



**Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee
36th Meeting
April 12, 2011**

Held: Tom Davies Square, Room C-11

Commenced at: 1:00 p.m.

Adjourned at: 3:55 p.m.

Present: Nels Conroy, Chair
Paul Baskcomb
Nick Benkovich
Luc Bock
Richard Bois
Stephen Monet
Lilly Noble
Cheryl Recollet
Wendy Wisniewski
Tim Worton

Also Present: Neil Gervais, Ministry of the Environment Liaison
Richard Auld, Sudbury & District Health Unit Liaison
Burgess Hawkins, Sudbury & District Health Unit Liaison
Mark Rondina, Sudbury & District Health Unit Liaison Alternate
Bob Rogers, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Authority Liaison
Judy Sewell, Drinking Water Source Protection
Melanie Venne, Drinking Water Source Protection
Jessica Brunelle, Drinking Water Source Protection
Katherine Mackenzie, Drinking Water Source Protection
Paul Sajatovic, Nickel District Conservation Authority

Communications: Greg Haddad
Vivian Naponse

1. Chair Conroy Opened the Meeting

Chair Conroy opened the meeting by welcoming the committee and welcoming Richard Auld, liaison for the Health Unit, back to the committee after returning from retirement. He then asked Judy to introduce the committee members to Katherine MacKenzie, who has recently joined staff with the Drinking Water Source Protection

Program as a planning and policy officer who will be covering Melanie's maternity leave.

Nels provided the committee with a brief overview of the presentations that he and Judy gave to city council and to the Greater Sudbury Source Protection Authority regarding the progress of the Drinking Water Source Protection Program and the updates regarding Ramsey Lake. He said he was very pleased with how well council members responded and how they indicated their appreciation towards staff members and the SPC. They also showed that they understood the importance of the program and extended their concern to other lakes within the Source Protection Area. Some concern was expressed about completing all of the source protection policies within one year. Nels and Judy indicated that they would bring a report to the next SPC meeting to show staff is preparing to meet the regulated schedule.

2. No Declarations of Conflict were declared.

3. Adoption of Agenda

Resolution 2011-11

Bois – Bock

That the agenda for the April 12, 2011, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee meeting be adopted as circulated.

Carried.

4. Adoption of Minutes of Previous Meetings

Resolution 2011-12

Wisniewski – Benkovich

That the minutes for the March 10, 2011, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee meeting, as duplicated and circulated, be approved.

Carried.

5. Business Arising From the Minutes

Nels indicated that a short meeting of the Early Response Program Application Review Committee (ARC) took place just before the Source Protection Committee meeting. Following the formation of the ARC at the last SPC meeting, an Early Response mail-out package was created and a Terms of Reference was drafted and approved. The Early Response program is set to begin the first week in May. Nels advised committee members that this will likely be a common subject of discussion during the Assessment Report public meetings that are occurring the same week.

6. Communication from Visitors

Judy informed the committee that a gentleman had emailed the Drinking Water Source Protection Program about concerns regarding a new Development on Howey Drive. Since this topic was on the agenda, Judy invited the individual to attend the meeting. He contacted staff before the meeting advising that he would be unable to attend. He was advised that he would have access to the minutes on the Source Protection website.

7. Assessment Report Update/Communications Update

Judy presented the committee with a review of communications activities that have occurred since the last committee meeting and also gave an overview of the major changes found in the Amended Assessment Report.

Judy began by notifying the committee that the Amended AR is due to the MOE on May 31, 2011. Among the most significant changes to the report is the identification of blue-green algae and sodium as issues in Ramsey Lake which will affect over 4,500 properties. As phosphorus levels are linked to blue-green algae, activities that contribute to phosphorus are considered as significant threats under the *Clean Water Act*. Other significant changes include: the addition of transportation corridors as a local threat, refined delineation of intake protection zone-2 for the Vermilion and Wanapitei systems, the addition of two new municipal wells in the Valley, an addition of 10 more significant threats, and the enumeration of low and moderate threats. Judy then broke down the list of 77 significant threats with committee members.

