

# 2017 Annual Progress Reporting Supplemental Form Kettle Creek

## Monitoring Policy Implementation - Question 1a, 1b

### Question 1a

Did all implementing bodies (IBs) submit a status update/report to the SPA for the reporting periods noted below?

| MONITORING POLICY REPORTING PERIOD                                  | Yes | No | If no, how many implementing bodies did not submit their status updates? |
|---|-----|----|--|
| Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year)     | ✓   |    |  |
| Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1) | ✓   |    |  |
| Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2) | ✓   |    |  |
| Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3) |     |    |  |

### Question 1b

Complete the table below to indicate which implementing body(ies) did not submit a status update/monitoring policy report and the reason(s) for not submitting. Insert additional rows as needed.

|        | Name of Implementing Body | Explanation |
|--------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Year 1 | N/A                       |             |
| Year 2 | N/A                       |             |
| Year 3 | N/A                       |             |
| Year 4 |                           |             |

## Implementation status of SPP policies - Question 2

### Question 2a

Table 1. Implementation status of policies that address *significant* drinking water threat activities.

| Implementation Status Category                  | Response Values | Percentage of Plan Policies |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Implemented                                     | 12              | 43%                         |
| No further action required                      | 0               |                             |
| In progress / some progress made                | 7               | 25%                         |
| No progress made                                | 0               |                             |
| No information available / no response received | 2               | 7%                          |
| No response required / not applicable           | 7               | 25%                         |
| Total   | 28              | 100%                        |

Table 3. Implementation status of policies (i.e., transport pathway, general education & outreach (E&O), some specify action, etc.) *not* directly associated with addressing specific drinking water threat activities.

| Implementation Status Category                  | Response Values | Percentage of Plan Policies |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Implemented                                     | 4               | 50%                         |
| No further action required                      | 0               |                             |
| In progress / some progress made                | 3               | 38%                         |
| No progress made                                | 0               |                             |
| No information available / no response received | 0               |                             |
| No response required / not applicable           | 1               | 12%                         |
| Total   | 8               | 100%                        |

\* Table 2. “ Implementation status of policies that address *moderate-low* drinking water threat activities”, not applicable.

### Question 2b

Summarize the reasons for results recorded above as being "No progress made" and/or "No information available/no response received" by the dates specified in your source protection plan for significant drinking water threat activities (Table 1) and for any moderate/low threat policies that used prescribed instruments and *Planning Act* tools by completing the table below with the following details. Insert additional rows as needed.

| Policy ID     | Implementing Body              | Explanation of why actions were not taken by the person(s) or bod(ies) | Outline Next Steps   |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| KCSPA-NB-1.14 | Central Elgin, Municipality of | MOE SAC update emergency contacts and mapping updated                  | Follow up with SAC to ensure mapping and contacts are up to date |
| BE-MC-3.2     | Central Elgin, Municipality of | MOE ECA for waste disposal sites, and Sewage Systems                   | Monitor  |

**Part IV - Questions 3 - 10**

**Question 3a**

If applicable to the SPR/A, complete the table below for risk management plans (RMPs) established.

| Total number of RMPs agreed to/established within the SPR/A since effective date of the SPP (i.e., cumulative total) (Column A) | Number of RMPs agreed to or established within the SPR/A (for existing and future threats) during the reporting period (i.e., annual total)(Column B) | Total number of properties (i.e., parcels) with RMPs agreed to or established since the effective date of the SPP (Column C) |
|---|---|--|
| 1   | 1   | 1  |

**Question 3b**

How many existing\* significant drinking water threats have been managed through the established RMPs, since the SPP took effect? (\*meaning engaged in OR enumerated as existing significant threats)

Response: 1

**Question 5**

How many section 59 notices were issued in this reporting period for:

i) activities to which neither a prohibition (section 57) nor a risk management plan (section 58) policy applied, as per ss. 59(2)(a) of the CWA?

Response: 0

ii) activities to which a risk management plan (section 58) policy applied, as per ss. 59(2)(b) of the CWA?

Response: 0

**Question 6**

The number of notices given TO the risk management official under subsections 61 (2), (7) and (10).

Response: 0

**Question 7a**

i) How many, if any, inspections (including any follow-up site visits) were carried out for activities (existing or future) that are prohibited under section 57 of the CWA?;

Response: 0

ii) How many properties (i.e., parcels) had inspections for the purposes of section 57?

Response: 0

**Question 7b**

The number of those cases in which the person was carrying out an activity in contravention of subsection 57 (1) of the Act.

Response: 0

**Question 8**

How many existing significant drinking water threats have been prohibited as a result of section 57 prohibitions since the plan took effect (i.e., the cumulative count)?

Response: 0

**Question 9a**

i) What is the total number of inspections (including any follow-up site visits) that were carried out for activities that require a RMP under section 58 of the CWA?

Response: 0

ii) How many properties (i.e., parcels) had inspections for the purposes of section 58?

Response: 0

**Question 9b**

i) The number of those cases in which the person was carrying out an activity in contravention of subsection 58 (1) of the Act.

Response: 0

ii) The number of those cases in which the person was not complying with a risk management plan agreed to or imposed under section 58 of the Act.

Response: 0

**Question 9c**

Where there were cases of non-compliance with RMPs, describe, in general terms, how these cases were resolved.

Response: There were no cases of non-compliance with RMPs.

