores based on pathogens or chemicals. Quarry pits have a parallel with storm water ponds in that surface water in Ontario is deemed to be contaminated with pathogens. On that basis, a release of that surface water to the aquifer is a release of those pathogens into the groundwater. It would be up to the Ministry of the Environment to determine the hazard score for the situation. B. Ungar asked if a pathogen is all inclusive (coliforms and chemicals). L. Minshall responded that the pathogens are whatever the Ministry of the Environment and public health have included in their assumptions regarding surface water contamination.

R. Seibel pointed out that any quarries that go below the water table and pump more than 50,000 litres per day require a permit to take water. The permits have a clause indicating that if conditions change, the permit may be removed.

R. Seibel asked whether it is expected the assessment of extraction as a threat would be addressed before or after the Assessment reports are submitted. L. Minshall responded that she hopes that the recommendations would be considered prior to submission of the Assessment Reports. This will allow the opportunity to work with the Ministry on developing the hazard rating. L. Minshall further identified that under Rule 19 the committee can identify a threat that is not on the threats list and ask the Director for a hazard score. If it is over 4, it can be a low, moderate, or significant threat. If, however, the MOE indicates that the committee's interpretation of the Clean Water Act is not in keeping with the Ministry's understanding, nothing would happen.

L. Minshall indicated that the last two recommendations of her report have been addressed in the Source Protection Plan discussion paper, and so it appears these will have already been acknowledged by the Ministry.

D. Parker asked if the water in the quarries had been tested for E. coli. S. Hollingshead responded negatively but noted that the MISA program undertook a study which determined there is no need to regulate water quality from the quarries, and that it was suitable for discharge.

D. Murray wondered how broadly the implications of these recommendations could affect activities, and cited the installation of sanitary sewers and water mains as an example. L. Minshall noted that the recommendation is based on excavation that breaches the aquitard in a wellhead protection area; any excavation breaching an aquitard in a wellhead protection area would be a threat. I. Macdonald pointed out that this recommendation is really related to a small area associated with municipal water supplies where the aquitard is being breached.
H. Cornwell asked if the recommendation should explicitly identify municipal wellhead protection area. He expressed concern that, as it is written now, more areas may be affected than intended. L. Minshall identified that the prescribed threats list only identifies the name of the activity, and these activities only apply in wellhead protection areas.

M. Wales suggested there are still concerns, and suggested the MOE has not recognized surface water as contaminated, citing an example in Peterborough pertaining to Canada geese in the Trent River. L. Minshall clarified that the situation in the Trent River referred to a Stewardship funding application, and that decision has since been reversed and the Ministry is identifying that there is a gap.

M. Goldberg stated that the purpose of the original motion was to add to the list of what could be considered significant threats. Justice O’Connor identified that a multi-barrier approach was necessary to safeguard drinking water. Removing an aquitard, a barrier that protects municipal drinking water, is removing a barrier. The intention of the recommendation is to ask the Ministry of the Environment to consider to what extent the removal of this barrier poses a hazard to municipal drinking water supplies.

J. Harrison suggested that the purpose of the committee is to consider proposals to protect drinking water. There has been a concern raised by some committee members that extraction that breaches the aquitard might impact the work of the committee. The committee is asking the Ministry for empowerment, a framework for considering that concern. Moving these recommendations forward would be asking for tools to achieve their goals.

M. Ceschi-Smith identified that there are gravel pits beside the Grand River upstream of Brantford’s intake and asked if this could negatively impact Brantford’s drinking water. L. Minshall clarified that there is not a parallel between the current recommendation and the gravel pits upstream of Brantford’s intake.

A. Henry identified that the first two recommendations are asking the MOE to consider this activity and its implications to the water systems. Noting that the outcome will not be solved at this committee table, A. Henry suggested it would be prudent to put the recommendations forward for the Ministry’ consideration, explanation and guidance.

