CALL TO ORDER

1. Adoption of Agenda

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest

3. Adoption of Minutes of January 15, 2016 - attached

4. Correspondence - attached

   - Letter from Heather Malcolmson, Director, Source Protection Programs Branch, dated February 18, 2016 respecting Source Protection Plan amendments process
   - Letter from Luke Charbonneau, Chair, Saugeen Conservation, dated February 18, 2016 respecting Source Protection Plan amendments process
   - Letter from Heather Malcolmson, Director, Source Protection Programs Branch, dated March 2, 2016 respecting Source Protection Plan amendments process

5. Matters arising from the Minutes

   - None at this time

6. New Business

   - Source Protection Plan Amendments Consultation – Report 6a attached
   - Source Protection Plan Amendments Submission – Report 6b attached
   - Source Protection Plan Proposed Amendment Ripley Well – Report 6c attached

7. Other Business

8. Confirmation of Next Meeting and Adjournment
SAUGEEN VALLEY SOURCE PROTECTION AUTHORITY

MINUTES – MEETING #22

MEETING: Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority
DATE: Friday January 15, 2016
TIME: 4:30pm
LOCATION: Administration Office, Formosa

CHAIR: Luke Charbonneau

MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert Buckle, Maureen Couture, Barbara Dobreen, Kevin Eccles, Brian Gamble, Wilf Gamble, Stewart Halliday, Dan Kerr, Sue Paterson, Andrew White

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH REGRET: John Bell, Dan Gieruszak, Steve McCabe, Mike Smith

OTHERS PRESENT: Wayne Brohman, General Manager/Secretary-Treasurer, Saugeen Conservation
Janice Hagan, Recording Secretary, Saugeen Conservation
Guests and a Member of the Press

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOTION #SVSPA-16-01
Moved by Dan Kerr
Seconded by Maureen Couture
THAT the agenda be adopted as presented.

Carried

2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No person declared a conflict of interest relative to any item on the agenda.
3. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

   **MOTION #SVSPA-16-02**
   Moved by Brian Gamble
   Seconded by Andrew White

   THAT the minutes of the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority meeting, held on May 28, 2015, be adopted as circulated.

   Carried

4. **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

   No matters arose from the previous minutes.

5. **CORRESPONDENCE**

   No correspondence was presented at this time.

6. **REPORTS**

   a. **Drinking Water Source Protection – Lead Authority**

   Wayne Brohman, GM/S-T, SVCA, presented his report regarding the Lead Authority for the DWSP. He briefed the Members on the administration of the source protection area and explained the responsibilities the Lead Authority has held since its inception. He explained that the nature of the program is now changing, especially in the area of Risk Management, therefore Grey Sauble Conservation Authority has offered to take on the role of Lead Authority. They have hired staff in the area of Risk Management and will be able to offer these services to interested municipalities.

   **MOTION #SVSPA-16-03**
   Moved by Brian Gamble
   Seconded by Andrew White

   THAT Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority (SVSPA), in cooperation with Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority (GSSPA) and the Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula, takes steps to transfer the Lead Authority designation under the Source Water Protection Program from SVSPA to GSSPA; and further

   THAT SVSPA and GSSPA request that the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) allow for the 2016/2017 Source Water Protection Grant Funding Agreement be an agreement between MOECC and GSCA.

   Carried
7. **NEW BUSINESS**

No new business was introduced at this time.

8. **OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business was introduced at this time.

9. **CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING**

No date was set for the next meeting of the SPA. The next meeting will be called by the Chair as required.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:57pm on motion of Kevin Eccles.

___________________________________   _____________________________________
Luke Charbonneau      Janice Hagan
Chair        Recording Secretary
February 18, 2016

Mr. Michael Traynor  
Chair, Source Protection Committee  
c/o Grey Sauble Conservation  
237697 Inglis Falls Road, RR#4,  
Owen Sound ON N4K 5N6

Mr. Luke Charbonneau  
Chair, Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority  
1078 Bruce Rd. 12  
P.O. Box 150  
Formosa ON N0G 1W0

Mr. Dick Hibma  
Chair, Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority  
Grey Sauble Conservation  
237697 Inglis Falls Road, RR#4,  
Owen Sound ON N4K 5N6

Mr. Milt McLver  
Chair, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Authority  
c/o Grey Sauble Conservation Authority  
237697 Inglis Falls Road, RR#4,  
Owen Sound ON N4K 5N6

Dear Mr. Traynor, Mr. Charbonneau, Mr. Hibma and Mr. McLver:

The purpose of this letter is to provide clarification on the legislative requirements that need to be met when source protection authorities submit proposed plan amendments to the Ministry under section 34 of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

In 2015, the Saugeen Grey Sauble Northern Bruce Peninsula source protection committee and local authorities initiated consultation on the proposed source protection plan. This included consultation on event based areas that had been modelled for the Great Lakes intakes throughout the region. However, during this consultation period local concerns were raised about the event based areas. As a result of these concerns, the committee decided to undertake further analysis and consultation on this work and the event based areas were not included as part of the approved source protection plan. As reflected in the Minister’s plan approval letter, it was expected that this work would continue to move forward, and would be submitted as a plan amendment under section 34 of the CWA.

It is my understanding that there is some uncertainty surrounding the process that must be followed to ensure that section 34 legislative requirements are met. Generally speaking, the requirements for amending a source protection plan are similar to those that applied during plan preparation. A key difference is that the municipalities affected by the proposed amendments must each pass a council resolution endorsing the plan amendments; this was optional during the plan development phase.

Additionally, the Act requires that source protection authorities submit the proposed amendments to the ministry. Operationally, this has typically meant that the affected source protection authorities pass a board resolution endorsing the submission of the
proposed amendments to the ministry. The authorities’ process and timing would be tailored to the local circumstances and expectations of the authority boards while taking into consideration the nature of the amendments and any local agreements among the authorities in the region. This means that if the authorities choose to endorse the proposed amendments via board resolution, section 34 only requires that this take place prior to submitting the proposal to the ministry.

I hope this helps clarify the legislative requirements for plan amendments under section 34 of the CWA. The ministry is looking forward to receiving the proposed amendments. If you have any questions, please contact Teresa McLellan, Liaison Officer, at Teresa.McLellan@ontario.ca or (519) 873-5113.

