

Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan (HH RAP) Beneficial Uses

i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii	xiii	xiv
---	----	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---	----	-----	------	-----

RESTRICTIONS ON WILDLIFE CONSUMPTION



STATUS

2002 Status (wildlife)	Impaired	Requires Further Assessment	Not Impaired
2012 Status (wildlife)	Impaired	Requires Further Assessment	Not Impaired

APPROVED BY 2012 RAP STAKEHOLDER FORUM:

- Beneficial Use i status regarding wildlife consumption remain "requires further assessment".
- Beneficial Use i delisting objective wording regarding wildlife consumption remain the same:
Beneficial Use i (wildlife) will be considered not impaired when there are no restrictions on consumption of wildlife from the Harbour attributable to local sources.

2002 HH RAP Delisting Objective:

That there be no restrictions on consumption of fish and wildlife from the Harbour attributable to local sources.

Why Keep the 2002 Status and HH Wording?

Wildlife Population Levels: One of the reasons current wildlife consumption levels are low is that the populations of wildlife traditionally hunted are quite small. Recovery of wildlife populations are anticipated due to the efforts of the HH RAP and safe consumption should remain part of that recovery. By requesting "requires further assessment" the HH RAP would be looking to the future of hunting to return as a beneficial use for this area.

Desire for Hunting: RBG staff report there is a segment of the local population who would like to be able to hunt again in Hamilton Harbour/Cootes Paradise.

Hunting Restrictions: The City of Hamilton and the City of Burlington both have by-laws in place which prohibit the discharge of a firearm or bow within the limits of their cities. The RBG controls the bed of Cootes Paradise and they have a by-law making it unlawful for people to "...kill any bird, animal, vertebrate or invertebrate" within the limits of the Gardens. There is apparently a historical Hamilton Harbour Commissioners (now Hamilton Port Authority) restriction on firearm discharge on the Harbour, but it was not located.

Wildlife Flesh Testing: In 1990 Canadian Wildlife Service released non-flying, farm-raised ducks into HH CDFs and tested the flesh after 10, 30 and 70 days after release. All ducks collected had PCB concentrations exceeding Health and Welfare Canada guidelines for edible poultry. As a result, actions were taken to discourage the use of CDFs by waterfowl.

Consumption Guidelines: There are no current Ontario or Canada guidelines for determining safe wildlife consumption. Health Canada does have edible poultry guidelines which maybe could be consulted.

Remedial Actions: No further remedial actions beyond those already in the works for other Beneficial Uses were envisioned to address this issue.

Monitoring: It would be practical to look to monitor species already studied for other purposes, for example, herring gulls, turtles, and mink. If contaminant levels in the flesh of these animals were found to be safe for human consumption, other "consumption desirable" resident wildlife should also be safe too (e.g. mallards, scaups, Canada Geese).

Dilemma: Do not want to give the impression that wildlife is safe for consumption. Do not want to give the impression that wildlife hunting is a use most stakeholders want restored.

REFERENCES

Where Can I Learn More?

City of Hamilton. 2005. By-Law No. 05-114. Discharge of Firearms By-law. <http://www.hamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/6B512F07-8535-4A14-AC46-D24735E4AD6F/0/05114.pdf>

Gebauer, M.B. and D.V. Weseloh. 1993. Accumulation of Organic Contaminants in Sentinel Mallards Utilizing Confined Disposal Facilities at Hamilton Harbour, Lake Ontario, Canada. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 25: 234-243

City of Burlington. 1991. By-Law 83-1991. A by-law to regulate or prohibit the discharge of firearms. <http://www.burlington.ca/clerks/by-laws/html/83-1991.htm>

Royal Botanical Gardens. 1989. RBG By-Law No. 01-3_C 3(a).

Most references can be provided by the HH RAP Office as a PDF upon request