The motion was initially put forward at the meeting December 3, 2009. M. Goldberg and J. Laird were asked if they would consider the proposed four recommendations as a friendly amendment to their original motion. M. Goldberg and J. Laird accepted the amendment. R. Seibel asked if the recommendations could be split into four motions.

R. Seibell pointed out that the committee is asking the Ministry to do more than consider or provide guidance; the committee is taking a position and asking the MOE to support this position. M. Goldberg called the question.

Res. No. 07-10  Moved by: M. Goldberg
Seconded by: J. Laird  Carried (1 opposed)

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee recommend to the Minister of the Environment that Regulation 287/07 section 1.1 subsection (1) be amended to add excavation that breaches the aquitard
protecting a municipal drinking water supply aquifer to the list of activities that are prescribed drinking water threats.

M. Wales asked if the wording for the second motion was going to be amended. L. Minshall proposed amending the wording to add “that breaches the confining layer protecting the aquifer”. M. Goldberg and J. Laird accepted the friendly amendment. B. Ungar pointed out that there is more than just the risk of pathogens, and suggested changing the wording to acknowledge this. A. Henry suggested changing “pathogens” to “contaminants”. B. Ungar agreed this would address his concern. M. Goldberg and J. Laird accepted the friendly amendments.

Res. No. 08-10 Moved by: M. Goldberg Seconded by: J. Laird Carried (2 opposed)

THAT the Lake Erie Source Protection Committee identify excavation below the water table that breaches the confining layer protecting the aquifer as an activity that may be a drinking water threat and request the Director to establish the hazard rating of the activity based on the release of contaminants to the aquifer that results from the breach of the confining layer protecting the aquifer.

Res. No. 09-10 Moved by: M. Goldberg Seconded by: J. Laird Carried (1 opposed)

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee request that the upcoming source protection planning regulation provide for policies intended to deal with transport pathways that increase the vulnerability of a drinking water source such that significant threats are or can be created.

Res. No. 10-10 Moved by: M. Goldberg Seconded by: J. Laird Carried (1 opposed)

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee request that pit and quarry licences issued under the Aggregate Resources Act be included in the list of instruments to be prescribed in the upcoming source protection planning regulation.

e) SPC-02-10-05 Haldimand County Vulnerability, Threats and Issues

There were no questions or comments pertaining to report SPC-10-02-05 Haldimand County Vulnerability, Threats and Issues.

Res. No. 11-10 Moved by: D. Murray Seconded by: R. Krueger carried unanimously

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee direct staff to make the information in the following reports be made available to the public and incorporate the components into the Grand River and Long Point Region Source Protection Area Assessment Reports.
1. Haldimand County Source Protection Planning Technical Study Phase 1 Update: Surface Water Vulnerability Assessment Study Update for the Dunnville and Nanticoke Water Treatment Plants (Stantec, 2010);

2. Haldimand County Source Protection Planning Technical Study Phase 2 Update: Issues Evaluation, Threats Inventory, and Threat Level Assessment for the Nanticoke WTP (Stantec, 2010); and


b) SPC-02-10-02 Region of Waterloo Threats and Issues

Tammy Middleton provided an overview of Report SPC-10-02-02 Region of Waterloo Threats and Issues. Region of Waterloo issues include nitrates, salt (chloride, sodium) and trichloroethylene. It was noted that the Region of Waterloo has been aware of these issues for some time, and has been monitoring them. The threats assessment data was collected from the census sent to landowners asking about activities on their property.

J. Harrison noted that 268 threats were identified in relation to the issue of salt, and asked if most of those threats are due to parking lot salting during the winter. T. Middleton responded that is likely the case.

A. Henry inquired if the historical trend versus the active trend of chloride can be quantified. T. Middleton responded that they have an estimate. E. Hodgins indicated that the travel times to the example wellfield are very long. The salt currently being identified in the water is likely 15-20 years old. It will take 15-20 years, even if applications were reduced now, to benefit from salt reduction in this area.

