



Halton-Hamilton
Source
Protection
Region

MINUTES

HALTON-HAMILTON SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING #7-11

**Dundas Valley Conservation Area, Maplewood Hall
917 Artaban Road, Hamilton, L9H 5E3
September 27, 2011 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm**

SPC Attendees:			
Andrea Doherty	Susan Fielding	Dave Braden	Peter Ashenhurst
Gavin Smuk	Turlough Finan	Paul Attack	Nick DiGirolamo
Doug Cuthbert	Melanie Horton	Barry Lee	David Simpson
Judi Partridge			
Regrets SPC/Other Regrets:			
Teri Yamada	Chris Shrive	Glenn Powell	Bob Edmondson
Kathy Menyes			
Other Attendees:			
Diane Bloomfield Project Manager HHSPR	David King, Health Liaison	Allison Denby, Trans Northern Pipelines Inc.	
Virginia Bancur Project Assistant HHSPR	Wesley Wright, MOE Liaison	Paul Yundt, Sun-Canadian Pipe Line	
Roy Maxwell, Communications Consultant	Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor & Associates		

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
1.	<p>Roll Call & Mileage Doug welcomed everyone. Virginia asked Committee members to sign in and record their mileage. Notification was given that Melanie Horton was given proxy of Teri Yamada; Andrea Doherty was given proxy of Glenn Powell.</p>	
2.	<p>Disclosures of Conflict of Interest None</p>	
3.	<p>Delegations None</p>	
4.	<p>Review of Agenda – Doug Cuthbert</p> <p>The following modifications were made to the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report back from Dave Braden on source protection finances deferred to October 11, 2011 SPC meeting • David Simpson requested that municipal notification letter be added after Item #9 • David Simpson requested that Halton Hills WHPA mapping be added to Item #12 • Discussion on T-49-C moved to follow Item #9 • Report back on policy O-1-S (g) to follow T-49-C <p>Acceptance of Agenda as Amended:</p> <p>HHSPC 11-30 Moved by: Susan Fielding Seconded by: Peter Ashenhurst</p> <p>THAT the agenda be accepted as amended. Carried</p>	Report back from Dave Braden on source protection finances at the October 11 SPC meeting.
5.	<p>Approval of Source Protection Committee Minutes of September 13, 2011 – Doug Cuthbert</p> <p>Gavin Smuk requested changes be made to comments he made Item 8, 9th paragraph, last sentence. – take out “pesticides and”, replace with “or livestock manure”. This was agreed to.</p> <p>Item 8, 8th paragraph, last sentence – take out “there still could a pathway through the soil and rock”, replace with “and is secure or has effective in-situ filtration, there is no pathway for bacteria to reach the water table”. A discussion was held on the above. It was suggested and agreed to leave the last sentence as originally printed but to move it to become a separate paragraph.</p> <p>HHSPC 11-31 Moved by: Judi Partridge Seconded by: Paul Attack</p> <p>THAT the Source Protection Committee minutes of September 13, 2011 be accepted as amended. Carried</p>	
6.	<p>Business Arising From Minutes – September 13, 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suncor Oakville facility has been arranged for October 25. 1 pm will be our meet time. Once the bus is booked, details will be sent to the Committee. 	Staff to send bus trip details to Committee.