Thank you for your work to protect Ontario’s sources of drinking water.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Heather Malcolmson, Director
Source Protection Programs Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change

cc:
Wayne Brohman, General Manager, Saugeen Conservation
John Cottrill, Chief Administrative Officer, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
Bill Jones, Chief Administrative Officer, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Authority
Carl Seider, Project Manager, SWP Project Manager
Emily Vandermeulen, Program Supervisor, Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
Linda White, Clerk, Town of Saugeen Shores
Pat Kinch, Manager, Source Protection Implementation
Debbie Scanlon, Manager, Source Protection Approvals
Wendy Lavender, Manager, Source Protection Planning
Teresa McLellan, Liaison Officer, Source Protection Implementation
February 18, 2016

To the Members of the Drinking Water Source Protection Management Committee,

At the Management Committee Meeting #56 on February 16, 2016, I raised concerns that the process underway for amending the Source Protection Plan to include 'events based area (EBA)' policies has not conformed to the Plan amendment process as described in the Clean Water Act (CWA) 2006 and its regulations. The committee requested that I prepare this report outlining my concerns for consideration.

The procedure for amending a Source Protection Plan (SPP) at the local level is outlined in section 34 of the Clean Water Act with further, pertinent detail provided in sections 48 and 50 of Ontario Regulation 287/07. Taken together and in order, these sections within the Act and Regulation describe the important steps in the amendment process from beginning to end. My concerns are centred upon the significant ways in which the process described in these sections differs from the process that has been used to advance the EBA amendments.

To begin, the EBA amendments have not yet been proposed in the manner described in CWA section 34.

Section 34 is titled "Amendments initiated by source protection authority" and its subsection (1) details the first step in the amendment process and reads as follows:

(1) A source protection authority may propose amendments to a source protection plan in the circumstances prescribed by the regulations.

The regulations referenced are found in Regulation 287/07 section 48 (1) which reads as follows:

(1) A source protection authority may propose an amendment to a source protection plan under section 34 of the Act if,
(a) the source protection authority consults with the source protection committee about the proposed amendment; and
(b) the source protection authority and the source protection committee are both of the opinion that the amendment is advisable.
Section 34 and its supporting regulations clearly intend that amendments will be initiated by proposal of the Source Protection Authority (SPA). After proposing an amendment, the SPA must consult the Source Protection Committee (SPC). Next, the SPA and SPC must both express the opinion that the amendment is advisable.

To date, the Saugeen Valley SPA has passed no resolution proposing EBA amendments and has not expressed by resolution any opinion as to the advisability of the EBA amendments. As such, the steps under section 34 (1) of the process have not yet been completed with regard to the EBA amendments.

Unfortunately, the EBA amendment process has carried on without the completion of the 34 (1) steps.

Section 34 (2) reads as follows:

(2) The source protection authority shall give a copy of the proposed amendments to the clerk of each municipality in which any part of the source protection area is located, if the municipality is affected by the amendments.

Subsection (2) clearly intends that an amendment must be proposed before being forwarded to municipalities. This necessitates that the subsection (1) steps be completed before the subsection (2) steps can commence. What's more, subsection (2) clearly intends that a copy of the proposed amendment will be given to the municipalities by the SPA.

The EBA amendments have now been given to the affected municipalities along with a request for those municipalities to pass resolutions of support for the amendments. Unfortunately, the given amendments have not yet been proposed by the Saugeen Valley SPA in accordance with 34 (1). What's more, the amendments were not given to the municipalities by resolution of the Saugeen Valley SPA. As such, the amendments have been given to the municipalities by the SPC and staff in a manner that does not conform to the step described in section 34 (2) of the process.

Section 34 (3) describes the steps to be taken once sections 34 (1) and (2) have been completed. It makes clear that, if the Councils of every municipality whose clerk was given a copy of the proposed amendments passes a resolution endorsing the amendments, the SPA shall publish the amendments and give public notice of the amendments in accordance with the regulations.

The regulations for publication and notice of amendments can be found in regulation 287/07 section 50.

The regulation and the Act make it clear that, once all affected municipalities have passed endorsing resolutions, it is the responsibility of the SPA to publish an amendment and to give notice to persons who the SPA believes could be engaging in activities that may be affected by the proposed amendment.
Unfortunately, in the case of the EBA amendments, notice has been sent to affected persons before the passage of endorsing resolutions by all affected municipalities. What's more, this notice was sent by the Chair of the SPC rather than by the SPA as envisioned in the Act and regulation. Furthermore, the Saugeen Valley SPA has not expressed by resolution any opinion on which persons may be engaged in an activity that may be affected by the amendment.

Clearly, the EBA amendments have proceeded in a manner that does not conform to section 34 (3) and its supporting regulations.

CWA section 34 (4) reads as follows:

(4) The source protection authority shall submit the proposed amendments to the Minister, together with the resolutions passed by the municipal councils and any written comments received by the source protection authority after publication of the amendments under subsection (3).

Subsection (4) clearly intends that the SPA will forward the amendments to the Minister upon completion of the steps described in subsections (1) (2) and (3). Until these steps are completed, as described in the Act and regulations, it is not possible for an SPA to complete the step described in subsection (4) or to certify to the Minister by the act of submission that that the steps have been properly completed.

Based on the above assessment, it is clear to me that the EBA amendment process has deviated from the SPP amendment process as described in the Act and regulations in many significant ways. The EBA amendments have not been proposed, agreed upon, given or published in the manner prescribed by CWA section 34 or the regulations. Taken individually or together, it is clear that neither the content nor the intent of subsections (1) (2) and (3) has been adhered to in the EBA amendment process.

In my view, the Saugeen Valley SPA must not forward any amendment to the Minister for approval until it has gone through the correct amendment process as described in the Act. It is my hope that the Management Committee shares and will endorse this view.

In addition, it has been suggested that the section 6 agreement establishing the Source Protection Region (SPR) supersedes the role of the individual SPAs in the amendment process and vests that role in the SPR Management Committee.

I cannot find anything in our section 6 agreement which would support this point of view. The section 6 agreement focuses on the practical administration of the SPR and would seem to leave it to each SPA to undertake its roles and responsibilities under the Act and its regulations (see the section titled “Responsibilities of each Source Protection Authority”).

That said, even if the section 6 agreement did confer the role of SPA onto the Management Committee, it still cannot be said that the Management Committee has fulfilled the section 34 roles of the SPA with regard to the EBA amendments. The Management Committee has not, by resolution,
proposed the amendments, given them to the municipalities or published them for public review. Importantly, an approved work plan is not, in my view, a substitute for the specific actions that would be required to fulfill each step in the section 34 amendment process.