**Prescribed Instruments - Integration and Conformity - Questions 11 - 18**

**Question 11**

Indicate the specific measures that provincial ministries have taken/are taking to integrate source protection into the business processes of their respective program areas associated with PIs.

| <b>Business Processes</b>   | <b>MOECC: Waste disposal – landfilling &amp; storage</b> | <b>MOECC: Sewage Works/ Wastewater</b> | <b>MOECC: Pesticides</b> | <b>MOECC: Water Takings</b> | <b>MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids</b> | <b>MOECC: Municipal water licences/works permits</b> | <b>OMAFRA: Nutrient Management</b> | <b>MNRF: Aggregates – Fuel storage</b> | <b>MTO: Aggregates – Fuel storage</b> |
|---|--|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Relevant staff training on source protection related to PIs including inspections                               | YES  | YES                                    | YES                      | YES                         | YES                                   | YES  | YES                                | YES                                    | YES                                   |
| Guidance documents (e.g., standard operating policy/procedures) available to align with new program changes for | YES  | YES                                    | YES                      | YES                         | YES                                   | YES  | NO                                 | YES                                    | YES                                   |

|   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| source protection for reference by ministry staff   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Screening process in place to identify incoming PI applications potentially affected by SPP policies  | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| Information or other support tools created and/or made available to external stakeholders (i.e. applicants) to inform them that restrictions may result from source protection policies, so that potential impacts can be | YES | YES | YES | NO  | YES | YES | YES | NO  | YES |

|   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| considered in advance of making an application  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| System in place to track the PIs that are subject to SPP policies                                       | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| Process in place to map or otherwise geo-reference PIs that are subject to PI policies                  | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| Protocol in place to review previously issued (i.e., existing) PIs potentially affected by SPP policies | YES | YES |     | YES |     | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| Other changes made to business processes.   | YES | NO  | NO  | YES | YES | YES | YES | NO  | YES |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Provide a brief description:</b>             |  |
| MOECC: Waste Disposal – Landfilling and Storage | For details on internal business process changes and tracking of prescribed instruments for this program area, see Questions 2-6 in Section 1.   |
| MOECC: Water Takings                            | The ministry has a centralized data system (Integrated Divisional System - IDS), which is an integrated information repository to record, process, review and approve Prescribed Instrument applications. The ministry has a project underway to develop a new Information Technology Platform for electronic applications. The proposed source protection-related data input fields for approvals will allow for streamlined tracking of the prescribed instruments that are subject to source protection plan policies. The project is expected to be implemented in 2018. Source protection water quantity vulnerable area data has recently been made available with the Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division of the ministry. Sites with active water taking permits within source protection water quantity vulnerable areas will be identified and compliance inspections will be planned based on risk analysis during Year-Start Planning process for FY 2018-19. The ministry has a Source Water Protection Information Atlas, including a mapping tool, in Geocortex platform that will allow staff to search a location for source protection water quantity vulnerability and follow the links to source protection plan policies and threats tool to find out if water taking is a drinking water threat and need to be managed using Permits To Take Water. Source protection layers have also been added to regional ArcGIS. The ministry has provided access and training to technical staff regarding the map tools and the Tier 3 water budget so that they have better understanding of the Tier 3 Water Budget and local risk assessment results. The ministry also plans to develop guidance material for proponents and qualified persons about using the source protection water budget science (including the input data, model and results) in their preparation of applications and for the Permit To Take Water decision-making process, particularly those for higher risk groundwater takings. In April 2016, the ministry developed a new Standard Operating Policy (SOP #PTTW-SP-PI-02) that updated the Standard Operating Policy that took effect January 2015. A summary of the ministry’s Standard Operating Policies was published on the EBR in April 2015 (EBR #012-2968) and continues to be available. While the Standard Operating Policies summary from 2015 noted the ministry had determined instrument changes were not required to address the Permit To Take Water instrument policies, this new Standard Operating Policy provides staff with direction and guidance to screen/review/amend/approve previously issued (i.e., existing) and new Permit To Take Water applications to conform with the source protection plan prescribed instrument policies where a water taking is or would be a significant water quantity threat (SDWT). To |



|   |   |  |                          |                             |                                       |  |                                    |  |                                       |
|---|---|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
|   | operationalize the Standard Operating Policy, the ministry initiated a training program in September 2016.  |  |                          |                             |                                       |  |                                    |  |                                       |
| MOECC: Hauled Sewage/Biosolids                | Since 2015 every hauled sewage site and biosolids site (aka processed organic waste) application submitted to MOECC District/Area offices has undergoing Source Protection Screening. Internal staff training, data tracking and program support materials have been developed and deployed for appropriate staff directly involved in screening and Environmental Compliance Approval review/approval activities. Other program upgrades are in development and are being/will be deployed in 2018 for external stakeholder use including updated application forms and guides and a new on-line Environmental Compliance Approval application platform. The Source Water Protection Information Atlas is available for external stakeholder use on the Ministry's public web site.  |  |                          |                             |                                       |  |                                    |  |                                       |
| MOECC: Municipal water licences/works permits | Approvals & Licensing Staff in the Environmental Assessment and Permissions Branch (policy, review engineers) have all attended source protection training and are updated on source protection matters during regularly scheduled staff meetings. MOECC has built and provided province wide staff access to an online internal source protection resource library, where they can access source protection policies, protocols, legislation, plans, contacts, guidance and support. For Prescribed Instrument conformity, the Ministry has undertaken an exercise to identify all high risk fuel storage and handling associated with municipal residential drinking water systems. Through this review, the ministry identified 15 licenced municipal drinking water systems that include fuel handling and storage that is a significant drinking water threat. By the end of 2017, the MOECC amended the Municipal Drinking Water Licences for each of these systems to include new conditions that address the fuel storage risk. |  |                          |                             |                                       |  |                                    |  |                                       |
| OMAFRA: Nutrient Management                   | Other changes made: approvals process revised to delegate letter of conformity preparation for instruments not approved by OMAFRA to certified person.  |  |                          |                             |                                       |  |                                    |  |                                       |
|   | <b>MOECC: Waste disposal – landfilling &amp; storage</b>  | <b>MOECC: Sewage Works/ Wastewater</b> | <b>MOECC: Pesticides</b> | <b>MOECC: Water Takings</b> | <b>MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids</b> | <b>MOECC: Municipal water licences/works permits</b> | <b>OMAFRA: Nutrient Management</b> | <b>MNRF: Aggregates – Fuel storage</b> | <b>MTO: Aggregates – Fuel storage</b> |
| No changes made.                              | NO  | NO                                     | YES                      | YES                         | NO                                    | NO   | NO                                 | NO                                     | NO                                    |