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wesley Wright should have an answer by the end of the week if we have to notify the landowners that are in the Halton Hills WHPAs of the updated assessment report. 	MOE to confirm notification of landowners in Halton Hills WHPAs.
7.	<p>Oil Conveyance in Pipelines</p> <p>Allison Denby from Trans Northern Pipelines Inc. (TNPI) with assistance from Paul Yundt from Sun-Canadian Pipe Line presented an overview of oil companies, and preventative measures to avoid pipeline spills.</p> <p>If a pipeline is only in one province, it is regulated by that province's energy board (OEB) and the TSSA. If a company's pipeline crosses a provincial or national border, it is regulated federally by the Canadian Safety Association and the National Energy Board Act. TNPI pipeline runs from Montreal to Nanticoke and therefore is regulated federally. Sun-Canadian is regulated provincially with TSSA regulating day to day operations. All pipeline companies are regulated by CSA Z662.</p> <p>There are approximately 27,000 km of pipelines that the governments monitor. Pipelines carry various products but primarily fuel. This is the safest mode of transportation for fuel.</p> <p>TNPI conducts its own spill scenario modelling to prepare for emergency response. In setting up spill scenarios, they look at modeling time, fluid properties, volume calculations, pipe diameters, product transported – gasoline, diesel fuel, furnace oil, stove oil and jet fuel. Worst case scenarios are modelled individually for each pipeline critical area.</p> <p>TNPI indicated that the scenario modelled by the Lake Ontario Collaborative uses a higher volume of fuel release (3 times) than what is possible from the pipe size they have. Fuel will not drain from the entire pipeline if a rupture occurs. This will depend on hydraulics. Valves are located strategically to control flow and installed closer together when there is a negative angle in the line.</p> <p>An emergency response exercise was completed on September 8 at the Burlington Canal.</p> <p>Q. When pressure and flow are down, do the valves close themselves? A. Valves are either controlled remotely or manually at the site.</p> <p>Preventative maintenance program – includes cathodic corrosion protection, inline inspections for corrosion and defects, rigorous repairs, detailed risk assessments to mitigate risk, plus many supplemental engineering assessments of remaining life and fitness for service. Mandatory annual inspections and NEB will inspect without notice. The company's procedures are audited. There is a legislated integrity manual that must be followed.</p> <p>Sun-Canadian has been audited five times this year – NEB, TSSA, ISO 14001, owners. TNPI has also had NEB audits this year.</p> <p>Maintenance of the pipeline includes: surveillance from the air; physical walks; leak detections; pressure monitoring, line controller testing, energy block valves, pipeline and station maintenance and damage prevention. Companies must have a program in</p>	

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
	<p>place for physical security, risk identification and mitigation measures. Each company has to keep up to date and ready for action if an emergency occurs. It is regulated that the public be made aware and that the pipeline companies work with local agencies.</p> <p>TNPI is in the process of updating their emergency response manual, their agency contacts, and their site specific plans. They have a crisis command plan as well. Qualified contractors are on call for land and water emergency response. They must maintain control points down every river that the pipeline crosses to have access to deploy equipment.</p> <p> Q. Do you know of any oil pipeline ruptures that have had serious impact on municipal water supplies? Where the rupture forced the municipality to substitute water? A. In March 2010, a fuel sheen was found in Bronte Creek. A leak was detected at the top of the Bronte Creek Valley near the Oakville terminal in the TNPI pipe. There was a pinhole leak in a pipe which went undetected for a while. Clean-up is going on. Fuel entered the creek but did not affect the municipal supplies in the lake. Q. How deep are the pipes buried within water bodies? A. In the Burlington Canal, 6 metres deep. In the streams or creeks, pipes are required to be buried at depths of 1.2 metres minimum. Even if a pipe is discontinued, it still needs to be maintained by the pipeline company and kept covered. Q. What is the largest threat to oil pipelines? How does it happen? A. Third party damage is the largest threat. Someone or something hits a pipe and either ruptures it, or if not attended to, corrosion sets in. </p> <p>Pipeline companies work together on public awareness. The pipelines are inspected every 7 years using electronic equipment.</p> <p> Q. Is there a program related to pinhole leaks? A. They would look at areas that have had small leaks before. </p> <p>Allison suggested that a policy could be for increased frequency of inspection of pipe</p>	
8.	<p>Oil Conveyance in Pipelines – Policy discussion Diane Bloomfield Handout – Lake Ontario Draft Policy Discussion (September 27, 2011)</p> <p>Discussion was held on the draft policies written by CTC and TCC to address the threat of oil conveyance in pipelines. The first seven policies on the handout were discussed.</p> <p>Staff will respond to CTC summarizing the discussion held today. All SPC members are requested to read the remainder of the policies on the spreadsheet and to send comments to Diane Bloomfield by Friday.</p> <p>Policy #1. Is there anything to gain from including this policy? MOE and TSSA already have a MOU. Sun-Canadian calls both agencies in the case of an emergency. How would this policy protect the water supply? Our policies should not duplicate what is already in place. After discussion, it was decided that this policy is not needed in our</p>	<p>SPC members to send their comments on the draft policies to Diane by Friday, September 30 for inclusion in a response to CTC.</p>

