

NIAGARA PENINSULA SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

WELLAND

March 08, 2011

7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

LIAISONS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: B. Wright, Coordinator Source Protection
D. Gullett, Recording Secretary
M. Stack, Director of Communications

OTHERS PRESENT: D. Barrow, Niagara Region

ROLL CALL

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

BUSINESS:

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m., welcomed everyone and requested that if anyone had a conflict of interest to declare it. The Chair mentioned with his permission, there was a proxy from Mr. Antonsen to Mr. Renshaw, therefore the votes are to be recorded votes. The following resolution was then presented.

SPCR-07-11

MOVED BY: M. Bellantino-Perco
SECONDED BY: T. Rigby
THAT: The agenda be accepted as presented.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

(1) MINUTES – FEBRUARY 8, 2011 SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

The Chair asked if there were any errors or omissions on the February 8, 2011 minutes. There being none, the following resolution was then presented.

SPCR-08-11

MOVED BY: D. Ostryhon
SECONDED BY: D. Ricker
THAT: The minutes of the Source Protection Committee meeting held February 8, 2011 be received and approved as presented.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

(2) BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Mr. Rigby apologized for not attending the previous meeting as he didn't receive the agenda package. Mr. Renshaw referred to Item 7, Background Reports Threat 6 & 7: Application, handling and storage of NASM. Table 7.1 Risk Management Plans – was left blank. Mr. Wright from MOE checked into this, and there is a tool available.

(3) GANTT CHART UPDATE

Mr. Wright asked to look at the Updated Assessment Report Schedule first, and noted we still haven't received the approval letter from MOE regarding the Transportation Corridor Threats. The IPZ-3 reports haven't been submitted by the consultants to date, and Ms. Bellantino-Perco questioned if these would be included in the UAR. The Chair responded these will have to go into the next round, post 2012. Mr. Ostryhon commented the committee will probably be scrutinized by the public about the spill in Port Colborne, and Ms. Bellantino-Perco recommended we insert a comment that it was the committee's intention to include this in the AR.

Mr. Wright mentioned there will be an Open House in Thorold hopefully by the end of March. There will be a short presentation, and a question and answer period.

The SPP schedule was revised a fair bit in April for the remaining background reports, as it generally takes two meetings to develop. The policy approaches should be completed by the end of May and that leaves June and July to start writing policies. The Chair mentioned we need to stay on top of things to complete these on time.

(4) UPDATED ASSESSMENT REPORT (UAR)

Mr. Wright went through some of the major changes made to the Assessment Report.

- Figure 5.5 shows all the revised IPZ's
- Figure 7.2 Revision 12 & 14 – As requested by the SPC, two options were provided. Staff recommends revision 12 which is option number one, mainly because it would be the most readily accepted by stakeholders and is easier to defend from of technical viewpoint.
- Mr. Ostryhon asked if there were any significant threats with option number two. The vulnerability score of this IPZ-2 would not likely be high enough to contain significant threats.

The following resolution was then presented.

SPCR-13-11

MOVED BY: T. Rigby

SECONDED BY: R. Bator

THAT: The Source Water Protection Committee endorses option #1 - Figure 7.2, Revision No.12 for the Updated Assessment Report.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

The following revised figures are no longer accurate based on this decision:

- Figure 2.21 – Revision 3
- Figure 7.2 – Revision 14
- Figure 7.7 – Revision 6 (with larger maximum vulnerable area)
- Figure 7.8 – Revision 6 (with larger IPZ-1)

Due to a landowner initiating improvements to a diversion ditch, the IPZ was reduced in Figure 7.3. The Sewage Pumping stations were removed as a threat, and a letter was sent to the MOE to confirm these may be removed.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any other questions or comments on changes made to the Assessment Report. Mr. Semple questioned the sediment criteria for Lake Gibson, and Mr. Wright explained the MOE approved the soil standards are based on human risk whereas the sediment criteria are based on ecological considerations. The human

health criteria were considered more appropriate.

Mr. Bator inquired about the source vulnerability scoring for Decew in the letter received from the Director. The following resolution was then presented.

SPCR-14-11

MOVED BY: C. Shrive
SECONDED BY: M. Bellantino-Perco
THAT: The Source Protection Committee move In-Camera to discuss previous In-Camera minutes.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

Back into open session.

The Chair mentioned there is insufficient data at this time for Lake Gibson, but it is being studied and to stay in compliance we must move forward. Mr. Rigby suggested we wait for confirmation testing is actually being done at the intake. The following resolution was then presented.

SPCR-15-11

MOVED BY: D. Renshaw
SECONDED BY: R. Bator
THAT: The Lake Gibson Alternate Supply Intake Source Vulnerability Factor in Table 7.6 be documented the committee has concerns and is to be brought forward at upcoming Assessment Report Amendments.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

There being no further discussion on the revisions to the Updated Assessment Report, the following resolution was presented.

SPCR-09-11

MOVED BY: D. Ricker
SECONDED BY: C. Shrive
THAT: This report no. SPC-03-11 concerning the draft Updated Assessment Report be adopted and accepted as amended by the Source Protection Committee.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

(5) SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Mr. Wright explained the process involved for developing the policies for the source protection plan. The working group will analyse the various policy options and recommend policy approaches to address each threat. A table format, as presented in the committee report will be used to outline how the SPPWG came up with the policy approach recommendations. These tables will be included as part of the explanatory notes in the SPP. The following resolution was presented:

SPCR-10-11

MOVED BY: T. Rigby

SECONDED BY: D. Ostryhon

THAT: This Report SPC-04-11 be received by the Source Protection Committee.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

(6) BACKGROUND REPORTS FOR THREATS 5, 12 & 13 AND 14

Three more background reports were prepared and the committee only had comments on Threats 12 & 13 (concerning application, handling and storage of salt). Mr. Renshaw commented design standards have been developed for storage sites and should be followed by contractors, municipalities etc. The Chair mentioned there are many references at the back of the report to show that these standards are adhered to. All the municipalities have a salt management plan except for Thorold. The following resolution was presented:

SPCR-11-11

MOVED BY: D. Semple

SECONDED BY: D. Ostryhon

THAT: This report SPC-05-11 and the attached Background Reports be received by the Source Protection Committee.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

(7) SPP WORKING GROUP (SPPWG) MINUTES

The Chair asked if there were any questions or comments on the SPPWG draft minutes. There being none, the following resolution was presented:

SPCR-12-11

MOVED BY: D. Ricker

SECONDED BY: T. Rigby

THAT: The draft minutes of the Source Protection Plan Working Group meeting held February 8, 2011 be received by the Source Protection Committee for information purposes.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
B. Antonsen	√		R. Bator	√		M. Bellantino-Perco	√	
D. Ostryhon	√		D. Renshaw	√		D. Ricker	√	
T. Rigby	√		D. Semple	√		C. Shrive	√	

“CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY”

(8) UPDATE FROM THE CHAIR

The Chair mentioned the working group and staff have been working very hard in completing background reports and preparing worksheets to make it easier for the policy selection process. The last two days, the Chair, Mr. B. Wright, Mr. J. Campbell, and Mr. W. Wright were in Toronto discussing the development of Source Protection Policies with other SP Areas. The Chair said our process is more robust, incorporating rationale as we go along. He reminded everyone our next committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 19, 2011.

(9) OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

There was no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:05 pm.

“D. Gullett, Recording Secretary

M. Neufeld, Chair”