|   |  |            |          |  |            |            |            |            |            |
|---|--|------------|----------|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <p>If no changes made to business processes to integrate source protection, please explain the reason(s):</p> | <p>N/A</p>   | <p>N/A</p> | <p>.</p> |  | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>MOECC: Pesticides</p>  | <p>Measures were implemented in 2015. Changes to the ministry's centralized data system (Integrated Divisional System - IDS) for Pesticide Permit module were completed in 2017. This includes Source Protection Plan specific selections to facilitate extracting relevant source protection information from pesticide inspection reports. The modifications will enable automated tracking/reporting capabilities</p>   |            |          |  |            |            |            |            |            |
| <p>MOECC: Water Takings</p>   | <p>The ministry has a centralized data system (Integrated Divisional System - IDS), which is an integrated information repository to record, process, review and approve Prescribed Instrument applications. The ministry has a project underway to develop a new Information Technology Platform for electronic applications. The proposed source protection-related data input fields for approvals will allow for streamlined tracking of the prescribed instruments that are subject to source protection plan policies. The project is expected to be implemented in 2018. Source protection water quantity vulnerable area data has recently been made available with the Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division of the ministry. Sites with active water taking permits within source protection water quantity vulnerable areas will be identified and compliance inspections will be planned based on risk analysis during Year-Start Planning process for FY 2018-19. The ministry has a Source Water Protection Information Atlas, including a mapping tool, in Geocortex platform that will allow staff to search a location for source protection water quantity vulnerability and follow the links to source protection plan policies and threats tool to find out if water taking is a drinking water threat and need to be managed using Permits To Take Water. Source protection layers have also been added to regional ArcGIS. The ministry has provided access and training to technical staff regarding the map tools and the Tier 3 water budget so that they have better understanding of the Tier 3 Water Budget and local risk assessment results. The ministry also plans to develop guidance material for proponents and qualified persons about using the source protection water budget science (including the input data, model and results) in their preparation of applications and for the Permit To Take Water decision-making process, particularly those for higher risk groundwater takings. In April 2016, the ministry developed a new Standard Operating Policy (SOP #PTTW-SP-PI-02) that updated the Standard Operating Policy that took effect January 2015. A summary of the ministry's Standard Operating Policies was published on the EBR in April 2015 (EBR #012-2968) and continues to be available. While</p> |            |          |  |            |            |            |            |            |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>the Standard Operating Policies summary from 2015 noted the ministry had determined instrument changes were not required to address the Permit To Take Water instrument policies, this new Standard Operating Policy provides staff with direction and guidance to screen/review/amend/approve previously issued (i.e., existing) and new Permit To Take Water applications to conform with the source protection plan prescribed instrument policies where a water taking is or would be a significant water quantity threat (SDWT). To operationalize the Standard Operating Policy, the ministry initiated a training program in September 2016.</p> |
|--|--|

**Question 12**

Provide a brief description of each provincial ministry’s process for ensuring PI decisions for incoming PI applications (new or amendments) conform with the significant drinking water threat PI policies applicable to each SPR/A (i.e., a description of the screening process in place) in the table below.

| <b>Ministry Program Area</b>                                 | <b>Description</b>   |
|--|--|
| <p>MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage</p> | <p>Since May 2015, the ministry has been screening environmental compliance approval (ECA) applications for waste disposal site activities to determine if the activity is located in an area where the activity could be a significant drinking water threat. This is called the primary screening. The vulnerable areas are the following: A wellhead protection area or intake protection zone with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher, an issues contributing area, or an event-based area. If any of the above criteria apply, the ECA application is flagged for a more detailed secondary screening to determine if the activity associated with the application is a significant drinking water threat. If yes, the appropriate standard operating policy (SOP) is applied. As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a prescribed instrument to prohibit an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an instrument for the activity. It should be noted that an ECA application may also be refused for reasons outside of source protection policies. Where a source protection plan policy outcome is to manage the activity for a waste disposal site, the ministry will conform to the policy by continuing to apply protective requirements under the Environmental Protection Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, and existing regulations, policies, and guidelines. New waste disposal ECAs include stringent terms and conditions that consider the protection of drinking water sources, such as requirements for: - buffer lands, and appropriate setbacks from wellheads or intake zones; - financial assurance (for privately owned sites) to ensure that if a proponent is unable or unwilling to meet their responsibilities for the site or if the site is abandoned, the site is properly closed and maintained to ensure it does not pose a risk to the environment, including drinking water sources. In addition to the SOP, we have provided detailed guidance to affected municipalities Source Protection Information Bulletin: Environmental Compliance Approvals for Waste Disposal Sites (2015). The</p> |