As I see it, the deviation from the section 34 process began unintentionally as a result of the circumstances in which the draft EBA policies were developed. It was a mistake to proceed without SPA involvement but not a fatal one for the amendment process. Unfortunately, because the process has continued into municipal and public consultation without correcting the initial mistake, the errors in process have been compounded and multiplied to the point where the entire process has been contaminated. It is possible, in my opinion that the amendment process may need to be started over in order for the result to be acceptable for submission to the Ministry.

I would suggest that, regardless of the Ministry’s comments on this matter, the Management Committee and each SPA should consider seeking independent legal advice to satisfy ourselves that we are fulfilling our obligations under the act and that amendments (now and in the future) are developed in a manner that is publicly defensible.

Respectfully submitted,

Luke Charbonneau
Chair, Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority
Chair, Drinking Water Source Protection Management Committee
March 2, 2016

Mr. Luke Charbonneau
Chair, and members of the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority Board
1078 Bruce Rd. 12
P.O. Box 150
Formosa ON N0G 1W0

Mr. Wayne Brohman
General Manager, Saugeen Conservation
1078 Bruce Rd. 12
P.O. Box 150
Formosa ON N0G 1W0

Dear Mr. Charbonneau, Mr. Brohman and members of the board:

I am writing to follow up on the concerns raised at your recent conservation authority board meeting regarding the role of the source protection authority board when proposing plan amendments under section 34 of the Clean Water Act (Act).

The amendments being considered by the board relate to work initiated in 2011 under section 22 of the Act. Under that section, the source protection committee undertook event based area (EBA) modelling work to identify risks, developed policies, and consulted with the public in accordance with the Act and regulations. Concerns were raised during the consultation period, and as a result this work is not included in the approved source protection plan. As per the Minister’s plan approval letter, the ministry expects this work to be completed and submitted for approval in March 2016 (under section 34 of the Act).

The decision on the merits of the technical work and the need to address these threats was made by the source protection committee, under section 22, before related requirements under section 34 came into effect. This removes the obligation of the source protection authority to make a decision to begin work related to a section 34 submission. Regardless of how this work was initiated, the EBA work has resulted in the identification of significant drinking water threats for a number of municipal drinking water systems, and it is important that policies be in place to address these risks. These policies were written in collaboration with affected municipalities and once submitted and approved will allow them to protect their municipal drinking water supplies from these known significant drinking water threats.

If the authority board is concerned that they have not met their obligations under section 34, comments to this effect can be included in their submission, as well as any other concerns the authorities may have.
We look forward to the submission of your amended source protection plan in the coming weeks. It's important to note that three municipalities have been offered Source Protection Municipal Implementation funding that is contingent on the province having received an amended source protection plan. If you have any questions, please contact Teresa McLellan, Liaison Officer, at Teresa.McLellan@ontario.ca or (519) 873-5113.

Thank you for your work to protect Ontario's sources of drinking water.

Sincerely,

Heather Malcolmson, Director
Source Protection Programs Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change

cc:
Mike Traynor, Chair, Source Protection Committee
Dick Hibma, Chair, Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority
Milt McIver, Chair, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Authority
Carl Seider, Project Manager, SWP Project Manager
Linda White, Clerk, Town of Saugeen Shores
Teresa McLellan, Liaison Officer, Source Protection Implementation
REPORT #6a

TO: SAUGEEN VALLEY SOURCE PROTECTION AUTHORITY

DATE: MARCH 31, 2016

RE: SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN AMENDMENTS CONSULTATION REPORT

Consultation Period:

The consultation period for the amendments to the Source Protection Plan (SPP) commenced on January 12, 2016 and was extended to March 7, 2016 to allow for a full 30-day consultation on all proposed Source Protection Plan amendments, including water quantity threat policies for Brockton.

Landowner Notification:

Individual landowner packages were prepared and distributed to affected property owners on January 13, 2016.

Public Notice of Consultation:

The Public Consultation Notice was also included on our webpage: http://www.waterprotection.ca/i-plan.htm with policies that were posted for consultation.

Also on January 13, 2016, as part of the consultation of proposed events-based area (EBA) policies, water quantity draft policies and other minor amendments to the approved Source Protection Plan, an Official Notice of Public Consultation letter with Media Release and Consultation Notice attachments was emailed and mailed to 21 lower-tier municipalities and 4 counties in the Source Protection Region, the Chiefs of the two First Nations, and the Chairs of the three neighbouring Source Protection Regions. Ontario provincial ministry stakeholders and/or implementing bodies for the Source Protection Plan policies were also each sent this information by email. Hard copies of the Source Protection Plan amendments were placed in the three Source Protection Authority offices for public viewing.

Public Notice advertisements were also purchased in the following newspapers to further inform the public of this consultation opportunity: Kincardine News, Owen Sound Sun Times, Shoreline Beacon, Wiarton Echo, Grey Bruce This Week and Meaford Independent.

Written Comments:

Written comments were received for review by the Source Protection Committee from the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) and the County of Wellington respecting the Source Protection Plan amendments. The majority of the Wellington County comments apply to
policies that have already been approved, however, several comments were addressed by the Source Protection Committee. No other comments were received. Attached to this report are copies of the above-noted comments, as well as the relevant policies.

Municipal Resolutions:

Under section 34(3) of the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, a municipal council resolution endorsing the proposed amendments to the SPP is required from affected municipalities. The Drinking Water Source Protection office has received resolutions from the eight of the nine municipalities affected by the events-based area and water quantity policies as follows:

1. Town of The Blue Mountains
2. Municipality of Meaford
3. Township of Georgian Bluffs
4. City of Owen Sound
5. Town of South Bruce Peninsula
6. Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula
7. The Municipality of Kincardine
8. Municipality of Brockton

As well as:

9. Township of Huron-Kinloss
10. Municipality of Grey Highlands
11. Municipality of West Grey
12. Township of Howick

Copies of these resolutions are attached to this report. We have been advised that the remaining municipality affected by the events-based area policies, the Town of Saugeen Shores, will be considering this matter at its next Council meeting on March 29, 2016.

Source Protection Committee Approval:

The Source Protection Committee approved the Source Protection Plan amendments on March 18, 2016 and a copy of the motion is attached.

