

**MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE NORTH BAY – MATTAWA
SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE
6:30 PM THURSDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2009
HELD AT THE VILLAGE OF SOUTH RIVER MUNICIPAL OFFICE**

1. ADMINISTRATION

- Meeting called to order at 6:30 PM, by Sue Miller
- Encourages members of the public to sign in so that they may receive notice and provide comment in future phases, especially for the Assessment Report

Source Protection Committee	NBMCA Staff and Other	Regrets
Barb Groves, Chair	Sue Miller, Project Manager	Lucy Emmott (SPC)
Dennis MacDonald	Scott Higgins, GIS Specialist	Ian Kilgour (SPC)
John MacLachlan	Sue Buckle, Communications Advisor	Kathy Parker (SPC)
George Onley	Rob Pringle, Source Protection Planner	Francis Gallo (NBMCA)
Maurice Schlosser	Neil Gervais (MOE)	Peter Jekel (NBPSDHU)
George Stivrins	Tammy Karst-Riddoch (Aecom)	
Roy Warriner	15 members of the public	

2. INTRODUCTION

Sue Miller, Manager Source Water Protection at NBMCA, introduces Conservation staff and Barb Groves, Chair of the Source Protection Committee (SPC). Barb Groves introduces members of the SPC, and reinforces the purpose of the SPC to serve the public throughout the process, hence the public consultation session. Barb requested that feedback be made throughout the evening and as specified afterwards.

3. DWSP OVERVIEW

Sue Miller provided a succinct background message to members of the community to educate them on the Drinking Water Source Protection process. This presentation focuses on the need to protect water resources from contamination from existing and potential threats. The process includes a number of steps which provide guidance, history, projection, and finally planning. This public consultation session forms a review of the history and projection.

Sue emphasized the conditions which are working in South River’s favour so far: a vast quantity of water which runs through a widely unpopulated natural area. South River’s major concerns would be activity closest to the town and drinking water system intake.

Special mention was made to relevant aspects of the Ontario-wide program:

- Process includes only Municipal Drinking Water Systems, but manages to cover 90% or more of Ontario's population.
- Ministry control of approvals for the AR and Plan, thus it is made equitable and effective – stakeholder comments are treated fairly and are processed appropriately.
- Funding to upgrade Septic Systems which are failing or substandard may be available from the Province through the CA on a first-come/first-served basis subject to available grant funds and the location near specified zones.

4. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Presentation made by Tammy Karst-Riddoch, AECOM Consulting. The focus of the presentation was put on the contents of the Municipal Technical Study report, which was made available to the SPC and the public at the meeting. The key findings are as follows:

- There are no significant water *quantity* issues identified.
- Water *quality* issues, especially pathogens, are being managed by Drinking Water Treatment Plant systems.
- Based on the Prescribed lists of 19 Activities from (O.Reg 287/07) which may constitute threats to water quality, a list of 239 Significant *Potential* Threats within the most vulnerable Intake Protection Zone (IPZ-1, or 1 km over water and up to 120 m on shore from the intake point) was generated. These *potential* threats do not currently exist (based on field study), but may be useful in the generation of public policy to prevent source water contamination as the Source Protection Plan is created.
- Overall, the Municipal Drinking Water System for South River is in good health and has low vulnerability.

5. QUESTIONS ARISING DURING THE PRESENTATION:

- What is the water speed of the River/Reservoir?
 - o Addressed within the presentation at a later point than when the question was posed.
- Did the characterization of the water flow include periods of high flow, including spring run-off, and could that flow level cause a reverse flow from the North part of the reservoir to the South part, through the causeway?
 - o The flow rate through the causeway is pressurized from the overall flow through the watershed and is sufficient to continue a downstream flow even in bank-full conditions.
- Would it have been better in terms of water quality for the intake to have been located where the water is running faster in the North part of the reservoir and it is potentially deeper?
 - o Other concerns were present, including contaminants from a charcoal processing facility which affected only the North Reservoir. The quality of the water is still good, it just is different than areas where stratification (vertical separation of water based on cooling

at greater depths and mixing between layers) and faster flow occur.