J. Harrison noted that Baden has 51 significant threats related to nitrate issues and asked if this means there are 51 farms in the wellhead protection areas causing the nitrate problems. E. Hodgins suggested that although farms may be contributing to the nitrates, septic systems could also be the cause.

D. Parker requested clarification regarding whether the Baden well is operational. E. Hodgins responded that the Baden well is not currently supplying municipal water, but is part of the long term water supply strategy, and as such, is included in the planned infrastructure.

D. Parker asked if there will be an independent audit for the census submissions. E. Hodgins stated that the next step is to begin site visits to verify site activities. D. Parker asked how places of worship could be identified as threats. T. Middleton noted that properties were identified based on their MPAC code, if the site had a septic system or a stormwater management pond, it could be considered a threat.

R. Seibel noted that there were two significant threats identified in gravel pits and asked if the source of the threat was fuel storage. T. Middleton advised that she did not have
the detailed threats list on hand; however, she suggested that typically pits and quarries were treated with assumptions of what type of activities would be occurring, and fuel storage could be one of them. R. Seibel requested follow-up details regarding the source of the threats.

A. Henry asked whether the peer review was complete. L. Minshall responded that the threats assessment does not require peer review but the information is somewhat dependant on the peer review of the vulnerability, which remains outstanding.

**Res. 12-10** Moved by: I. Macdonald  
Seconded by: A. Henry carried unanimously

* THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee direct staff to make the Region of Waterloo threats, conditions and issues assessment report available to the public and incorporate the information into the Grand River Source Protection Area Assessment Report pending acceptable peer review of the reports, as outlined in report SPC-12-09-01.*

* Break – 2:50 – 3:00 *

c) **SPC-02-10-03 Draft Source Protection Plan Regulation**

S. Glauser provided an overview of report SPC-10-02-03 Draft Source Protection Plan Regulation and summarized the changes to the Draft Source Protection Plan Regulation since the discussion paper comments were submitted.

J. Oliver asked if the Conservation Authority Act is included in the prescribed instruments. S. Glauser replied that the Conservation Authority Act is not currently listed in the draft regulation. L. Minshall elaborated that Conservation Ontario has taken note of the fact that the Conservation Authority Act has not been included and it is expected they will be providing feedback.

J. Harrison emphasized that any explanatory documents supporting the Source Protection Plan could be subjected to legal scrutiny for any item of dispute.

**Res. No. 13-10** Moved by: J. Harrison  
Seconded by: M. Ceschi-Smith carried unanimously

* THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee receive Report SPC-02-10-03 Draft Source Protection Plan Regulation for information.*

* J. Oliver left the meeting at 3:10 pm.*

d) **SPC-02-10-04 City of Guelph Threats and Issues**

D. Belanger provided an overview of SPC-02-10-04 City of Guelph Threats and Issues and noted that adjusted vulnerability will be brought to the committee on March 4. Issues in the City of Guelph include nitrates, salt (chloride, sodium) and trichloroethylene.
J. Harrison asked how issue contributing areas are defined. D. Belanger responded that contributing areas are identified through computer modeling using particle tracking.

* M. Cecshi-Smith left the meeting at 3:30.

D. Parker asked what is being done about brownfields and industrial sites. D. Belanger advised that there are sites that still require remediation. When the properties belong to private landowners, it is the Ministry of the Environment's responsibility to enforce site remediation; unfortunately that process can sometimes be quite slow. D. Parker wondered if there is a method for municipalities to follow up with companies who leave brownfields. D. Belanger noted that those policies rest in the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Water Resources Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Environment.

J. Harrison identified that the largest data gap appears to be the uncertainty pertaining to conditions; he asked how long it is expected to take to achieve more certainty pertaining to conditions. D. Belanger pointed out that the exchange of information is at the discretion of the property owner. Some individuals are cooperative with sharing the information, while some are afraid to share that information for fear of liability. The Ministry of the Environment is working to clean up sites, but has difficulties mediating discussions pertaining to who is responsible.

