



**Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee
35th Meeting
March 10, 2011**

Held: Tom Davies Square, Room C-11

Commenced at: 9:10 a.m.

Adjourned at: 11:25 p.m.

Present: Nels Conroy, Chair
Paul Baskcomb
Nick Benkovich
Luc Bock
Richard Bois
Greg Haddad
Stephen Monet
Cheryl Recollet
Wendy Wisniewski

Also Present: Neil Gervais, Ministry of the Environment Liaison
Burgess Hawkins, Sudbury & District Health Unit Liaison
Kris Longston, City of Greater Sudbury Planning Department
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
Brianna Carter, Drinking Water Source Protection
Paul Sajatovic, Nickel District Conservation Authority

Communications: Vivian Naponse
Lilly Noble
Tim Worton
Mark Rondina, Sudbury & District Health Unit Liaison Alternate

1. Chair Conroy Opened the Meeting

Chair Conroy opened the meeting by welcoming the committee. He thanked them for agreeing to the early start and change of date.

Nels provided the committee with a brief overview of the meetings himself, Judy and Melanie attended in Toronto earlier in the week. He said there was a lot of discussion with the MOE and other committees regarding the planning process. One of the sessions held dealt with significant threats and solidified some draft policy that can be shared with committees.

2. No Declarations of Conflict were declared.

3. Adoption of Agenda

Resolution 2011-06

Bois – Baskcomb

That the agenda for the March 10, 2011, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee meeting be adopted.

Carried.

4. Adoption of Minutes of Previous Meetings

Resolution 2011-07

Benkovich – Baskcomb

That the minutes for the February 8, 2011, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Committee meeting, as duplicated and circulated, be approved.

Carried.

5. Communications Update

Brianne presented the committee with a brief review of communications activities that have occurred since the last committee meeting. On February 25, a number of notifications were mailed out. These included:

- notifications to some landowners with previously notified threats to inform them that they are no longer considered threats,
- planning notices to 39 landowners with previously notified threats,
- planning notices for four landowners with previously notified threats who have had new threats identified on their properties, and
- planning notices for municipalities with land inside the watershed.

The planning notification and notification of new threats for the City of Greater Sudbury was sent to the City Clerk and CAO on March 2, and a news release

announcing that the planning process has begun was issued to local media and committee members on March 2.

Brianne informed the committee that the next items on the communications plan to be undertaken are the planning notifications for First Nations, which will be sent in the next couple of weeks, the letters for new threats identified in the amended Assessment Report, including landowners in the Ramsey Lake watershed, the presentation to City Council on March 30 and an update at the NDCA/Source Protection Authority board meeting on March 31.

Before the notifications can be mailed for new threats, the dates and locations of the public meetings had to be discussed. A draft of the meeting invitation to be included in the mailout was distributed to committee members. Staff recommended holding informal, open house type meetings to enable the general public to walk in, gather information and ask questions of staff members and consultants who are present. A meeting room at Tom Davies Square has been booked for May 3 and 5, and it was recommended to have meetings on both of these dates, beginning at 1 p.m. and running until 8 p.m.

Greg inquired as to the cost of having consultants on hand for the meetings, and asked if it would exceed the budget set aside for the consultations. Judy said that it was useful having consultants on hand at the last public meetings, as they could answer detailed technical questions and, if necessary, those funds could come from the technical studies budget.

As a number of significant threats are located in the Valley, it was also suggested that there be a third session held to accommodate those individuals and promote the Stewardship program. Brianne will check to see if the hall at the Howard Armstrong Centre is available on May 4. Once the dates and locations for the public meetings are finalized, she will provide this information to committee members through email.

6. Early Response Program

Jessica provided the committee with an update on the Early Response program. She gave an overview of the program, and reminded committee members that the program is aimed at addressing significant threats identified in the Assessment Report as prioritized by the committee. Projects completed under this program are totally voluntary at this point in time and cannot be funded if a property owner has been ordered to do a project by a regulator.