Source Protection Authorities:

The Management Committee representing the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority, the Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority and the Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Authority passed a motion approving the process for submission of the Source Protection Plan amendments and, pending the aforementioned Source Protection Committee approval, directed Drinking Water Source Protection Staff to seek the endorsement of the three Source Protection Authorities prior to submission of the SPP to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change. A copy of the Management Committee motion is attached.
The Source Protection Authorities will be asked to receive the Source Protection Plan amendments and direct Drinking Water Source Protection Staff to submit the amendments to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change on April 29, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Seider  
Project Manager  
Drinking Water Source Protection
Policy Comments

EBA Policies (Provided November, 2015)

- No additional comments on EBA policies; policies have not changed since revisions submitted by SPA on November 26, 2016.

Water Quantity Policies (Provided January 26, 2016)

19-01 (Review of Permits to Take Water)

- As policy 19-01 is meant to apply to both existing and future water taking activities, it is recommended that the word “future” be added at the end of the first sentence where “(existing activity)” is shown, as well as to the “Activity Type” column in the Threat #19 table on the first page.

19-03 (Water Quantity Management Plan Development)

- As this policy only applies to future takings, please remove the text “ceases to be,” in reference to “consumptive demand,” as it implies the policy applies to existing activities as well.

- The policy states that the water management plan shall address “issues with water supply”. It is recommended that further explanation regarding the intent of this policy be included in the Explanatory Document.

19-04 (Collaboration with Other Agencies)

- As this policy is quite broad in scope, and yet applies to a very small geographic area (zone Q1 surrounding Lake Rosalind Wells 1 and 3), it is recommended that a more detailed explanation regarding the intent of this policy, including tangible examples, be included in the Explanatory Document.
Technical Comments

Water Quality Work (New Comments-March, 2016)

The following comments are the result of comparing the most recent revisions, with the previous submission.

Saugeen AR- Chapter 4:

1) Page 4-209 (Southampton backup intake): As written, the statement “As such, the MOECC approved the removal of the backup intake for consideration” implies that MOECC actually formally “approved” the removal of the backup intake from the EBA process. Please revise this sentence to reflect that MOECC provided comments with respect to the options available under the CWA for addressing the backup intake, but not its actual removal from consideration under the EBA process. In addition, please provide the supporting rationale for removing the Southampton backup intake for consideration under the EBA process.

2) Page 4-209: The AR states some of the EBAs for the Southampton intakes (main and back-up) had to be re-organised as a result of the removal of the previous EBAs associated with the Southampton back-up intake. This led to merging some EBAs (i.e. in the previous draft, there were areas where fuel of 4500 – 6000L was deemed a SDWT). However, in this new submission, these same areas have disappeared and have been covered by a new EBA of 13000L fuel.

This means that any volume of fuel less than 13000L in these areas will no longer be captured as a SDWT. It is unclear why the SPA has reduced the number of the EBAs from 3 to 2, and volumes under 13000L that were previously included, are no longer addressed. Please provide the rationale that supports the use of a different approach for the Southampton intakes, in comparison to the other SPAs (where at least 3 categories of EBAs were delineated to capture various volumes of fuel, including smaller volumes of fuel).

3) Table 4.9.S1.3 lists the 5 fuel SDWTs for the Southampton intake EBAs (land use: 4 commercial areas; and 1 municipal area). The same number of threats and land uses has been listed for the Kincardine intake as well. Please confirm that the numbers and type of land uses for both intakes are correct.

North Bruce AR:

1) Page 4-84 (Lion’s Head intake): The 2 previous EBAs of 3600L and 5000L, shown in the former posted ARs, have been merged into one EBA with 5000L. This means that all fuel SDWTs (existing or future) that have volumes between 3600 and 5000L will no longer be captured. In particular, the north-east corner of IPZ-1. Please explain the rationale behind merging the previous EBAs.
Grey Sauble AR:

1) Pages 4-147 and 148: Reference is made to 1 fuel SDWT for the Wiarton intake where it may impact the East Linton Intake; however, no fuel SDWT has been modelled for the East Linton intake. As a result, it is unclear where this 1 SDWT came from, and what modelling has been conducting to support this result. Please provide supporting rationale.

2) Page 4-221 (Wiarton Intake): The 2 previous EBAs of 3600L and 5000L have been merged into one EBA 5000L presented. This means that all fuel SDWTs (existing or future) that have volumes between 3600 and 5000L will no longer be captured. In particular, for the shoreline setbacks along the IPZ-1 and 2. Please clarify and explain the rationale behind merging these EBAs.

3) Maps 4.8.S1.8 and 4.8.S1.9 (Wiarton Intake): The IPZ-3 and the EBA for 8000L of fuel has been extended significantly to the east of the IPZ-3 as compared to the IPZ-3/EBA previously delineated. The rationale behind this extension is unclear. Based on the maps provided, the extended area seems to drain into a stream that is not captured in any IPZ and that stream is discharging in the Georgian Bay at the far end of Oxenden. Please provide the technical rationale and/or modelling work to support this extension.

Water Quantity Work

1) (3.16.9) Peer Review of Tier III Water Budget
   • Please correct professional designation for Lynne Milford, by changing it from hydrogeologist to water budget analyst (refer to list of Tier II reviewers).

2) (3.16.3) WHPA-Q1 Delineation
   • It is suggested that additional information be included (1 or 2 sentences) to better explain the rationale for the size and shape of the WHPA-Q1-B surrounding the 2 Lake Rosalind wells to the reader.

   • The language referencing hydraulic separation between the 2 aquifers should be revised to ensure that it’s consistent and clear. For example, the paragraph uses the words “apparent”, “inferred” and “demonstrated” to describe the hydraulic separation. Based on the evidence provided by Matrix, “demonstrated” may be the preferred term.
3) (3.16.6) Local Area Delineation

- Please consider adopting the following revised language (or something similar), to remain consistent with previous descriptions for these local areas:

  "Three Local Areas (Local Areas A, B, and C) were delineated surrounding the municipal intake and supply wells in the Study Area (Figures 3.16.1). The areas were delineated following the Technical Rules (MOECC, 2009) based on a combination of the cone of influence of each municipal well (WHPA-Q1) and the surficial drainage area, which may contribute water to” surface water intake and associated area that provides recharge to an aquifer that discharges to the drainage area (IPZ-Q) (Matrix, 2016)."
MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael Traynor, Chair, Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Committee
    Carl Seider, Program Manager, Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region

FROM: Kyle Davis, Risk Management Official, Wellington County municipalities

DATE: February 29, 2016


The purpose of this memorandum is to provide staff comments regarding the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region document entitled: Draft for Consultation Approved Source Protection Plan: Saugeen Valley, Grey Sauble and Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Areas dated October 16, 2015 (Draft Plan). The public comment period closes on March 7, 2016.