M. Goldberg noted the significant impact the quarry has on the wellhead protection areas. He asked if the source of the trichloroethylene (TCE) at Emma well has been identified and eliminated. D. Belanger responded that although the City of Guelph has done some initial work, they have not found the source. Deep bedrock aquifers tend to pull water from large areas, and the source of contamination cannot easily be tracked through a monitoring well. He noted that this process will lead in the right direction by identifying properties that have handled or stored TCE.

R. Seibel observed that the WHPA-D and E have changed significantly with the quarry's pumping stopped, but he didn't see a change otherwise in the mapping. D. Belanger advised that the new mapping was not used for the purposes of this presentation; however, the new maps will be used moving forward.

**Res. No. 14-10**

**Moved by:** B. Ungar  
**Seconded by:** L. Perrin  
**carried unanimously**

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee direct staff to incorporate the components of the report City of Guelph Water Quality Threats Assessment (AquaResource and Stantec, 2010) into the Grand River Source Protection Area Assessment Report, and make it available to the public.

**f) SPC-02-10-06 Draft Assessment Report Public Comments**

S. Glauser provided an overview of report SPC-10-02-06 Draft Assessment Report Public Comments.
A. Henry referenced comment number one and requested clarification regarding whether the reference to the blob refers to the Kettle Creek sediments as well as Port Stanley. He further suggested that shoreline protection is not within the purview of this committee. L. Minshall clarified that the shoreline comment was pertaining to risk management along the shoreline, such as septic upgrades through the Stewardship Program, which is not part of the Assessment Report. A. Henry also noted that because the intake protection zone is completely within the lake, shoreline properties would not qualify for Stewardship funding.

A. Henry referenced comment number three regarding the Kettle Creek plume and asked if it is referring to the interface between the flow of water from Kettle Creek out into Lake Erie. He noted that this can change dramatically based on wind and wave conditions. L. Minshall identified that the comment was a specific request; the Kettle Creek plume was characterized in the full characterization report, but was left out when the report contents were condensed for the assessment report. The comment is asking that this reference to the plume be included in characterization information that is being brought forward into the assessment report.

A. Henry referenced comment number four regarding the implications of the wastewater treatment plant. He noted that there was considerable discussion in the characterization section regarding the wastewater treatment plant, but the actual assessment has been dealt with in work for IPZ-3. He asked if it is staff’s intention to revised the wording and advise that the wastewater treatment plant is being addressed in the IPZ-3 studies. L. Minshall responded that the comment is related to the characterization of the wastewater treatment plant in the discussion regarding general water quality. The concern is that the data that was used to characterize the water quality is outdated and does not provide a current representation of the wastewater treatment plant.

Res. No. 15-10  Moved by:  D. Murray
Seconded by:  W. Wright-Cascaden carried unanimously

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee direct staff to make the recommended changes to the Catfish Creek Source Protection Area Assessment Report and Kettle Creek Source Protection Area Assessment Report in response to comments received during the consultation period on the Draft Assessment Reports.

g) SPC-02-10-07 Centre Wellington Vulnerability and Issues

G. Zwiers provided an overview of report SPC-10-02-07 Centre Wellington Vulnerability and Issues.

D. Parker asked if the new Middlebrook well is expected to be listed. G. Zwiers responded that the Middlebrook does not yet meet the definition of a planned well, and therefore cannot be included in this process. D. Parker noted that downtown Fergus has no gas stations, but they have boreholes for monitoring for contamination. D. Murray responded that there are known contamination concerns that continue to be monitored in Fergus.
D. Parker expressed concern with relying on lines on a map to determine which properties are or are not included in the source protection planning process.

J. Harrison asked why trichloroethylene is not being considered an issue. D. Murray advised that the Township of Centre Wellington does not perceive trichloroethylene to be an issue because of the decreasing trend. J. Harrison noted that he is not questioning the issue, but he is questioning the process.