The significant threats eligible for funding that the committee had prioritized at a previous meeting were septic systems, livestock grazing, a waste disposal site and the handling and storage of fuel. Staff suggested adding the storage of agricultural source material to this list of prioritized threats, as this would allow the building of manure storage structures. It was also pointed out that with the inclusion of phosphorus as a

threat in the Ramsey Lake watershed, the number of septic threats has increased to 203.

Some examples of projects completed during the past funding year were outlined to the committee, including septic pumping and inspections, and the completion of two Nutrient Management Plans. A question was asked regarding septic inspections and who is responsible for completing them. This is done by the company pumping the system, and staff have a list of licensed companies who can provide this service. It was asked whether there is a recommended rotation schedule in place for the pumping and inspection of septic systems. Staff replied that it is expected to occur every five years, however, based on NDCA's current data collected through the stewardship program, it generally appears to occur every two years for most of the residents in the Valley. The committee was reminded that the program will only fund one septic pumping and inspection per property, and in cases where a problem is found during inspection, funds will not be paid out for the inspection unless the problem is fixed.

Nels then asked committee members if they were prepared to make a motion to add the storage of agricultural source material to the list of prioritized threats, or if the committee felt more discussion was required.

Resolution 2011-08

Bois – Baskcomb

That the Greater Sudbury Source Protection Area's Early Response Program Agreement be updated to include the storage of agricultural source material to the prioritized threats listed in Table B1.1 of the Agreement as discussed during the March 10, 2011, Early Response Program Update.

Carried.

Discussion then turned to the formation of an Early Response application review committee. For the Early Actions program, funding decisions had been made by staff; however, for Early Response, every SPC is mandated to form this committee. This committee would be responsible for agreeing on a terms of reference for the roles, responsibilities and governing of the committee, reviewing funding applications as they are received, sending letters to applicants to notify them whether or not their application has been approved and to participate in occasional site visits. The meetings for this committee would be scheduled only when a reasonable number of applications have been received, in conjunction with regularly scheduled SPC meetings. Short meetings of 20-30 minutes could be held before or after the SPC meetings.

As SPC Chair, Nels volunteered to sit on the committee. Burgess indicated that a SDHU representative would be made available to participate. Luc and Richard also volunteered to sit on the sub-committee. A motion was made to accept the committee composition.

That the membership of the Early Response Application Review Committee be accepted as discussed at the March 10, 2011, SPC Meeting.

Carried.

Jessica then provided the committee with information regarding the proposed program delivery model. A bilingual information package will be mailed the last week of May to property owners with specific threats as agreed to by the committee. This will include a letter, application guides and forms, an information flyer, which is being designed in-house, and a map of the corresponding vulnerable area. Once approved projects are completed, landowners will submit invoices to the Conservation Authority, which will issue cheques and thank-you letters to the landowners.

Nels thanked Jessica for her work on the program and for conveying the message to the committee.

7. Planning Working Group Update – Storage of Snow

Melanie provided the committee with an overview of the planning working group meeting that was held on February 16 to discuss storage of snow as both a significant and “would be” threat. The primary consideration for this threat is to ensure contaminated runoff does not enter groundwater and surface water.

Only one instance of this significant threat has been identified through preparation of the Assessment Report, and the site doesn’t appear to be used for snow storage every year. Staff members visited the site in question recently and the property was not being used for snow storage. There is no applicable provincial or federal legislation regulating the storage of snow.

The City of Greater Sudbury has 12 designated snow storage sites, some of which fall in highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas. Local policies allow snow storage for commercial operators on land zoned as heavy industrial and zoning by-law currently prohibits the establishment of snow storage disposal facilities within WHPA A and B. The City of Greater Sudbury Salt Management Plan addresses snow removal and storage, removing snow if it poses a safety risk and transporting it to designated snow dumps, which are located away from potentially vulnerable areas.

For the existing threat, Melanie recommended that if a Prescribed Instrument would work, it would be the best policy for the committee to go with. This would be discussed with the Ministry of Natural Resources, and the threat would be prohibited or managed through the Prescribed Instrument, in this case, the Aggregate Resources

Act. Additional research is required to determine if the Aggregate Resources permit can be used to resolve the issue.