- A drainage ditch, identified in IPZ-3, runs towards the train tracks and Highway 11, and has a high potential for contamination from these two sources. Is it possible that that ditch, which is man-made, be re-aligned away from those high traffic areas? Is that risk not being considered a valid issue within the risk assessment?
 - o The classification of IPZ-3 exists for that area not based on the presence of potential sources of contamination, but based on the time of travel for a contaminant to reach the intake. It would be more appropriate for the municipality to consider their own options for re-alignment of the drainage ditch, as the current situation is not classified as an issue or threat in the prescribed Rules. *Suggestion was made for municipal follow-up.*

- Clarification was sought as to the symbology for IPZ-3 and wetlands.
 - o The confusion over symbology has been noted as an issue with Ministry guidelines on map production, thus the clarification should be made when a wetland and IPZ-3 symbol may interact and create confusion.

- With regards to the over-land transmission of contaminants, what is the ability of soils to hold or transport contaminants?
 - o Soils slow the spread of contaminants best when there is less opportunity for infiltration. The buffer on land should be significant to prevent transmission to a watercourse until environmental clean-up occurs, even in the IPZ-1 area. Once a contaminant reaches the watercourse, it still responds to flow characteristics, and in the case of South River, the threat is low.

- What would be the threat classification of a substance such as sulphuric acid, which has in the past and may still be transported through the community on the rail systems? O. Reg 287/07 does not seem to have a classification for it.
 - o This concern has been noted and the consultant is intent on finding an answer to that issue.

- What consideration is given to the presence of fuel storage tanks which are old and have the potential to leak through and create spills?
 - o Every tank is being identified and treated, regardless of age, as having the potential to spill for whatever reason, including age. Accidents can cause spills and are rarely predictable, so we must consider all potential threats. In Policy creation phase, we may see requirements for soil testing and other inspections.

- If E. Coli bacterium are present in the source water, why is that not listed as a higher concern in the study?
 - o E. Coli and other identified pathogens in the source water are naturally occurring in levels far below Provincial Water Quality standards. The South River Water Treatment Facility effectively removes pathogens, and has the capacity to treat the water if the source levels of pathogens rise moderately.

- A potential issue has been identified by a concerned citizen. Approximately 400 railway ties have been stored for 3-4 weeks beside the auto service station and LCBO. Due to the recent weather patterns, rain has created pools of water in the area, which the citizen believes will promote leeching of contaminants. This location is near a drainage ditch which runs towards the IPZ-1 and is within or near the IPZ-3 . Citizen wants to know if this is a concern and how to have this blight removed.
 - o There is a low likelihood of contamination due to any leeching from this pile, due to the location away from the IPZ-1 and the presence of a number of existing buffers or barriers to spread of contamination. It is recommended that the citizen follow up with the Village Council, and perhaps to the Ministry of Environment
 - o * Communication was made to the SPC MOE Liason in the attempt to get feedback on the issue.

- The IPZ-1 crosses into Machar and unorganized Townships, how are those areas to be planned in the later parts of the process?
 - o Two options: the Village of South River could annex the land included in IPZ-1; or the planning is done through multiple plans, including a Ministry-approved plan for the unorganized portion.

6. COMMITTEE QUESTIONS:

- How many households within South River are on the Municipal System: 99%
- How is water consumption monitored? How are fees assessed?
 - o Bi-monthly user fee, no household consumption charges.
 - o Committee intends to show difference between total consumption in a smaller community without water usage monitoring versus a larger community with similar or slightly lower consumption which has household monitoring and pay-by-consumption fees.

7. CLOSING

Sue Miller provided an approximate timeline of future events, including the comment period for the meeting. Comments were requested to be submitted by Friday, November 6 to the Conservation Authority. The audience was informed that the Assessment Report draft presentation for public consultation should occur mid-January, 2010, with a consultation period lasting 30 days. Barb Groves thanked the guests for attending, and adjourned the meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 8:04 pm.

Barbara Groves, Chair

Sue Miller, Project Manager