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                       | <p>ministry emailed this draft information bulletin to municipalities affected by source protection plans in early June, 2015. A public version of all MOECC program area SOPs was posted on the EBR on April 1, 2015 under EBR #012-2968.</p>  |
| <p>MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater</p> | <p>Since January 2015, every application for a new or amended prescribed instrument goes through a primary screening to determine if the activity associated with the application is located in one of the following: A wellhead protection area or intake protection zone with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher, an issues contributing area, or an event-based area. If any of the above criteria apply, the prescribed instrument application is flagged for a more detailed secondary screening to determine if the activity associated with the application is a significant drinking water threat. If yes, the appropriate standard operating policy is applied. As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a prescribed instrument to prohibit an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an instrument for the activity. Source protection policies may be just one of the reasons an application is denied. Where a source protection plan policy outcome is to manage a significant threat to drinking water sources through the prescribed instrument for sewage works, the ministry is meeting the policy's obligations by including design and operational measures in an Environmental Compliance Approval. To assist in the implementation of this approach, anyone subject to policy requiring management of a significant drinking water threat is required to include in their application a description of the measures necessary to protect drinking water and submit a Source Protection Supplementary Report to outline how the activity for the sewage works will be managed so that the activity will not become a significant drinking water threat. As a precautionary and pollution prevention approach is fundamental to the design of all sewage works, additional measures are assessed on a site specific basis. In addition to this, sewage works that pose a significant threat to drinking water which are also eligible for the Transfer of Review Program require that the letter of recommendation from the municipality outline that the works was reviewed in accordance with the Clean Water Act and the local Source Protection Plan and is and will no longer pose a significant threat to drinking water as a result of the measures identified by the proponent and with appropriate ECA terms and conditions, if approved. In addition to the standard operating policies, we have provided detailed guidance to affected municipalities Source Protection Information Bulletin: Environmental Compliance Approvals for Sewage Works (2015). The ministry emailed this draft information bulletin to municipalities affected by source protection plans in early June, 2015. A public version of all MOECC program area standard operating policies was posted on the Environmental Registry on April 1, 2015 under EBR #012-2968.</p> |
| <p>MOECC: Pesticides</p>              | <p>Since January 2015, every application for a new or amended prescribed instrument goes through a primary screening to determine if the activity associated with the application is located in one of the following: A land application of pesticides in a source protection area that includes any of the pesticide ingredients from the Tables of Drinking Water Threats under the Clean Water Act, 2006, A wellhead</p>   |