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
8 cont.	<p>protection plan.</p> <p>Policy #2: A contingency plan would be equivalent to an emergency response plan. These plans already include what is set out in the TCC draft policies. For Hamilton Harbour piping, Sun-Canadian has double walled pipes with remotely activated valves on the sides of the Harbour.</p> <p>Q. Sun-Canadian was asked how many spills occur in a year. R. Paul Yundt responded that they have one reportable spill every two years. A recent spill was 1,000 litres that never left the property.</p> <p>Discussion was held on whether the pipeline company should contact the water operators directly or through Spills Action Centre. The municipal water operator needs to be notified as quickly as possible of a spill to extend response time.</p> <p>It was agreed that pipeline companies should update their emergency response plans to reflect protection of drinking water sources. The proposed Halton-Hamilton policy was agreed to,</p> <p>Policy #3: Is there a need for annual updates? Is new information generated that quickly? Paul Yundt indicated that Sun-Canadian reviews their plans and updates them as needed every three years.</p> <p>It was agreed that this policy is not required.</p> <p>Policy #4: Since our threat is for pipelines that cross open bodies of water, notification of the Conservation Authority does occur if a spill occurs.</p> <p>It was agreed that this policy was not needed.</p> <p>Policy #5: A joint practice exercise is taking place September 29 in the Don Valley using an Enbridge spill scenario of 2,000 m³ to the river. Allison Denby reported that TNPI had a practice exercise at the Burlington Canal on September 8 to practice response. There was a question about whether the exercises were regulated. Staff to follow up with Paul Yundt.</p> <p>Policy #6: Paul Yundt indicated that notification of conservation authorities occurs already.</p> <p>Policy #7 only first part discussed: Already discussed whether the notification to the municipal water operators should be from Spills Action Centre or from the pipeline company.</p>	Staff to follow up with Paul Yundt to determine if the exercises are regulated and completed.