Due to the noteworthy change in threats relating to Ramsey Lake, notification to over 4,500 affected residents was to be sent by mail on April 13, 2011. This information mail-out contained: a brochure about source protection, a notice of planning, notification that the use of road salt, fertilizer and septic systems (approximately 197 in the watershed) would pose a threat to drinking water, and an invitation to the public meetings in May. At the same time, notification of the public meetings was sent to both First Nations.

Judy also informed the committee of other mail-outs, presentations and notifications that have recently taken place. As Nels had mentioned, a presentation to council was made on March 30, as well as a presentation to the Source Protection Authority on March 31. Letters were sent to both local MPP's and to the MOE main office to inform them of the current phase of the program. A copy of the Ramsey mail-out was also provided to municipal councillors.

Public meetings will take place during the first week of May. They will be informal, open house type meetings to enable the general public to walk in, gather information and ask questions of staff members and SPC members. The public review schedule is as follows:

- April 18 - AR to be made public
- May 3, 4, 5 - public meetings
- May 17 - comments due
- May 17 to May 31 - incorporate comments as appropriate, and
- May 31 - submit to MOE.

Judy also mentioned the “notification of planning” letters which were sent out at the end of February to the municipality and to property owners with previously identified threats.

Nels indicated that SPC members will have the opportunity to come and meet with staff members the day before the first of the public meetings in order to view the information panels ahead of time and ask any questions.

Judy encouraged SPC members to come out to as many of the public meetings as they could to both represent their sector and assist in answering questions from the public. Paul Baskcomb indicated that peak times at these types of meetings are usually as soon as they commence.

8. Howey Drive/Kingsway Development

Staff members have received several comments concerning two planned developments in recent weeks. Lilly had particular concern about the proposed industrial subdivision planned off the Kingsway due to its proximity to the Significant Groundwater Recharge Area for Ramsey Lake. Judy provided an aerial photo and description of the area to the SPC which identified the proposed lot boundaries and roads within the complex. During the City review of the proposed development, City staff had identified the wetland to the northwest of the property where the SGRA is located as a sensitive area and stipulated that no lots be developed in that section of the parcel. Paul Baskcomb updated the committee on this particular project and the applicable zoning by-laws and restrictions that will affect it. Richard voiced concern relating to an incident at the Walden Industrial Park in the past and inquired about what types of activities would be occurring at this site. One committee member indicated that engineering standards for stormwater retention ponds around these sites are often not very high and indicated that policy could be put in place to raise these standards. Paul Sajatovic asked if the Kingsway development would be applicable to site plan control and if they would need to be fully serviced. Paul Baskcomb answered by indicating that this would indeed be the case and that sewer service will also be required in any vulnerable area in order to allow development. Nels then explained that these two developments will act as examples to compare the

differences between the developments in existence and those that come in the future after policy is drafted. Nels went on to say that if the SPC does a good job, then policy written now should protect vulnerable areas against new stormwater threats .

9. Septic System Presentation – Richard Auld

Richard Auld gave the committee a presentation on basic septic system knowledge. In the Nickel District Conservation Area, the Sudbury & District Health Unit is the Principal Authority, although this varies throughout the province and can also be the Municipality or the local Conservation Authority. The SDHU currently inspects new systems and responds to complaints.

The building code indicates that only three types of beds can be used to receive effluent; these include: field/leaching beds, filter beds and the less common shallow buried trenches. Richard also went on to explain that effluent filters are now mandatory on new systems. Older systems cannot be retrofitted with this attachment. They should be cleaned once a year by the landowner.

Inspections of new systems consist of the following: an initial inspection of the property prior to construction; a substantial inspection carried out prior to backfilling and a final completion inspection after backfilling. At this time they also check any grading and seeding/sod that must be added to the bed. Richard went on to explain the difference between various types of systems to the committee.

Richard Bois asked who the principal authority would be for Federal Lands, (i.e. Whitefish Lake First Nation). Richard Auld explained that Health Canada currently regulates this and has a precise set of guidelines to follow. There are no guidelines yet for the mandatory inspections that the Health Unit will have to do.

Nels thanked Richard for the informative presentation.

10. Planning Working Group Update – Septic Systems

Melanie provided the committee with an overview of the planning working group meeting that was held on March 23 to discuss septic systems as both a significant and “would be” threat. The primary consideration for this threat is to prevent unacceptable impact on the water resources from chemical and pathogen contaminants in septic effluent.