This memorandum was written in consultation with staff from the Town of Minto, Township of Wellington North and County of Wellington.

Comments

Upon reviewing the Draft Plan, the Wellington County municipalities’ respectfully submit the following comments for the Source Protection Committee (SPC)’s consideration. Please note that many of these comments are follow-up to our previous comments dated March 6, 2015. We note and appreciate that the SPC considered and adopted many of our 2015 comments in the Approved Plan.

The purpose of this memorandum is to restate select comments for the SPC’s further consideration and to introduce some new comments. Although we are taking this opportunity to provide comment on the Draft Plan, we recognize that the SPC may be limited to considering only those comments applicable to the recent changes to the Plan (ie event based areas, fuel management, snow storage, water quantity etc.). If that is the case, we hope that the SPC will keep our comments on other topics for review at a later date.
Please note, where applicable, the policy reference number has been noted (ie TP-02) along with a brief description of the purpose of that policy. The comments are generally presented in order of the policies within the Draft Plan.

1. Flexibility Relating to Risk Management Plan Policy Requirements (Policies 01-01; 01-02; 03-02; 04-02; 04-03; 08-02; 09-01; 10-02; 11-02; 12-01; 14-02; 15-02; 15-03; 15-05; 15-06; 16-02; 17-02; 21-02; 21-03)

It is noted that often the SPC has chosen to use the wording “a RMP shall include”. Our municipalities are supportive of providing guidance to the content of RMPs, however, respectfully request that the SPC consider using wording such as “a RMP should include” or the use of “and / or” in the requirement listing. This allows site by site flexibility that will likely be needed as our municipalities begin to implement the RMP policies. A rigid list of mandatory requirements will lead to implementation challenges. We note that the SPC chose to include “or” in Policy 15-02 to provide some flexibility for small fuel facilities. We appreciate and support that change and respectfully request that the SPC consider adding similar flexibility to the remaining RMP policies either through the use of “should” or “and / or”.

2. General Comment regarding Prohibition and RMP Approaches – We note that there are differences between policy approaches for some threat activities. For example, commercial fertilizer storage and hazardous waste (not requiring provincial approval) uses an RMP approach for both existing and future activities while organic solvents, pesticide storage, fuel and DNAPLs use a RMP approach for existing uses and a prohibition approach for future and expansion of existing. Our municipalities would respectfully request that the SPC consider using RMP approaches consistently for, at a minimum, expansion of existing activities and existing activities. Our municipalities would also support the use of RMP approaches for the above future activities instead of a prohibition approach.

3. Policy 02-09 – Sewer Maintenance – As the policy is currently worded, it does not differentiate between sanitary sewer mains and connection laterals. Our interpretation and our discussion with SPA staff is that this policy applies to sewer mains. Due to their smaller diameter, connection laterals can be difficult to inspect and are often on private properties. Clarification within the explanatory document would assist in making this interpretation clear.

4. Policy 14-02 – Snow Storage – We are supportive of the change to risk management plans for snow storage.
5. Policy 15-02 – RMP for Small Fuel Facilities – This policy is aimed at home heating oil threats. Given that the owners will be residential land owners, we note that policy 15-02 provides a more detailed list of requirements (although with flexibility to choose requirements) than policy 15-03 despite policy 15-03 applying to larger quantities of fuel.

6. Policy 15-03 – RMP for Certain Fuel Facilities – We note that this policy seems to contradict policy 15-01 regarding expansion of existing fuel facilities.

7. Policy 16-01 – Prohibition of future DNAPL use in WHPA A, B, (vulnerability score = 2 or greater). Further to our comments in March 2015, we recognize that the SPC removed the prohibition within WHPA C for future activity and we appreciate and acknowledge that change. We still wish to comment that the policy prohibits all future DNAPL use in WHPA A and B and does not distinguish between the DNAPL chemicals or the quantities stored or handled. DNAPLs may be present in small to large quantities at a variety of commercial or industrial businesses. The effect of the policy as currently written, would be to prohibit all future DNAPL storage or handling within a still relatively large geographic area (WHPA A and B) without regard for the type of DNAPL or the quantity. In effect, this prohibits the handling of DNAPL chemicals by new retail stores even if that is in small retail volumes (ie 500 millilitres or 1 litre) stored within a building.

As large quantities of liquid DNAPLs are of the greatest risk to groundwater, we respectfully suggest the SPC consider building on the 25 litre exemption that the SPC has written into the policy. The policy could be reworded to prohibit single containers of 25 litres or greater of liquid DNAPL products. This change would address future, liquid bulk storage of DNAPL while still allowing retail volumes to be stored and sold under an RMP. As noted above, the liquid DNAPLs (primarily chlorinated solvents) are of greatest risk to the groundwater.

8. G-06 – Road Signs – Our analysis indicates that eight signs will be required within Wellington County for the Saugeen Source Protection Area. Six of those signs appear to be on roads that are provincial jurisdiction and therefore will be the province’s responsibility to install and maintain. There are two signs that appear to be County jurisdiction. There are some differences between our analysis and the Source Protection Authority’s analysis of sign location; we will follow up separately regarding that analysis. We would respectfully request, however, that the SPC consider an extension to the implementation timeline.
9. Policy G-09 – Transition Provisions – Our five source protection plans have a range of existing definitions and transition provisions. Although we would prefer consistency, at this point, we recognize that each SPC has chosen different definitions and transition provisions based on specific rationale. We have no further comment on this policy beyond noting our preference for consistency, wherever possible, between our five source protection plans.

10. Policy G-12 – Update of Municipal Emergency Response Plans – Our municipalities support this policy, however, would ask the SPC to consider a two year implementation timeline to allow for the appropriate consultation and discussion.

11. It is noted that there are a number of monitoring policies that are municipal or RMO responsibility. At a minimum, it would be helpful if the SPC or Source Protection Authority would prepare a list of the required data to assist municipalities in tracking and reporting on the various information that is required by the monitoring polices. In Wellington, we are currently building our database and reporting system and this information would be useful in our design. It is noted that various municipal departments will likely be involved in reporting on the various monitoring policies, therefore, a list would aid data collection. Alternatively, we would be supportive if the SPC wished to reduce or simplify the monitoring policy requirements for municipalities and RMOs.