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
9.	<p>Informal pre-consultation with municipalities – September 15, 16 meetings – Ruth Victor</p> <p>Handout – Memo from Ruth Victor and Associates regarding Pre-consultation Meetings, dated September 22, 2011</p> <p>Diane Bloomfield and Ruth Victor met with the staff of City of Hamilton, County of Wellington, the Township of Puslinch, the Region of Halton and the local municipalities to discuss source protection, the policy development process, and draft policies.</p> <p>Hamilton: Hamilton staff will be presenting to General Issues Committee on November 14. Diane will be attendance to assist staff with answering questions.</p> <p>Halton Region: Comments received from Barry Lee at the September 13 meeting of the SPC were discussed with the planners. There was discussion about who should be the implementing body for education and outreach on septic systems. Our policy identifies Halton Region but the local municipalities now have responsibility for septic systems. The Region was selected because they have the expertise re health effects and previously educated the public through their well water information sessions. David Simpson asked to see the revised pre-consultation letter before it is sent to the Clerk.</p>	<p>Staff to send David Simpson a revised draft of the pre-consultation letter to Halton Region.</p>
10.	<p>T-49-C: Gavin Smuk provided rationale for not using prohibition for the threat of farm-animal grazing and pasturing as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Nutrient Management Act prohibits nutrient application 100 m from a municipal well, whether the source is commercial fertilizer or livestock manure. Since “intensive” grazing usually requires the importation of feed, effectively adding nutrients to the grazing area, it could be argued that this management system would violate the NMA. “Extensive” grazing does not add additional nutrients to an area. (While this is not a bacterial consideration, it is a good reason for excluding “intensive” grazing from WHPA-A.) • In some WHPA-As, there are a dozen or so existing septic leaching beds. HHSPC policy accepts that all properly functioning systems may remain in place with inspections, monitoring, and educating owners with best management practices. HHSPC policy also accepts that new systems may be installed in these areas. • HHSPC policy has not acknowledged any other bacterial source as a threat, such as wildlife or companion animals (pets). These are smaller threats, but would be worthy of consideration for highly vulnerable water systems. • OFEC indicates that there is no credible scientific evidence to support the concept that ‘extensive grazing’ poses a chemical (nitrogen or phosphorus) drinking water threat. John Fitzgibbon, from the University of Guelph, presented at a PWG meeting that limited research done on livestock manure bacterial management suggests that managing manure for nitrogen and phosphorus provides adequate bacterial management. • All municipal wells within our regions are either secure, or have effective insitu filtration. There exists a natural barrier that filters and prevents suspended matter (i.e., bacteria or cryptosporidium) from reaching the well screen. • There is some raw water data of Hamilton’s wells published on the internet, and the results show no bacterial problems at any well. Disinfection systems on each well would neutralize small amounts of bacteria if any were to make it into the raw water. • Septic systems emit human pathogens. Wildlife and companion animals can 	

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
	<p>shed pathogenic organisms, and farm livestock can also shed pathogenic bacteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>For policy credibility, all these sources should be managed similarly,</u> prohibition or proper management. <p>It was suggested that policy T-49-C be deleted and that a modified version of T-47-C be used. Limit grazing to low density only.</p> <p>Q. How many farm wells are contaminated by E.coli? A. 40%. Please Note: At the October 11, 2011 SPC meeting, the committee requested additional information on the source and the context of this value for discussion at the November 8, 2011 SPC meeting.</p> <p>Q. Why are we letting grazing near a municipal well if 40% of farm wells are affected. A. Municipal wells are constructed to higher standards than farm wells.</p> <p>Halton has had no adverse reaction to contaminates from cattle or horses grazing.</p> <p>The Risk Management Official can restrict the grazing of animals near a well. He can also state that the well needs to be upgraded.</p> <p>A vote was called for Committee support on the deletion of T-49-C and the use of a modified T-47-C. There were 5 votes against and 9 in favour. 2/3 vote was needed of members present and/or with proxy to change the policy direction. (<i>Following the meeting this vote was discussed with Chris Shrive and he would vote in favour.</i>)</p> <p>Some members in favour of the change in policy support prohibition as the best option to protect the drinking water sources but without compensation for the landowner they cannot support the policy.</p> <p>Instead of allowing pasturing and grazing because septic systems are allowed (two wrongs), we should revisit the science and policies for septic systems in the vulnerable areas. There is a chance that the quality of a water source could be affected by grazing animals and therefore we should be protecting that water source through policy. This is Turlough's area of expertise and he was requested to review the threat of septic systems and report back to the Committee at the October 11 meeting.</p> <p>The province is not willing to compensate homeowners for septic systems but there are other avenues where compensation is available. The MOE has appointed one person to review these areas post 2012.</p>	Turlough Finan to review septic system risks and report back at the October 11 SPC meeting.
11.	<p>IPZ-3 policies – bulk fuel storage, wastewater treatment plants, CTC policy directions – Diane Bloomfield</p> <p>Deferred to next meeting.</p>	SPC members to review spreadsheet distributed and provide comments on draft CTC policies to Diane Bloomfield by Friday September 30 for a response back to CTC.