There are currently 231 instances of this significant threat that have been identified through preparation of the Assessment Report, with the majority being in the Ramsey Lake watershed due to the addition of blue-green algae being identified as an issue. Staff members estimated the number of septic systems using GIS data mapping. A septic system would also be a significant threat if it were established in the Ramsey Lake IPZ 1, 2 or 3, the Vermilion River IPZ-1, the Wanapitei River IPZ-1 and in any

WHPA-A or B with a score of 10. Melanie then showed the committee maps of the corresponding areas where the threats can currently be found, in both the Ramsey watershed and the Valley area.

The mandatory reinspection program under the Ontario Building Code is applicable to systems that have been identified in an approved Assessment Report and will be prioritized for inspection based on which systems pose the greatest risk. The program will require that these systems are inspected every five years by the Health Unit or other principal authority if designated, and that the maintenance inspections follow a progressive audit approach. Principal authorities may choose to accept third-party certifications of inspection if done by qualified persons. These inspections will be done in two steps; phase 1 will be a non-intrusive visual test, while phase 2 will be required if problems are detected and will include a more detailed inspection of the entire system.

Currently there are two local policies already in place, they include a minimum lot size requirement and a zoning by-law which prohibits new, larger capacity septic systems and “above or below ground storage tanks” in wellhead protection areas A and B. For the existing threats, Melanie indicated that the Ontario Building Code would be the main option, while creating new by-laws and education and outreach programs could also be used.

For “would-be” threats, the working group ideas included using the zoning by-law to prohibit septic systems in Wellhead Protection Areas and Intake Protection Zones, along with the Ontario Building Code re-inspection program.

Melanie provided committee members with a copy of the septic system draft policies discussed at the last working group meeting. She also distributed a copy of the updated snow storage policies as discussed at the March committee meeting.

The committee was informed that the next working group meeting will be held on April 28 to discuss pesticides and that everyone is welcome to attend.

Nels indicated that septic systems are going to be a tough issue to work through and perhaps will need to be re-visited as more information becomes available about the new re-inspection program. He suggested that it be brought back to the planning working group for further analysis.

Nels thanked Melanie for the policy updates and the SPC for the informative discussion. He said that the working group is a good forum to discuss policy development and encouraged committee members to attend.

11. Correspondence/Program Updates

Judy updated the SPC on calls that have been received recently. One call came from the Vermilion Stewardship Group regarding metal concentrations in the river. There were also inquiries about the Xeneca projects on the Vermilion River. Staff members provided as much information as they could to the caller. A phone call was also received regarding oil deposits being found in the Fairbanks area from drilling associated with mining exploration. NDCA staff suggested to the concerned citizens that they contact the MOE. There have also been a handful of calls from landowners seeking funding to repair faulty septic systems; but these landowners are not near municipal water sources so they are not eligible for stewardship funding. Nels commented on the fact that most of the calls received so far have come from people who have their own water sources and who are not near municipal water sources, so they are not part of the current drinking water source protection program.

12. New Business

Neil indicated that new planning bulletins and Liaison newsletters have been distributed and asked that they be filed accordingly.

Paul Sajatovic inquired about policy planning timelines and requested that an information piece be drafted and presented to the SPC in May to help show how work will unfold over the next year in order to meet regulated timelines.

Stephen Monet outlined fertilizer and phosphorus issues within the city. He indicated that an article had recently been published in the Northern Life regarding this issue. He also explained that phosphorus in fertilizers is practically unheard of already unless they are the type purchased to help start the growth of a lawn, in which case the phosphorus is completely utilized by the plant. Stephen indicated he is working very closely with major retailers to address the phosphorus issue. Since the banning of herbicides in recent years, sales for these types of products have diminished greatly. In the end, what he has discovered is that the move towards phosphorus free products is industry-wide.

13. Adjournment

Resolution 2011-13

Bois

That we do now adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Carried.

14. List of Handouts Provided at Meeting

- Source protection program update presentation
- Septic system draft policy options handout
- Updated snow storage policy options handout

15. Flash Drive Updates

- None provided

Next meeting: Tuesday, May 10, 2011, 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m., Room C-11, Tom Davies Square