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
|                                       | <p>protection area or intake protection zone with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher, If any of the above criteria apply, the prescribed instrument application is flagged for a more detailed secondary screening to determine if the activity associated with the application is a significant drinking water threat. If yes, the appropriate standard operating policy is applied. As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a prescribed instrument for implementation prohibits an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an instrument for the activity. Source protection policies may be just one of the reasons an application is denied. When issuing pesticide permits for the application of pesticides on land in areas where this activity would be considered a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is including the following terms and conditions as per the standard operating policy: ensure the permit includes appropriate terms and conditions that address emergency response measures and spill contingency plans for any pesticide mixing, loading, and handling related to the proposed pesticide treatment which are protective of drinking water sources ensure the permit includes applicable terms and conditions related to site specific setbacks to watercourses, timing restrictions (including consideration of weather events) and spills/runoff management or other measures necessary to manage the significant threat activity in order to protect sources of drinking water.</p> |
| <p>MOECC: Water Taking</p>            | <p>As part of the current Permit To Take Water review and decision making process, the ministry is using the best available science to assess the sustainability and potential impacts to municipal drinking water systems, other users, and the natural and built environments. The ministry is working to fully operationalize the new Standard Operating Policy. As per the Standard Operating Policy, the ministry staff are required to consider the information and conclusions of Tier 3 Water Budgets in addition to the site specific technical information provided in the support of the application for the purposes of incorporating Source Protection Plan policies into the Permit To Take Water review and decision making process.</p>  |
| <p>MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids</p> | <p>Since January 2015, every application received by MOECC District/Area offices for a new or amended hauled sewage or biosolid spreading site prescribed instrument goes through a source protection screening performed Southwest Region staff to determine if the activity associated with the application is located in any of the following areas where the land application and/or storage of hauled sewage or Processed Organic Waste could be considered to be a significant drinking water threat, this includes sites located within: A wellhead protection area with vulnerability score of 10, an intake protection zone with vulnerability score of 8 or higher an issues contributing area linked to pathogens, phosphorus or nitrates If necessary, the prescribed instrument undergoes a more detailed screening (performed by southwest region or Source Protection Programs Branch) to help confirm the potential threat level of the operation at the site in question. Once the appropriate potential threat classification is determined the applicable standard operating policy is applied. As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a waste disposal site prescribed instrument issued under the Environmental Protection Act for implementation prohibits an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an approval for the activity in that area. Source protection policies may be just one of the reasons an application is denied. Note that an approval may still be issued for those portions of the site where the activity is not considered to be a significant drinking water threat. For applications proposing to apply or dispose of untreated hauled sewage (e.g. waste from septic tanks and holding tanks, etc.) to land in areas where this activity would be a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is not issuing an approval, even if a source protection plan policy allows for managing the threat through the environmental compliance approval. Note that an approval may still be issued for those portions of the site where the activity is not considered to be a significant drinking water threat. MOECC is responsible for regulating the land application of Processed Organic Waste (e.g. digested sewage biosolids, processed organic food waste, pulp and paper biosolids, off-spec composts and other organic wastes etc) on non-agricultural sites. At these sites, Processed Organic Waste storage and land application is regulated with an Organic Soil Conditioning Site environmental compliance approval issued under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act. To be consistent with O. Reg. 267/03 under the Nutrient Management Act, for applications seeking to store or land apply biosolids within 100 metres of a municipal well, the ministry is not issuing any approval for the land application or storage of this material regardless of the policy in the local source protection plan. Outside this zone, where the policy outcome is to manage the threat, MOECC is taking a local approach to any approvals for the land application or storage of this material.</p> |
| <p>MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits (Fuel storage)</p> | <p>Applications are screened to determine if fuel storage or handling activities are being proposed or altered. Such applications are reviewed in detail to ensure conformance with significant drinking water threat policies. In addition, where fuel storage and handling has been identified as significant threat in a drinking water system and conditions have been added to the prescribed instrument (municipal drinking water licence), all applications received for that system are screened in detail to ensure that fuel storage and handling activities remain in conformance with significant drinking water threat policies.</p>  |
| <p>OMAFRA: Nutrient Management</p>   | <p>Each new prescribed instrument application and application for amendment to exiting prescribed instruments that is received goes through a detailed screening for source water protection policies. The farm has a municipal tax roll number associated with it that is searched using a Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping application. Once the farm is located, several source water protection layers are turned on to determine if any policies apply to the area. If not, the review carries on as normal. If policies may apply then the vulnerability score is determined to see if the activity is a significant drinking water threat, and if so, we determine what policies apply and add applicable conditions, if necessary, to the prescribed instrument approval.</p>   |
| <p>MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel</p>  | <p>MNRF Aggregate Inspectors have received an overview of Source Protection and applicable Source Protection policies and have been instructed to screen new applications and amendments using the mapping tool developed by MOECC. To ensure decisions made on PI</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>storage)</p>  | <p>applications conform with significant drinking water threats policies, all new aggregate licence and permit applications submitted to MNRF must be circulated to the Upper and Lower Tier Municipality for review and comment. In addition, all new licence applications must be circulated to the local Conservation Authority for review and comment. All new aggregate licences and permits issued since 1997 contain conditions prescribed in regulation that require a Spills Contingency Program to be developed prior to site preparation and that all fuel storage tanks must be installed and maintained in accordance with the Liquid Fuels Handling Code. All new aggregate licences and permits must also identify the location of existing and proposed fuel storage areas on the site plan. In addition, the site plans also identify the elevation of the water table and regulate extraction depths. All new aggregate licence and permit applications that propose to extract below the water table must complete a Hydrogeological Level 1 Report to determine the potential for adverse effects to groundwater and surface water resources and their uses. If the results of the Level 1 Report identify a potential for adverse effects, an impact assessment (Hydrogeological Level 2 Report) is required to demonstrate the significance of the effect and feasibility of mitigation. A Hydrogeological Level 2 Report must be completed by a qualified person and address the items specified in the Aggregate Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards (e.g. water wells, groundwater aquifers, springs, surface water courses and bodies). Monitoring programs or mitigation measures identified in the technical reports are written into the site plan to ensure their implementation and enforceability. A new licence or permit application in which a Level 2 Hydrogeological Report was completed must be circulated to the MOECC.</p> |
| <p>MTO: Aggregates -road construction (Fuel storage)</p> | <p>For applications that propose to extract material above the water table the permit application process includes the preparation of a water table summary report and/or hydrogeological studies undertaken by a Professional Engineer or Professional Geoscientist. Applications that propose extraction of aggregate material below or near the water table require a Level 1 Hydrogeological Report to determine the potential for adverse effects to groundwater and surface water resources and their uses. A Level 2 Hydrogeological Report is required if a potential for adverse effects is identified by the Level 1 Report. The Level 2 Report must demonstrate the significance of the effect and feasibility of mitigation, and is completed by a professional that is qualified to address items specified in the Aggregates Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards (AROPS). Any required monitoring programs or mitigation measures that result are incorporated into the site plans. In accordance with the mandatory requirements of the AROPS, all new aggregate and wayside permit applications must be circulated to the Upper and Lower Tier Municipality for review and comment. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is sent those permit applications that require the completion of a Level 2 Hydrogeological Report for review. Feedback provided back to MTO is considered in the application review and approvals process.</p>   |

**Question 13**

Provide a brief description of the approach each provincial ministry is taking for incoming PI applications (new or amendments) to have regard to any moderate and/or low drinking water threat policies that rely on PIs.

N/A

**Question 14**

Complete the tables below to assist with tracking decisions made on incoming PI applications (new and amendments) for significant drinking water threat activities indicated. The tables below can be completed by the data provided by the applicable ministries through their respective PI electronic/paper reporting forms. The data in the tables are the annual counts of actions taken on incoming applications (i.e., not the cumulative count).

**MOECC: Waste disposal site – landfilling and storage (transfer/processing sites)**

| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
|---|---|--|
| 0   | 0   | 0  |

**MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater**

| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
|---|---|--|
| 0   | 0   | 0  |

**MOECC: Pesticides**

| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
|---|--|--|
| 1   | 0  | 0  |



**MOECC: Water Taking**

| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of PIs issued in WHPA Q1 where SDWT is managed through conditions |
|---|--|
| 0   | 0  |

**MOECC: Hauled Sewage**

| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
|---|--|--|
| 0   | 0  | 0  |

**MOECC: Biosolids (Processed Organic Waste)**

| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
|---|--|--|
| 0   | 0  | 0  |

**MOECC: Municipal Drinking Water Licences and Drinking Water Works Permits (Fuel storage)**

| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions |
|---|---|
| 0   | 0   |

**OMAFRA: Nutrient Management Strategies (NMS)**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
| NULL  | NULL   | NULL   |

**OMAFRA: Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Plans**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
| NULL  | NULL   | NULL   |

**MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Aggregate Licenses (AL)**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
| NULL  | NULL   | NULL   |

**MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Aggregate Permits (AP)**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
| NULL  | NULL   | NULL   |

**MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Wayside Permits (WP)**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
| NULL  | NULL   | NULL   |

**MTO: Aggregates – road construction (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Wayside Permits (WP)**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection | Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions | Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited |
| NULL  | NULL   | NULL   |

