

NIAGARA PENINSULA SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

NIAGARA PENINSULA

March 10, 2009

7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: M. Neufeld, (Chair)
R. Bator
M. Bellantino Perco
D. Ostryhon
D. Renshaw
T. Rigby
C. Shrive

MEMBERS ABSENT: B. Antonsen
D. Ricker
E. Schneider

LIAISONS PRESENT: B. Baty, Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority
M. McHugh, Ministry of the Environment
G. Hudgin, Niagara Public Health Representative

LIAISONS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: B. Wright, Coordinator Source Protection
T. D'Amario, C.A.O. - Secretary Treasurer
J. Kukalis, Director Water Management
M. Stack, Director, Communications
D. Ransom, Chair, NPCA
D. Gullett, Recording Secretary

ROLL CALL

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Brian Baty declined to take part in the discussion about the per diem rates.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

(1) BUSINESS:

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:13 p.m., thanked the members for attending and requested that if anyone had a conflict of interest to declare it.

The Chair welcomed Doug Ransom and Tony D'Amario and expressed the rationale behind the request for increasing the per diem rates. Mr. Ransom was there to answer any questions.

Robert Bator mentioned he had a discussion with Ian Smith from the MOE and there is funding for up to \$ 200.00 per diem that is available. Maria Bellantino Perco questioned the amount other SWP committees were receiving. David Renshaw commented he was under the impression each SWP committee member received the same amount. Tony D’Amario said that each SPC can be provided different per diems, and also commented the NPCA board members only receive one per diem for both NPCA and Source Protection Authority meetings.

(2) MINUTES – FEBRUARY 10, 2009 SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

The Chair asked if there were any errors or omissions on the February 10, 2009 minutes. There being none, the following resolution was then presented.

SPCR-14-09

MOVED BY: T. Rigby

SECONDED BY: D. Ostryhon

THAT: The minutes of the Source Protection Committee meeting held February 10, 2009 be received and approved as presented.

“CARRIED”

(3) BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Robert Bator submitted a list of comments regarding the Ambient Groundwater Quality Report to the Chair prior to the meeting date. These concerns will be dealt with at a later date, once the consultant and NPCA staff have had a chance to review and respond to his comments.

(4) UPDATE OF GANTT CHART AND WORK BY NIAGARA REGION

Brian Wright went over the tasks and schedules with the committee. The review of Rosehill IPZ-2 will be delayed until April. The IPZ-3 delineations for Rosehill and Grimsby may also be delayed until June. The Chair commented these aren’t a major concern, but we have to keep moving forward to stay on schedule. Niagara Region and Stantec have fifty percent of the threats and issues complete for the Type 2 intakes.

The modeling and reports still have to be completed for the IPZ-3 intakes. Brian Wright also said the Lake Ontario Collaborative is waiting for a letter from the MOE to proceed with their draft work plan and Martin Keller has asked Ian Smith for the letter.

(5) PORT COLBORNE WTP SURFACE WATER VULNERABILITY STUDY – REPORT NO. SPC-06-09

Committee members went through the peer review and made the following observations / comments:

- 2.6 David Renshaw asked if there was any indication when the city of Port Colborne will update their records. Brian Wright stated the estimated sewershed divides in question are mostly situated in residential areas, and that some delineation of the IPZ-2 used information provided by Port Colborne staff since some design documents were not available due to the age of construction. Figure 4 in the technical memoranda indicates a revision of the IPZ-2 of about 2 blocks to the west flowing toward the hospital, not the canal. Maria Bellantino Perco commented the mapping shows industrial addresses, not the outfalls. This is a concern which should be taken back to Stantec. Tim Rigby questioned where the residential clean up of metals in soil was situated and was told all but one property has been done. Heavy metals are left out as a threat, in the Assessment Report Technical Rules.
- 2.8 Robert Bator commented the ECOMSED flow pattern is incorrect on page 9 of Appendix 4.1 Brian Wright will check with Stantec and Dr. Alex McCorquodale and get back to the committee.
- 2.12 The numbering of items in the Peer Review should be corrected.
- 3.4 Robert Bator indicated that the depth of the intake is incorrect. Brian Wright suggested we get clarification from the consultant and Niagara Region as to the correct measurements, location & depth. Another factor Mr. Bator discussed was the turbidity. Mr. Bator did not believe turbidity should be considered as an issue, and provided a demonstration when it is drinkable. David Renshaw stated that turbidity should be considered as it is often an important indicator of poor water quality. Toxic contaminants are often associated with high turbidity. Removing turbidity is often an effective way of reducing contaminant concentrations in water. The turbidity is treated at the water treatment plants. The MOE is looking into guidance on how to address transportation corridors.

SPCR-15-09

MOVED BY: D. Renshaw

SECONDED BY: C. Shrive

THAT: The report “Regional Municipality of Niagara Source Protection Technical Study, Port Colborne Water Treatment Plant”, by Stantec Consulting Ltd. and dated August 2008 (concerning the intake surface water vulnerability) be accepted by the source protection committee; and

That the Peer Review Summary for this report subject to actions by NPCA be received as amended by the source protection committee and to be reviewed at a later date.

