

Halton-Hamilton Source Protection Committee Meeting October 5, 2021

Agenda Item #5

Action Items (June 15, 2021) Follow up

No.	Action Item from SPC meeting (date)	Follow up by HHSPR
1	Staff will work with the City of Hamilton and County of Wellington to refine numbers for the Freerton WHPA before pre-consultation, especially dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) and fuel threats.	Complete. Refined significant threat counts are reflected in the updated Assessment Reports.
2	Gavin Smuk asked about Carlisle WHPA livestock density calculations, as he would like to see the data about how the number of livestock was generated. There is a concern that buildings are counted rather than the actual animals. Staff confirmed the numbers were based on a desktop analysis using 2019 orthophotography and by applying the OMAFRA method for livestock density calculations for each property. This may not capture the actual number of animals on the land and field verification work is not being carried out at this time. Staff will follow up with the committee this week on the desktop calculations to confirm them.	Complete. Senior Manager Chitra Gowda met with agriculture sector rep Gavin Smuk and Chair Bob Edmondson on July 2021. The methodology was explained and the MECP technical bulletin including the table of estimated nutrient unit was reviewed. SPC Business Report 21-10-02 (October 2021) documents further actions planned.
3	Chitra went through the significant threats table for all WHPAs in the Halton Region Assessment Report, page 276. Staff are preparing the draft assessment reports for the purpose of early engagement. There might be an opportunity to refine the properties identified with the municipalities. Dan Banks suggested working	Complete. Refined significant threat counts are reflected in the updated Assessment Reports.

	together on threats verification to refine the counts over the next few weeks and Chitra agreed.	
4	Chitra thanked Christopher Murray for providing formatting suggestions. These include moving the current preambles to a new “Additional Notes” section at the bottom of the policy tables. By consensus from the committee, this change will be made to the table format	Complete. Notes section is added to the updated policy format in the Source Protection Plan.
5	By consensus, the committee agreed to edit the Legal effect row in the policy tables to cover <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) each of the main policy parts’ legal effects and compliance lists b) the monitoring policy part to be mentioned in brackets without the need to specify legal effect. 	Complete. Reflected in the updated policy format of each policy in the Source Protection Plan.
6	Staff will add “Education and Outreach” to T-47-C – Policy tool Section of the policy table.	Complete. Reflected in the updated Source Protection Plan.
7	Chris Murray noted that O. Reg 406/19 Excess Soils Regulation came into effect since the policy O-4-S was last updated and asked if there was a need to reference that regulation. Tea Pesheva will discuss with her policy team and follow up with Chitra	Complete. This text was added to the Explanatory Document (page 253 in tracked changes version): “O. Reg. 406/19 On-Site and Excess Soil Regulation (under the Environmental Protection Act): On January 1, 2021, phase one of Ontario’s On-Site and Excess Soil Regulation O. Reg. 406/19, came into force. Through it, the province regulates soil reuse to responsibly dispose of contaminated soil and also decrease the amount of clean excess soil entering landfills as waste. “Excess soil” means soil, or soil mixed with rock, that has been excavated as part of a project and removed from the project area for the project”.

8	<p>Councillor Partridge requested the proper definition of excess soil and fill. She pointed out that contaminated fill is an issue in some parts of the region and that the intent of the policy to address this should be retained. Christopher Murray confirmed that per O. Reg 406, “excess soil” means “soil, or soil mixed with rock, that has been excavated as part of a project and removed from the project area for the project”. Chitra advised staff will investigate definitions and bring it back to the committee.</p>	<p>In progress. In the Source Protection Plan, the phrase “imported fill” is retained to address the comment. The phrase “disposal <u>or use of</u>” imported fill is also now used (i.e. “use” is added). However, the notes section refers to “soil”, and terminology needs to be made consistent.</p> <p>In the Explanatory Document, this text is retained: “Fill refers to a variety of materials that are not native to a property and are typically used to alter the elevation of the ground surface. Fill normally comprises earth and rock, but broken asphalt, concrete and boulders may be used. Depending on the purpose of fill placement, the properties of the fill may be strictly controlled. Imported fill is materials brought from another property. It can be excess soil or demolition debris from development sites or construction projects”.</p> <p>Discussion: “excess soil” may not intuitively capture the intent of managing contaminated fill. Explore harmonizing the definitions and check that the intent of the policy is retained.</p>
9	<p>Dan Banks will check on how the municipality converts biosolids to pellets and provide information to the CA.</p>	<p>Complete. Reflected in the updated Assessment Reports.</p>