**Question 15**

Provide a brief description of each provincial ministry’s process for ensuring PIs that were previously issued or otherwise created before the plan took effect (i.e., existing PIs) conform with the significant drinking water threat policies in the table below.

| <b>MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA</b>                          | <b>DESCRIPTION</b>  |
|---|---|
| MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage | The ministry is currently identifying existing instruments where a waste disposal sites is located in an area that could be a significant drinking water threats activities. If an approved activity is deemed a significant drinking water threat, the ministry will review the activity and the environmental compliance approval to determine if changes are needed to meet the intent of the source protection policies. The ministry addresses drinking water threat activities that are regulated by ministry approvals and permits on a consistent province-wide basis and as such intends to review within 3 years from the time the plan took effect and amended within 12 months of the review, or such other date as the Director determines based on a prioritized review of Environmental Compliance Approvals that govern significant drinking water threat activities. |
| MOECC: Sewage   | Ministry staff have developed a screening process to identify previously issued Environmental Compliance Approvals for sewage works located in vulnerable areas where prescribed instrument policies may apply. If an approved activity is deemed a   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| works/wastewater  | significant drinking water threat, the ministry will review the Environmental Compliance Approval to determine if the terms and conditions of the approval are protective of drinking water sources. If updates to an approval are required, the ministry will contact the owner/operator of the works or site to discuss the next steps. The ministry addresses drinking water threat activities that are regulated by ministry approvals and permits on a province-wide basis and as such intends to review within 3 years from the time the plan took effect and amended within 12 months of the review, or such other date as the Director determines based on a prioritized review of Environmental Compliance Approvals that govern significant drinking water threat activities.  |
| MOECC: Pesticides   |  |
| MOECC: Water Taking   |  |
| MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids  | MOECC Standard Operating Policy for the Permit To Take Water program was developed in 2016. The Standard Operating Policy provides the staff with direction and guidance to screen/review/amend/approve previously issued (i.e., existing) Permits To Take Water and new Permit To Take Water applications to conform with the source protection prescribed instrument policies where a water taking is or would be a significant water quantity threat (significant drinking water threat - i.e., water takings without returning the water taken to the same aquifer). To date the only existing (i.e., previously issued) permits within a WHPA-Q1 with a significant stress/risk level are the permit(s) for the municipal taking. The Ministry will support municipalities as they work to determine if management measures are required for the long term sustainability of their taking. At this time, formal amendments to existing Permits To Take Water have not been initiated. |
| MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits (Fuel storage) | The Ministry has undertaken an exercise to identify all high risk fuel storage and handling associated with municipal residential drinking water systems. Where fuel storage and handling is a significant threat, conditions have been added to the prescribed instrument (municipal drinking water licence) to address fuel storage risk.  |
| OMAFRA: Nutrient Management   | OMAFRA has identified the existing prescribed instruments that will need to be reviewed. The existing date was determined to be January 1, 2016 as this is when we were confident that our process was detailed enough for reviewing all new prescribed instruments. Every owner of a prescribed instrument has been contacted and informed that they have a nutrient management strategy or a Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) plan in an area to which local source water protection policies may apply. They must work with a certified person to evaluate their prescribed instrument, make any necessary modification to address local source water protection policies and resubmit the instrument for approval. OMAFRA will evaluate the amended prescribed instrument and issue an approval with conditions when the prescribed instrument is complete, compliant with Ontario  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | Regulation 267/03 and conforms with significant drinking water threat policies.   |
| MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)                   | MNRF is in the process of reviewing existing instruments under the Aggregate Resources Act (e.g. licences and permits which authorize pits and quarries) issued prior to the effective date of the Source Protection Plan to determine if the applicable sites are storing and handling fuel in the vulnerable areas identified in the policy.  |
| MTO: Aggregates -road construction (Fuel storage) | There were no existing prescribed instrument applications affected by source protection policies. All (existing and future) MTO aggregate/wayside permits, as well as existing dormant permits activated for a provincial highway contract, must contain fuel handling and storage conditions in the site plan, as prescribed by regulation. This includes installation of fuel storage tanks in accordance with the CSA B139 Installation Code for Oil Burning Equipment and compliance with the strict conditions specified by the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) Liquid Fuels Handling Code, 2007, as amended. Furthermore, MTO does not allow permanent or long term storage of fuel at MTO permit sites. Such requirements ensure the activity is managed in a manner that reduces the risk of contamination. |

**Question 16**

The tables below assist with tracking the actions taken on previously issued (i.e., existing) PIs for significant drinking water threat activities indicated. The tables below can be completed using the data provided by the applicable ministries through their respective PI electronic/paper reporting forms. The data in the tables are reported on a cumulative basis meaning the counts are provided as a running tally of actions taken on previously issued or otherwise created PIs since the effective date of the SPP.

**MOECC: Waste disposal site – landfilling and storage(transfer / processing sites)**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 0

| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I)) |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0                                | 0                                 | 0   | -   |

**MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 1

| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I)) |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 1   | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0                                | 0                                 | 1   | 100%  |

**MOECC: Water Taking**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 0

| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I)) |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0                                | 0                                 | 0   | -   |

**MOECC: Municipal Drinking Water Licences and Drinking Water Works Permits (Fuel storage)**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 2

| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I)) |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 1   | 0  | 2  | 0  | 0  | 0                                | 0                                 | 2   | 100%  |

**OMAFRA: Nutrient Management Strategies (NMS)**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 0

| Number of PIs that completed detailed review | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT | Number of PIs amended or replaced | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were | Number of PIs revoked | Final Decision Pending | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------|--|--|
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------|--|--|

|            |            |            |            |  |            |            |                      |   |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|--|------------|------------|----------------------|---|
| (column A) | (column B) | (column C) | (column D) | needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | (column F) | (column G) | C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I) |
| NULL       | NULL       | NULL       | NULL       | NULL   | NULL       | NULL       | NULL                 | -   |