“CARRIED”

(6) DECEW WTP SURFACE WATER VULNERABILITY STUDY – REPORT NO. SPC-07-09

Committee members went through the peer review and made the following observations / comments:

- 2.1 Brian Wright pointed out the 3 intakes on the overhead map, and indicated they could be considered all type B. Robert Bator replied 250 cubic meters per second of water enters the generating plant from Lakes Gibson and Moody. Mr. Bator recommended the Decew intake be classified a type B connecting channel based on the volume of water flowing through Lake Gibson. David Renshaw didn't think the reservoirs should be classified as type B. He requested clarification of what constitutes an inland lake versus connecting channel intake. MOE indicated this is a grey area and you could consider either Type B or D. A diversion ditch passes along the south side of the reservoirs to prevent surface runoff from entering the reservoirs. Dean Ostryhon asked about sedimentation – the reservoirs are cleaned out periodically. MOE recognized Decew as a very unique intake. Brian Wright recommended reclassifying all three Decew intakes as Type B. (Connecting Channel)

The following resolution was then presented:

SPCR-18-09

MOVED BY: R. Bator

SECONDED BY: D. Renshaw

THAT: Recommend reclassifying all three intakes as Type B Connecting Channel intakes be accepted by the source protection committee.

“CARRIED”

- 2.6 Upland component for IPZ-2 needs to be confirmed.
Peer review items require renumbering correctly.

Maria Bellantino Perco questioned how the reports are to be finalized all in one addendum. MOE suggests we submit the AR report with only a reference to these technical consultant's reports.

SPCR-16-09

MOVED BY: T. Rigby

SECONDED BY: D. Renshaw

THAT: The report “Regional Municipality of Niagara Source Protection Technical Study, Decew Water Treatment Plant”, by Stantec Consulting Ltd. and dated August 2008 (concerning the intake surface water vulnerability) be accepted by the source protection committee; and That the Peer Review Summary for this report subject to actions by NPCA be accepted as amended by the source protection committee.

“CARRIED”

(7) UPDATE FROM THE CHAIR

The Chair discussed the letter he submitted to the SPA Board in regards to per diems for the March meeting.

(8) OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair asked about the distribution of reports to municipalities. The committee will discuss this at the next meeting as the regional representatives weren't available at this time. Brian Wright presented the responses from the Niagara Region and Ministry of the Environment.

With regards to questions raised on the peer review summary for the Welland report, Niagara Region had the following comments:

Q – Does Niagara Region have a communication protocol with the St. Lawrence Seaway regarding notification of maintenance impacting the Old Canal levels?

A – Yes, the Waste & Wastewater Division's Associate Director, Operations receives a memorandum every season stating when and how low the canal levels will be fluctuated.

Q – Do the operators know what to do in the event of a reverse flow at the siphon ports (at the Welland WTP)?

A – Yes. The levels in the river and the canal are monitored daily by the Operator; if they reach a certain threshold the gate is closed. In the unlikely event reverse flow were to occur through the siphon ports, the raw water turbidity may increase. Fluctuating turbidity levels are part of normal operations at all of our water treatment plants and all operators know how to respond to this situation (i.e. coagulant dosage modifications if necessary). Turbidity is continuously monitored and alarmed as part of the plant's SCADA system. An SOP documenting this situation is under development.

Martin Keller from MOE had e-mailed the following comments in response to questions at the last SPC meeting:

Item 2.1 – Classification of Intakes: the Technical Rules as set out do allow the Welland Intake located in the Old Welland Canal to be classified as a type D intake. As indicated, this has implications on the delineation of IPZ-1, the vulnerability scoring, as well as the type of threats assessment that is available in IPZ-3 (vulnerability scoring approach versus modeling approach).

Item 2.3 – Modification of IPZ-1 for type B intakes. Mr. Keller indicated that modifications are allowed for both expansions and reductions of IPZ-1 (Rule 60). A downstream limit of 175m is therefore a possibility provided adequate hydrodynamic information is provided to support this decision.

Item 3.3 – Peer review comments note that “no IPZ-3 is required,” in the Welland WTP peer review but it should read “no IPZ-3 vulnerability scoring is required” based on the Welland intake being classified as a Type B intake.

General comment: Final Technical Rules (December 12, 2008) supersede any guidance documents previously posted and must be referenced as they define the requirements for the assessment report. Whether earlier guidance is still relevant should be checked with MOE.

ADJOURNMENT

There was no further business, the following resolution was presented.

SPCR-17-09

MOVED BY: T. Rigby

SECONDED BY: D. Ostryhon

THAT: This meeting does now adjourn.

Received at 9:20 p.m. "CARRIED"

"D. Gullett, Recording Secretary

M. Neufeld, Chair"