12. Generally, we note that many of the policies directly refer and quote the Province's Table of Drinking Water Threats, November 2009. The SPC may wish to consider for future Plan updates, removing the direct quotes and instead using wording such as where significant. This allows more flexibility if the Province changes the Table of Drinking Water Threats.

c.c. (via email)

Town of Minto
Township of Wellington North
County of Wellington
19-01 Review of Permits to Take Water

The policy applies in all vulnerable areas where water taking activities are significant drinking water threats (existing and future activity).

The policy applies to provincial instruments related to water takings, Permits to Take Water.

The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change shall:

1. Review all existing permits;
2. Review all future permit applications;
3. Determine whether the permits contain appropriate terms and conditions and require adequate measures to be in place to ensure that the water taking activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat; and
4. Where the Ministry is of the opinion that the terms, conditions and measures contained in a permit are not adequate, make such amendments to the approval so as to ensure that the water taking activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.

Monitoring policy MP-01 applies.
19-03 Water Quantity Management Plan Development

The Municipality of Brockton shall develop and implement a water management plan using the Tier 3 water budget findings and any other available data to ensure that consumptive demand does not become a significant drinking water threat. The plan shall address:

1. Issues with water supply;
2. Future development;
3. New water supply options; and

The municipal Official Plan must be updated or amended with the water management plan. The update or amendment to the Official Plan must be initiated within three years and completed within five years of the effective date of the Source Protection Plan.

Monitoring policy MP-21 applies.
19-04 Collaboration with Other Agencies

The Municipality of Brockton shall give due consideration to collaborating with other agencies for, but not limited to, the following purposes;
- Incentive/financial assistance programs;
- Education programs/materials;
- Scientific research;
- Policy implementation; and
- Communication with the public.

Monitoring policy MP-19 applies.


15-03  Risk Management Plan for Other Fuel Facilities

The policy applies in:

1. all Wellhead Protection Areas where the handling and storage of fuel is a significant drinking water threat (existing activity); and
2. all Intake Protection Zones with a vulnerability score of 10 where the handling and storage of fuel is a significant drinking water threat (existing activity).

Furthermore, the policy applies under the following circumstances:

A. the quantity of fuel is more than 2,500 L; or
B. the quantity of fuel is more than 250 L but not more than 2,500 L and where the facility is a bulk plant or a facility that manufacturers or refines fuel

Establishment of a Risk Management Plan is required. The handling and storage of fuel may only occur in accordance with an approved Risk Management Plan. Therefore, the handling and storage of fuel is designated for the purposes of s.58 of the Clean Water Act.

As a minimum, the Risk Management Plan shall address:

1) product handling;
2) product storage;
3) record keeping and documentation, including any inspection reports;
4) disposal methods;
5) spills response plan; and
6) containment measures.

The Risk Management Official shall document the capacity of the fuel storage as of the threats verification date and shall not allow for the expansion of the storage facility beyond the documented capacity.

All locations for Risk Management Plans for existing activities shall be inventoried within three years and plans established within five years of the effective date of the Source Protection Plan.

Monitoring policies MP-24 and MP-25 apply.
March 7, 2016

Moved by: Gail Ardiel               Seconded by: R.J. Gamble

THAT Council receive Staff Report PDS.16.17 “Source Water Protection Plan Proposed Amendments to Events Based Area Policies for Intake Protection Zones”, and

THAT pursuant to Section 34(3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, the Corporation of The Town of The Blue Mountains endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, North Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region to address significant drinking water threats for fuel storage near Great Lakes intakes, CARRIED.

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY

[Signature]
Krista Royal, Deputy Clerk
Date: Monday, February 01, 2016
From: Robert Armstrong, Director, Development and Environmental Services
Subject: Drinking Water Source Protection Events Based Area Amendment
Report No. DES2016-04
Roll No. Various

Recommendation

That Committee of the Whole recommend Council of the Municipality of Meaford:

1. Endorse the proposed Events-Based Area & related amendments to the Source Protection Plan in the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region; and,

2. Direct Staff to forward the above noted resolution to the regional Source Protection Committee in response to their request for comments.

Background

The following report is provided in relation to Notice of Proposed Amendments to the local Source Protection Plan (Appendix 1).

As Council may recall, the Clean Water Act, 2006, came into effect in July 2007 and required Source Protection Plans to be developed for watersheds in Ontario. The Source Protection Plan for the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region was approved by Hon. Glen Murray, Minister of the Environment and Climate Change on October 16, 2015.

Based on in-lake modelling of fuel spills completed by Baird & Associates in July 2014, the Source Protection Committee also prepared draft ‘Events Based’ policies for areas near municipal water intakes where fuel handling and storage would constitute a significant drinking water threat. These draft
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GEORGIAN BLUFFS

MOVED BY: D. R. Blunt
SECONDED BY: D. R. Blunt
NO: 17-2016
DATE: January 20, 2016

That the Council of the Township of Georgian Bluffs endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan in the Saugeen, Grey Sauble and Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region.

☐ CARRIED  ☐ DEFEATED

Recorded Vote

Councillor Carol Barfoot  F  A
Councillor Paul Sutherland  F  A
Councillor Sue Carleton  F  A
Councillor Ryan Thompson  F  A
Councillor Tom Wiley  F  A
Deputy Mayor Dwight Burley  F  A
Mayor Alan Barfoot  F  A

TOTAL

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

_________________________  ____________________________
Name  Name

Disclosed his/her/their interest, abstained from and did not vote on the question.

_________________________
Clerk
March 1, 2016

Drinking Water Source Protection
237897 Inglis Falls Road, RR 4
Owen Sound, Ontario, N4K 5N6

Attention: Carl Seider, Project Manager

Please be advised the Council for The Corporation of the City of Owen Sound at its meeting on February 29, 2016 adopted Resolution R-160229-004 as follows:

“THAT in consideration of the Notice dated January 13, 2016 and request for endorsement of the proposed amendments to the approved Source Protection Plan in the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region related to events-based threats, the presentation by Carl Seider, Source Protection Committee, and comments by the City’s Director of Public Works and Engineering, City Council for The Corporation of the City of Owen Sound hereby resolves as follows:

THAT pursuant to subsection 34(3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, City Council hereby endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan in the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region to address significant drinking water threats arising from fuel storage near Great Lakes intakes; and further

THAT a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Drinking Water Source Protection Committee.”