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
		Discussion deferred to October 11 meeting.
12.	<p>Polices within the Georgetown and Acton wellhead protection areas and issue contributing areas – Ruth Victor</p> <p>Handout – Memo from Ruth Victor and Associates regarding Proposed CTC Policies, dated September 22, 2011</p> <p>Deferred to next meeting.</p> <p>Ruth and Diane will be meeting with CTC and South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe planners on Thursday September 29 and would like to share Ruth's memo with them. The Committee agreed to this.</p>	SPC members to review memo prior to October 11 meeting for discussion.
13.	<p>Updated Assessment Reports – Diane Bloomfield</p> <p>Handout – marked up pages of the Assessment Reports with one copy of Appendix G.</p> <p>Appendix G in our reports was written by the Lake Ontario modellers and only a few references to Halton-Hamilton have been added. Comments were received from Peter Ashenhurst primarily on Appendix G. One clarification was provided for the use of the term "high water mark" in the report. Peter indicated that only tidal waters have a high water mark. The write-up copies the requirements from the Technical Rules: Assessment Report which includes the use of this term.</p> <p>Following endorsement by the SPC, the updated Assessment Reports will be posted on our website and notices sent to those who will be affected by the changes made. MOE is to let Diane know if we have to consult with landowners in the Georgetown area when CTC has already done this and with the proposed new wellhead protection areas these landowners will change. Discussion on comments received during the 30 day comment period will occur at the November 8 meeting and then we will require approval to submit the updated reports to the Source Protection Authority for submission to the Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>David Simpson indicated that there is confusing information in Appendix G for the modelled duration of the disinfection failure at the wastewater treatment plants. Diane will follow up. David will e-mail Diane comments he has received. David requested that the same Georgetown WHPA maps be used in the Halton-Hamilton and CVC reports. Staff reported the Georgetown WHPA is the same in both reports however the CVC report also identifies the issue contributing area.</p> <p>HHSPC 11-32 Moved by: Peter Ashenhurst Seconded by: Gavin Smuk</p> <p>THAT, the Halton-Hamilton Source Protection Committee endorse the amendments to the Assessment Reports and approve release of the documents to the stakeholders for a 30-day consultation period.</p>	Carried
14.	<p>Draft Source Protection Plans – Diane Bloomfield</p> <p>Hand out – Draft Source Protection Plan for Halton Region Source Protection Area</p>	SPC members to review the text of the draft Source Protection Plan for

ITEM	TOPIC/DISCUSSION	ACTION REQUIRED
	Hard copies of the draft Source Protection Plan for the Halton Region Source Protection Area were distributed. The text in the introduction of the document has been reviewed by the Communications Sub-Committee. All SPC members are now requested to review the introductory text prior to the policies and the appendices afterward for discussion at the October 11, 2011 SPC meeting. If anyone has questions or comments prior to this time please contact Diane.	discussion at the October 11 SPC meeting.
15.	<p>Other Business – All</p> <p>Wesley Wright will check on timing for review of updated CVC assessment report.</p> <p>David Simpson – Halton Region would like the same Georgetown WHPA mapping to be included in both the CVC and the Halton-Hamilton Assessment Reports. Halton Region hydrogeologist has indicated that the new delineation will not likely be completed in time for inclusion in our updated report.</p>	Wesley Wright to check with MOE about timing of review of updated CVC Assessment Report.
16.	<p>Comments from Attending Public</p> <p>None</p>	
17.	<p>Adjournment – Doug Cuthbert</p> <p>HHSPC 11-33 Moved by: Judi Partridge Seconded by: Dave Braden</p> <p>THAT, the Halton-Hamilton Source Protection Committee meeting be adjourned.</p>	Carried
18.	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Tuesday, October 11 Hearth Room, Halton Regional Museum, 5181 Kelso Road, Milton L9T 2X7, starting at 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm</p>	

Minutes prepared by: Virginia Bancur