

Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee
49th Meeting
October 9, 2012

Held: Room C-11, Tom Davies Square

Commenced at: 1:00 p.m.

Adjourned at: 3:35 p.m.

Present: Nels Conroy, Chair
Nick Benkovich
Greg Haddad
Stephen Monet
Lilly Noble
Wendy Wisniewski
Tim Worton

Also Present: Marc Rondina, Sudbury & District Health Unit
Richard Auld, Sudbury & District Health Unit
Neil Gervais, Ministry of the Environment Liaison
Lin Gibson, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Authority Liaison
Judy Sewell, Drinking Water Source Protection
Jessica Brunelle, Drinking Water Source Protection
Paul Sajatovic, Nickel District Conservation Authority
Melanie Venne, Drinking Water Source Protection

Communications: Paul Baskcomb
Luc Bock
Richard Bois
Cheryl Recollet
Heather Sawdon

1. Chair Conroy Opened the Meeting

Chair Conroy welcomed back the Committee after a summer break. Over the summer there were a number of staffing changes. At the MOE, the chief drinking water inspector retired and a new acting drinking water inspector is currently in place. The Source Protection Programs Branch also has a new director.

Nick Benkovich spoke to updates regarding the risk management office. In late June, the City of Greater Sudbury decided to retain the Risk Management office and have since begun

training. The NDCA has been working closely with the City in this regard to prepare for implementation upon plan approval.

Bob Rogers retired as chair of the Nickel District Conservation Authority board. Lin Gibson is the new chairperson and will be attending the SPC meetings. Lin introduced herself to the committee and thanked them for their hard work over the past four years.

2. Declarations of Conflict of Interest

No declarations of conflict were declared.

3. Adoption of Agenda

Resolution 2012 – 14

Noble - Wisniewski

That the agenda for October 9, 2012, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee meeting be adopted as circulated.

Carried.

4. Adoption of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Resolution 2012 – 15

Noble - Haddad

That the minutes for the June 12, 2012, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee meeting, as duplicated and circulated, be approved.

Carried.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

Nels quickly reviewed the minutes from the June meeting. There was no new business arising from the minutes.

6. Submission of Proposed SPP and Comments Received during 30 day Review Period

Judy discussed the submission package for the Source Protection Plan that was sent to the MOE for August 20, 2012. The package was submitted both in hardcopy and electronically on a memory stick. Some of the more important pieces were handed out in a package to the SPC; including the cover letter, submission letter from the SPC to the SPA, summaries of written public comments received on the draft and proposed plan, and an analysis of outstanding stakeholder concerns.

During the consultation period for the Proposed Source Protection Plan over 20 letters were received. The top two concerns from the public were the protection of Ramsey Lake and the proposed chromite smelter in Capreol.

Many of the Ramsey Lake topics had been thoroughly discussed by the SPC during assessment report and plan development. The chromite smelter is a newly identified concern because the announcement to locate it in Sudbury was made after the consultation period for the draft SPP was over. This proposed facility will be subject to the same type of review as any other proposed facility. In this case, the proposed location is within the Vermilion River IPZ-3 with a vulnerability score of 1 and therefore a significant threat cannot occur in this area.

All the letters received during this second consultation period were sent to the MOE with the submission package. No substantive changes could be made to the Source Protection Plan during this consultation period.

7. Update on Tier 3 Water Budget – Steve Kaufmann, Golder Associates

Steve Kaufmann, a hydrologist from Golder Associates gave a presentation on the water budget process and results for the Greater Sudbury Source Protection Area. The water budget looked at every municipal supply and examined how much water was being used and how much was available.

Steve explained the progression from conceptual water budget through to the tier 1, 2 and 3 water budget analyses. Both the Ramsey Lake and Valley well system required tier 2 and tier 3 analyses because they were deemed to have water quantity stresses.

The Valley groundwater system had significant risk for water quantity and was the focus of the presentation and discussion. The Committee had many questions for Steve about the methodology, results and long-term implications.

Judy concluded the presentation by discussing next steps. Before policies can be written, a threats ranking process and a risk management measures evaluation process will need to be done for the Valley groundwater system; these processes may require more modeling.

Nels thanked Steve for the very informative presentation. It is very helpful as we move towards water quantity policies to have a better understanding of the water budget process.

8. Water Quantity Threats – Initial Policy Discussion

Melanie Venne gave an introductory presentation on policy options for the water quantity threat. There are two prescribed threats for water quantity; however in our Source Protection Area only one is considered significant in the Valley groundwater system:

- An activity that takes water from an aquifer without returning the water taken to the same aquifer.

A map was distributed that showed the WHPA Q1 (“Q” refers to “quantity”) and the Valley distribution system. Staff are still in discussions with the MOE to verify areas to which the

policies will apply.

Three other source protection areas or regions have created water quantity policies for their source protection plans and the policy options that were discussed were taken from existing policies and modified for our local situation.

Policy options mentioned included education and outreach, financial incentives, prescribed instruments (permits to take water), infrastructure improvements, a water conservation plan, and land-use planning approaches.

Melanie closed off the presentation by discussing the next steps for staff and the SPC.

Neil noted that the MOE is in the process of reviewing the proposed Greater Sudbury Source Protection plan and that updating the assessment report and source protection plan for tier 3 content will not slow down the review and approval process of the SPP that was submitted on August 17, 2012.

9. Program Updates

i) Septic Re-inspection Program

Mark Rondina and Richard Auld of the Sudbury & District Health Unit provided an update on the mandatory septic re-inspection program. The program was launched in June 2012 and 63 inspections have been completed. Inspections were prioritized based on proximity to drinking water sources and a review of older files. The program has been going well and is currently winding down for the season.

ii) On-going tasks

Judy spoke about on-going tasks. Staff are currently updating the Assessment Report to include the Tier 3 water budget information. There are also on-going considerations as we move towards implementation, including information management, capacity and annual reporting.

There may not be monthly SPC meetings until we receive guidance on policy development for the water quantity threats or if decisions are needed during the review of the August 17th proposed source protection plan. Nels will keep the Committee updated.

10. New Business

No new business was raised.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

12. List of Handouts Provided at Meeting

- SPP Submission Package, selected components
- Slide deck: Water Budget Presentation by Steve Kaufmann, Golder Associates
- Slide deck: Water Quantity Policy Development Presentation
- Map of Wellhead Protection Area Q1 and Valley Groundwater Distribution System

Next meeting: To be determined