Yours truly,

Carolyn Stobo, B.A. (Hons.), LL.B.
Deputy Clerk
16. CLK08-2016 Drinking Water Source Protection Plan Amendments

R-45-2016

It was Moved by A. Vukovic, Seconded by M. Jackson and Carried

That pursuant to Section 34(3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, the Town of South Bruce Peninsula endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region to address significant drinking water threats for fuel storage near Great Lakes intakes.
1. Chief Administrative Officer Report No. 16-03  
Re: Source Water Protection Agreement Amendment and Approval of Source Water Protection Plan

Moved by T. Boyle  
Seconded by R. Rouse

Resolution # 08-11-2016

THAT pursuant to Section 34(3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, the Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, and Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region to address significant drinking water threats for fuel storage near Great Lakes intakes;

AND FURTHERMORE THAT Council authorizes the Mayor and Clerk to sign the Source Protection Region Memorandum of Understanding.

Carried
February 11, 2016

Drinking Water Source Protection
237897 Inglis Falls Road, RR 4
Owen Sound, ON
N4K 5N6

VIA E-Mail

Attention: Carl Seider, Project Manager

Dear Mr. Seider:

RE: Municipality of Kincardine
Events-Based Area Policies

Council of the Municipality of Kincardine at their meeting of February 10, 2016 passed the following motion:

"Pursuant to section 34(3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, the Municipality of Kincardine endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region to address significant drinking water threats for fuel storage near Great Lakes intakes."

If you have any questions don’t hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Michele Barr, M.A.A.T.O., CBO
Director of Building and Planning

MB:ed
12.8 Endorse Amendments to the Source Protection Plan of the Saugeen Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region

Pursuant to section 34(3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, the Municipality of Brockton endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region to address drinking water quantity concerns related to the Lake Rosalind drinking water system.

And further that the Municipality of Brockton will utilize the Tier 3 Water Budget Risk Assessment and other relevant documents to formulate the long-term plan to address the water quantity concerns within the Lake Rosalind Water System.
SENT VIA EMAIL

February 25th, 2016

Mike Traynor, Chair
Source Protection Committee
Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula
Drinking Water Source Protection
237897 Inglis Falls Road, RR $
Owen Sound, ON N4K 5N6
mail@waterprotection.ca

Dear Sir,

Copy of Resolution # 51

As per the requirements under section 34(3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, please find below a copy of the resolution adopted by the Township of Huron-Kinloss Council at its February 16th, 2016 session.

Motion No: 51
Moved by: Gamble Seconded by: Elliott
That the Township of Huron-Kinloss Council hereby endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan in the Saugeen, Grey, Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region under Section 34 (3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006.

Carried.

Sincerely,

Sonya Watson
Clerk
February 12, 2016

Drinking Water Source Protection
237897 Inglis Falls Road, RR4
Owen Sound, ON N4K 5N6

Via Email only: mail@waterprotection.ca

Re: Drinking Water Source Protection Plan Amendments
Public Consultation January 12/16 to February 29/16
Municipal Council Resolution

Council, at their meeting held on February 1, 2016, adopted the following resolution:

16-55
Silverton - Little
That correspondence Re: Drinking Water Source Protection Plan
Amendments Public Consultation January 12/16/ to February 29/16
Need for Municipal Council Resolution be received; and That in
accordance with section 34(3) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, Grey
Highlands Council endorses the proposed amendments to the Source
Protection Plan in the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce
Peninsula Source Protection Region.
CARRIED.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the
undersigned.

Regards,

Debbie Robertson, AMCT
Clerk/Director
Council & Legislative Services
robertson@greyhighlands.ca
519.986.1216 Ext. 233
Corporation of the Municipality of West Grey
Resolution

Moved by: [Signature]  No. 39-16
Seconded by: [Signature]  Session: February 8, 2016

Be it resolved that, the Council of the Municipality of West Grey hereby endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan in the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE COPY DATED AT WEST GREY THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2016.

JAMES MARK TURNER, CLERK
CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF WEST GREY

Carried ☑ Defeated _____ Mayor [Signature]

*****************************************************************************

John A. Bell  For
Bev Cutting  ☐
Kevin Eccles  Against
Doug Hutchinson  ☐
Carol Lawrence  ☐
Don B. Marshall  ☐
Rob Thompson  ☐

Declaration of pecuniary interest or the general nature thereof:
Moved by Councillor Scott; Seconded by Councillor Harding:
Be it resolved that Council supports the resolution from the Township of Madawaska Valley requesting that the Minister of Health and Long Term Care reinstate incentives for physicians to practice in rural areas of Ontario; and that the Minister return to the table with Ontario’s doctors and work together through mediation-arbitration to reach a fair deal that protects the quality, patient-focused care Ontario’s families deserve. Carried. Resolution No. 19/16

Correspondence received from the Township of Carling supporting Township of Madawaska Valley resolution was noted and filed.

Correspondence received from Saugeen Conservation including the 2016 levy assessment was noted and filed.

Correspondence received from Saugeen Conservation reporting the 2015 remuneration and expenses to Director Robert Buckle was noted and filed.

Correspondence received from Drinking Water Source Protection regarding Drinking Water Source Protection Plan Amendments, public consultation January 12 to February 29, 2016 and the need for municipal Council resolution was discussed.

Moved by Councillor Scott; Seconded by Deputy Reeve Clarkson:
Be it resolved that Council endorses the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan in the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region. Carried. Resolution No. 20/16

9. By-laws and Motions

Moved by Councillor Harding; Seconded by Deputy Reeve Clarkson:
Be it resolved that Council approve the Howick Skating Club’s request for the extra 25% of the gross revenue share from the fundraising event, Yuk Yuks, being held February 13, 2016, and further; that Council approve the Howick Staking Club use of their own bar staff provided the bar staff schedule and all staff Smart Serve numbers are provided to the Clerk by January 30, 2016. Carried. Resolution No. 21/16

Moved by Councillor Henhoeffer; Seconded by Councillor Harding:
Be it resolved that Council give first, second and third and final reading to By-law No. 1-2016; being a by-law imposing special annual drainage rates upon land in respect of which money is borrowed under the Tile Drainage Act, Lot 15, Concession 1. Carried. Resolution No. 22/16

Council discussed how to fill vacancies on the Fordwich and Gorrie Village Management Boards and directed the Clerk to contact the Chairs to suggest placing an advertisement in Howick Happenings.