**OMAFRA: Non-Agricultural Source Material Plans (NASM Plans)**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 0

|   |  |  |  |  |                                  |                                   |   |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I) |
| 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0                                | 0                                 | 0   | -  |

**MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Aggregate Licenses (AL)**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 0

|   |  |  |  |  |                                  |                                   |   |   |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|



|      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |                              |
|------|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|------------------------------|
|      |      |      |      | terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) |      |      |      | H/Baseline number (column I) |
| NULL | NULL | NULL | NULL | NULL  | NULL | NULL | NULL | -                            |

**MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Aggregate Permits (AP)**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 0

| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I) |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| NULL  | NULL   | NULL   | NULL   | NULL   | NULL                             | NULL                              | NULL  | -  |

**MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) - Site plans/Wayside Permits (WP)**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 0

| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I) |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
|   |  |  |  |  |                                  |                                   |   |  |

|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |   |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| NULL | NULL | NULL | NULL | NULL | NULL | NULL | NULL | - |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|

**MTO: Aggregates – road construction (Fuel Storage) - Site plans/Wayside Permits (WP)**

Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: 0

| Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A) | Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B) | Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C) | Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D) | Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E) | Number of PIs revoked (column F) | Final Decision Pending (column G) | Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G)(column H) | Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I)) |
|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| NULL  | NULL   | NULL   | NULL   | NULL   | NULL                             | NULL                              | NULL  | -   |

**Question 17**

For the purposes of section 61 of O. Reg. 287/07 (exemption from RMP policy), complete the table below to indicate the number of notices or PIs issued by the applicable provincial ministries that state the PI conforms to the significant drinking water threat policies in the SPP (i.e., statement of conformity confirms the instrument holder is exempt from requiring a Risk Management Plan). Also, state the prescribed drinking water threat activity to which the statements of conformity pertain. (NOTE: May apply to instruments under the Safe Drinking Water Act, Pesticides Act, Nutrient Management Act or Aggregate Resources Act).

Response: 0

Additional comments:

PIs issued under the Nutrient Management Act (OMAFRA)

- We did not have any requests for a statement of conformity for a PI to be exempt from a section 58 RMP where we issued that statement (we had 2 requests for statements of conformity on NMSs that had previously expired and therefore we could not review and amend.)

PIs issued under the Aggregate Resources Act for road construction

- There were no existing PIs affected by Source Water Protection policies

**Question 18**

In situations where a provincial ministry does not issue or create the prescribed instrument, briefly describe what is being done by the ministry to ensure the PI conforms with the significant threat policies that use the PI tool. (NOTE: Applicable to only certain OMAFRA instruments issued under the Nutrient Management Act.)

Response: Guidance is currently being developed for RMOs, farmers and certified individuals that prepare NMPs to use to help determine if a PI conforms to the SDWT policies.

**Prescribed Instruments - Inspections and Compliance - Questions 19 - 21**

**Question 19**

Briefly describe how provincial ministry staff involved in inspections related to PIs have been trained in source protection for each of the program areas in the table below.

| MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA                                 | DESCRIPTION   |
|---|---|
| MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage | Training: Online Training, Provincial Officer designation training, Source Protection Program Branch training, Specific program area inspections training. Environmental Officers need to complete extensive training programs and acquire Provincial Officer designation for the purpose of regulating and enforcing compliance under the Environmental Protection Act, Ontario Water Resources Act, Environmental Assessment Act, Nutrient Management Act and Pesticides Act. Starting in late 2014, general training on source protection, as well as Operations Division’s implementation activities, was delivered to staff at large. Training sessions were held in each Region, and all staff were invited to attend. All new Environmental Officers are required to complete MOECC Foundations training, where they receive general Source Protection training that covers the following topics: Clean Water Act, scope of source protection program, source protection program structure and process, key players, assessment reports, source protection plans, risk management plans, vulnerable areas, water budgets and water quantity vulnerability analysis, prescribed drinking water threat activities, conditions and local threats, source protection tools, prescribed instrument and monitoring policies etc. Environmental Officers need to follow the ministry Inspection Guidance Manuals that outline the roles and |

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                       | <p>responsibilities for provincial officers in conducting inspections. The General Inspection Guidance Manual (Part A) is intended to assist in carrying out all types of inspections. The specific Inspection Guidance Manuals (Part B) have been generated for individual inspection types including waste disposal site inspections.</p>   |
| <p>MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater</p> | <p>Training: Online Training, Provincial Officer designation training, Specific program area inspections training, Technical guidance. Field officers who assess compliance with sewage prescribed instruments have received annual training specific to sewage works which may be, or are confirmed to be, a significant drinking water threat. Updated guidance, technical reference material and assistance when conducting inspections at sewage works with source water protection considerations is provided to all field inspectors.</p>   |
| <p>MOECC: Pesticides</p>              | <p>Training: Source Protection Program Branch training, Specific program area inspections training. Regional Pesticide Specialists were also trained in 2014 and keep current with program developments and changes. Source Protection Programs Branch delivered training to Operations Division District Offices in the Fall of 2014 and new/updated training in the fall of 2017. Regional Pesticide Specialists continue to provide technical support related to pesticide inspections to District Offices.</p>  |
| <p>MOECC: Water Taking</p>            | <p>Training: Online Training, Peer Training, Provincial Officer designation training, Source Protection Program Branch training, Specific program area inspections training, Technical guidance, Workshops. Environmental Officers need to complete extensive training programs and acquire Provincial Officer designation for the purpose of regulating and enforcing compliance under the Environmental Protection Act, Ontario Water Resources Act, Environmental Assessment Act, Nutrient Management Act and Pesticides Act. Starting in late 2014, general training on source protection, as well as Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division implementation activities, was delivered to staff at large. Training sessions were held in each Region, and all staff were invited to attend. All new Environmental Officers are required to complete MOECC Foundations training, where they receive general Source Protection training that covers the following topics: CWA, scope of SP program, SP program structure and process, key players, assessment reports, source protection plans, risk management plans, vulnerable areas, water budgets and water quantity vulnerability analysis, prescribed drinking water threat activities, conditions and local threats, source protection tools, prescribed instrument and monitoring policies etc. Environmental Officers need to follow the ministry Inspection Guidance Manuals that outline the roles and responsibilities for provincial officers in conducting inspections. The General Inspection Guidance Manual (Part A) is intended to assist in carrying out all types of inspections. The specific Inspection Guidance Manuals (Part B) have been generated for individual inspection types including the Permit To Take Water Inspection. There is an hour long online training module for Environmental Officers on “How to conduct a Permit To Take Water Inspection“. This training is intended</p> |