**Res. No. 16-10**

*Moved by*: B. Ungar  
*Seconded by*: J. Laird  
*carried unanimously*

**THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee direct staff to incorporate components of the report: Township of Centre Wellington Draft Source Protection Vulnerability Assessment and Issues Evaluation (Golder, 2009) into the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Assessment Report.**

**h) SPC-02-10-08 Southgate Vulnerability and Issues**

G. Zwiers provided an overview of report SPC-10-02-08 Southgate Vulnerability and Issues.

W. Wright-Cascaden asked if there will be a consistent approach to addressing issues in the assessment report. L. Minshall responded that staff have not received all of the technical reports, but it is not expected that the approach will not be consistent. In the cases of Centre Wellington and Southgate, they have a plan of action that is shown to be working. W. Wright-Cascaden expressed concern that for some municipalities the issues will appear to be greater, because of the different approaches. She noted that it would be prudent to think strategically regarding how to best address this.

I. Macdonald wondered what the benefit would be in not including these issues. D. Murray advised that from Southgate’s perspective they feel strongly they have identified, studied, and sampled their issue, and they have a game plan that they would like to be given the opportunity to put in place and see if it solves the situation. In this municipality’s situation, they feel more comfortable trying to address the issue without including it in the source protection process. If this approach proves unsuccessful, they will then include it in the source protection process.

J. Harrison noted that different consultants are submitting the technical information for various municipalities in different formats and asked if it is expected that there will be an attempt to provide a consistent format in the assessment reports. L. Minshall replied affirmatively.

H. Cornwell asked how the well decommissioning in the two year time of travel will be funded. D. Murray responded that he can only speak to this particular case. The decommissioning of wells in Southgate has been completed. The municipality and the Ministry of the Environment’s Stewardship Program shared the cost. There was no cost to the landowners.
I. Macdonald identified that he is uncomfortable with municipalities being able to say they are not issues, noting that these are issues, they are simply managed issues. He drew the parallel that industries can be identified as threats, and do not have the option of being taken off the list if they are a managed threat. He noted that the Region of Waterloo has numerous issues, and they are identifying them. L. Minshall suggested that this is a topic of discussion for committee. The decision regarding including or excluding an issue has been left up to the municipality. If the committee feels strongly as a group there should be a more systematic approach and decides to veto the decision of the municipality that is within their purview.

A. Henry noted that managed issues should still be addressed as issues. As part of the risk assessment, the report could state that the risk is being addressed through the identified measures.

J. Piersol advised that the consultants requested guidance from the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry’s response was that issues is a grey area regarding deteriorating water quality and whether effective treatment is in place.

R. Krueger concurred that even managed issues should be identified as issues. If mitigation is in place, the threat can be considered low.

J. Harrison suggested that if the Ministry provided consultants with background material, it would be helpful if staff could provide a report with a brief discussion on the subject.

T. Schmidt expressed surprise that the Ministry of the Environment would provide this response to consultants, and agreed that an information report would be helpful.

Res. No. 17-10 Moved by: A. Henry
Seconded by: J. Harrison carried unanimously

THAT staff provide a report for the Source Protection Committee that describes the Ministry of the Environment’s guidance on identifying issues.

Res. No. 18-10 Moved by: H. Cornwell
Seconded by: D. Parker carried unanimously

THAT the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee direct staff to incorporate components of the two reports: Draft Report on Dundalk Municipal Wells – Groundwater Model and Capture Zone Development (Golder, 2009a) and Village of Dundalk, Draft Source Protection Vulnerability Assessment and Issues Evaluation (Golder, 2009b) into the Lake Erie Region Source Protection Assessment Report.

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, March 4, 2010, 1:00 pm
GRCA Administration Centre, 400 Clyde Road, Cambridge, ON

15. Adjourn

   Moved by: G. Rae
   Seconded by: D. Parker carried unanimously

The Lake Erie Region Source Protection Committee meeting of February 4, 2010 adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

_______________________________  _______________________________
Chair                                    Recording Secretary