Moved by Councillor Scott; Seconded by Councillor Henhoeffer:
Be it resolved that Council give first, second and third and final reading to By-law No. 2-2016; being a by-law to appoint members to the Township of Howick Municipal Service Boards for the purpose of carrying out the duties of the Boards. Carried. Resolution No. 23/16
SAUGEEN, GREY SAUBLE, NORTHERN BRUCE PENINSULA SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MOTION

DATE: MARCH 18, 2016

MOTION #: SPC-16-257

MOVED BY: BRUCE DAVIDSON

SECONDED BY: BRET LANKTREE

THAT: the Source Protection Committee for the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region approve the Amended Source Protection Plan for the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Area, the Grey Sauble Source Protection Area and the Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Area pending the implementation of changes, if any, agreed to by the Source Protection Committee during its meeting on March 18, 2016; and further,

THAT Drinking Water Source Protection Staff be directed to forward the Amended Source Protection Plan to the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority, the Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority and the Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Authority, as required.
MOTION

DATE: MARCH 3, 2016

MOTION #: SWP-MC-16-178

MOVED BY: DICK HIBMA

SECONDED BY: TOM BOYLE

WHEREAS upon the approval of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Management Committee (Management Committee), Drinking Water Source Protection (DWSP) staff retained Baird & Associates (Baird) to do the preliminary work for the IPZ-3 modelling in 2010-2012;

AND WHEREAS in 2013-2014, Baird was retained to continue modelling work;

AND WHEREAS from August to December 2014, DWSP staff worked on delineating the IPZ-3s for the Great Lakes intakes; and during the September 12, 2014 Source Protection Committee (SPC) meeting, presentations from the consultant and the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) were requested;

AND WHEREAS in January 2015, DWSP staff worked with the MOECC technical staff to review and improve the delineations for the Great Lakes intakes and accordingly, new delineations and policies were presented to the SPC on January 23, 2015;

AND WHEREAS on March 20, 2015, the SPC passed a motion to remove the Events-based Area (EBA) policies from the Updated Proposed Source Protection Plan and that the SPC proceed with all other work;

AND WHEREAS on April 22, 2015, the Management Committee approved the DWSP workplan, including activities associated with assembling the EBA Technical Advisory Working Group;
AND WHEREAS on May 13, 2015, the Management Committee meeting received a report on the Updated Proposed Source Protection Plan and upcoming respective presentations to the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority, the Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority and the Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Authority;

AND WHEREAS on May 28, 2015, the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority received a presentation on the Source Protection Plan (SPP) and a status update on EBA work and the SPP submission process;

AND WHEREAS on June 10, 2015, the Grey Sauble Source Protection Authority received a presentation on the SPP and a status update on EBA work and the SPP submission process;

AND WHEREAS on June 22, 2015, the Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Authority received a presentation on the SPP and a status update on EBA work and the SPP submission process;

AND WHEREAS on October 29, 2015, the Management Committee received an update on the Technical Advisory Working Group progress in addressing the SPP and the EBA fuel threats policies;

AND WHEREAS on November 27, 2015, the SPC reviewed the draft EBA policies and passed a motion to approve the EBA policies and direct DWSP staff to undertake SPP consultation on activities, as required;

AND WHEREAS on January 6, 2016, the Management Committee received an update on the EBA consultation and the submission of the updated SPP to MOECC proposed for March/April 2016;

AND WHEREAS on January 13, 2016, Public Consultation commenced respecting amendments to the Source Protection Plan, including Events-based Areas, the Hanover/Brockton Tier 3 Water Budget and other minor updates, which consultation period will end March 7, 2016;

AND WHEREAS on February 16, 2016, the Management Committee asked the Chair to provide a written report regarding his concerns with the SPP amendment process;

THAT: the Management Committee for the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region approve the process for submission of the amendments to the Source Protection Plan, as set out above; and further,

THAT: pending approval of the amended Source Protection Plan by the Source Protection Committee, Drinking Water Source Protection Staff is directed to seek endorsement of the amended Source Protection Plan from the Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Authority at its meeting on March 21, 2016, the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority at its meeting on March 31, 2016 and the Grey Sauble Source
Protection Authority at its meeting on April 13, 2016, prior to submission of the amended Source Protection Plan to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change for approval.
REPORT #6b

TO:        SAUGEEN VALLEY SOURCE PROTECTION AUTHORITY

DATE:      MARCH 31, 2016

RE:        SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN AMENDMENTS SUBMISSION

Consultation activities for the Source Protection Plan amendments have been completed and consultation comments presented to the Source Protection Authority are in Report 6a of this meeting.

The Source Protection Authority is now being asked to receive the Source Protection Plan amendments and also to direct Drinking Water Source Protection Staff to submit this document to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change on April 29, 2016.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT: the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Authority receive the Source Protection Plan with amendments for the Saugeen Valley Source Protection Area, the Grey Sauble Source Protection Area and the Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Area dated April 29, 2016;

AND THAT staff be directed to submit the Source Protection Plan with proposed amendments to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, together with the resolutions passed by the municipal councils and written comments received during the consultation period.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Carl Seider
Project Manager
Drinking Water Source Protection
REPORT #6c

TO: SAUGEEN VALLEY SOURCE PROTECTION AUTHORITY

DATE: MARCH 31, 2016

RE: SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN PROPOSED AMENDMENT
RIPLEY WELL

Funding has been identified in the Drinking Water Source Protection program 2016/2017 Grant Funding Agreement to conduct a technical study for a new municipal drinking water well in the community of Ripley located in the Township of Huron-Kinloss.

Under the Clean Water Act, 2006, the identification of wellhead protection areas are required for existing and planned municipal drinking water systems. An Environmental Assessment for the Ripley well was completed in 2014 and it is anticipated that the new well will come into production within the next few years.

The results of this technical study would be used as the basis for delineation of the Wellhead Protection Area around the well and result in a subsequent amendment to the Source Protection Plan for the Saugeen, Grey Sauble and Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region.

RECOMMENDATION:

WHEREAS: Under Section 34(1) of the Clean Water Act, 2006, a source protection authority may propose an amendment to a source protection plan;

THAT: pending approval of the 2016/2017 Grant Funding Agreement with the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, Drinking Water Source Protection Staff is directed to work with the Township of Huron-Kinloss to prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a groundwater study to delineate the Wellhead Protection Area related to the new drinking water well in Ripley.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Seider
Project Manager
Drinking Water Source Protection