For “would-be” threats, the working group ideas included extending the zoning by-law to prohibit future snow storage areas in Wellhead Protection Areas and Intake Protection Zones, along with education and outreach initiatives, such as workshops and training sessions to raise awareness of snow storage best management practices.

Melanie provided committee members with an updated version of the salt policies discussed at the last committee meeting and said that she had incorporated a number of their comments into the draft. She reminded committee members that policies will be kept in draft format for now and all policies will be reviewed together as a package once they have all been drafted.

The committee was informed that the next working group meeting will be held on March 23 to discuss septics and that everyone is welcome to attend.

Nels thanked Melanie for the good work and said that the working group is a good forum to discuss policy development.

8. Correspondence/Program Updates

A meeting was held with a landowner with property located near two municipal wells on February 17 to address their concerns regarding the delineation of wellhead protection areas. Jessica, Nels and Paul Baskcomb and two consultants, Rich Schmidt and Stephen Kaufman were present at this meeting. Nels felt the meeting was valuable in terms of clarifying some misconceptions regarding how properties are included/excluded from wellhead protection areas and said the consultants who were present provided a good introduction to hydrogeology. He clarified that staff are not committing to doing this for each landowner, the option to provide the information in a group session or at the updated Assessment Report meetings is an option. Overall, those who attended the meeting felt the landowner was appreciative of the clarification regarding the planning process.

The update process for the Assessment Report is on schedule. The final report is expected from the consultants on March 11. Once this is received, everything will be in-house to update the text. The updated Assessment Report will be posted online April 18.

Judy reminded committee members that the next planning working group meeting would be held on March 23 at 9:30 a.m. to discuss septics. All committee members are invited to attend the planning working group meetings; Melanie will forward the meeting information and agenda to the committee.

Judy and Nels attended a Source Protection Plan meeting in Toronto on March 7 and 8. This provided a useful opportunity to speak with others who are developing Source Protection Plans. At present, no one has set a format for completing the plans. Staff, after consideration for our circumstances, will begin writing the plan by drinking water system and assess whether or not this meets our needs. Neil informed the committee that MOE has developed a database of the required fields for each policy that will help to ensure that the policies are complete. He also said that Ministry staff are trying to review everything they can to assist in plan development and provide any information required by staff.

10. New Business

Paul Sajatovic was asked if there was any update on the Xeneca development. He said the Authority would be receiving a report on March 31 and that there had been no environmental report or general public consultation on the project yet. He also pointed out that the NDCA is only one of many regulatory agencies who would provide input on the project.

Stephen updated the committee on the plan to implement a City-led lake friendly phosphorus-free product campaign. He recently met with management at five local retailers regarding this proposal and said they are all on board with the idea. He pointed out that many retailers are already moving to phosphorus-free products and will be easy to work with on this initiative.

Judy asked Wendy if she had any information from Vale regarding the Xeneca development. Wendy said she had no information, that Vale staff had recently made a presentation to the Vermilion Stewardship group regarding hydroelectric generation at the intake and she has heard that information is coming from Xeneca.

Nels asked if the Ramsey watershed mailout would include letters to institutions regarding parking lots. He was informed that every landowner in the watershed, including institutions would be receiving a letter. It was asked if it would be beneficial to hold a workshop for those who de-ice parking lots as it is possible for some misinformation to get out after the mailout. Staff took the suggestion under advisement including the possibility of holding a focus group to discuss best management practices and possibly posting these on the website.

12. Adjournment

Resolution 2011-10

Monet – Bois

That we do now adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Carried.

13. List of Handouts Provided at Meeting

- Storage of snow policy handout
- Updated road salt policy handout
- Draft public meeting invitation
- Early Response Program presentation

14. Flash Drive Updates

- None provided

Next meeting: Tuesday, April 12, 2011, 1:00 p.m. - 4:00p.m., Room C-11, Tom Davies Square