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                       | <p>to prepare an Environmental Officer to conduct a thorough and accurate inspection and enable them to make more informed decisions about what information needs to be collected, reviewed, reported on, and included in a completed Permit To Take Water Inspection. Participants are be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Find relevant Legislation, Policies, Procedures and Guidance Documents.</li> <li>• List the five key resources required to conduct a detailed file review.</li> <li>• Search IDS for all sources of information regarding water takers.</li> <li>• Search the Environmental Registry for information regarding water taking applications.</li> <li>• List the six steps to a successful Permit To Take Water Inspection.</li> <li>• Understand critical areas to inspect during a site visit to assess whether adverse impacts may be occurring from the water taking.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids</p> | <p>Training: Peer Training, Provincial Officer Designation training, Technical guidance.</p> <p>No special training in the Clean Water Act/Source Protection is necessary for MOECC staff conducting inspections under the Nutrient Management Act. Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change inspectors are not designated under the Clean Water Act and have no authority to conduct inspections or undertake any compliance promotion activities under that Act. Rather the prescribed instruments subject to inspection by MOECC Environmental Officers for the Agricultural Source Material (ASM) and Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) subprograms are issued under the Nutrient Management Act. MOECC inspectors are designated Provincial Officers under the Nutrient Management Act (among other legislation) who have received mandatory training in order to receive their designation. MOECC inspectors of Agricultural Source Material and Non-Agricultural Source Material sites assess compliance with the terms/conditions within the applicable prescribed instrument(s) associated with the operation as well as other applicable regulatory requirements made under the Nutrient Management Act or other legislation such as the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Water Resources Act. In the event any terms or conditions are contained in an instrument to address Source Protection policy requirements, compliance with those terms/conditions is addressed as part of the regular inspection activities. When ministry inspectors identify non-compliance with legal requirements during an inspection, various abatement actions may be taken to address non-compliance, ranging from providing guidance and information to issuing corrective orders. It should be noted that general training sessions have been made available to MOECC field inspectors on the fundamentals of the Clean Water Act as well as Source Protection implementation activities undertaken by the Ministry; however, completion of this training is not mandatory prior for field officers conducting inspection activities. Finally, new provincial officials do receive general Source Protection training as part of their officer designation training.</p> <p>No special training in the Clean Water Act/Source Protection is necessary for MOECC staff conducting inspections at hauled sewage sites or processed organic waste (aka biosolids) sites. Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change inspectors are not</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>designated under the Clean Water Act and have no authority to conduct inspections or undertake any compliance promotion activities under that Act. Rather the prescribed instruments subject to inspection by MOECC Environmental Officers for the hauled sewage and processed organic waste subprograms are issued under the Environmental Protection Act. All MOECC inspectors are designated Provincial Officers under the Environmental Protection Act (among other legislation) who have received mandatory training in order to receive their designation. MOECC inspectors of hauled sewage/processed organic waste sites assess compliance with the terms/conditions within the applicable prescribed instrument(s) associated with the operation as well as other applicable regulatory requirements made under the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Water Resources Act. In the event any terms or conditions are contained in an instrument to address Source Protection policy requirements, compliance with those terms/conditions is addressed as part of the regular inspection activities. When ministry inspectors identify non-compliance with legal requirements during an inspection, various abatement actions may be taken to address non-compliance, ranging from providing guidance and information to issuing corrective orders. It should be noted that general training sessions have been made available to MOECC field inspectors on the fundamentals of the Clean Water Act as well as Source Protection implementation activities undertaken by the Ministry; however, completion of this training is not mandatory prior for field officers conducting inspection activities. New provincial officials do receive general Source Protection training as part of their officer designation training. Finally, Source Protection information is included as part of the annual inspection guidance provided to field staff. Specifically, Source Protection information is incorporated into the risk ranked lists that are provided to inspectors.</p> |
| <p>MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits (Fuel storage)</p> | <p>Training: Online Training, Peer Training, Source Protection Program Branch training, Specific program area inspections training, Technical guidance, Workshops.</p>   |
| <p>OMAFRA: Nutrient Management</p>   |  |
| <p>MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)</p>                                       | <p>Training: Peer Training, Source Protection Program Branch training, Specific program area inspections training, Workshops. MNRF Aggregate Inspectors have received an overview of Source Protection and their role in inspecting aggregate licences/permits within WHPA-A, WHPA-B and IPZ-1 zones and the screening of new applications and amendments with regards to Source Protection policies.</p>  |
| <p>MTO: Aggregates -road</p>   | <p>Training: Peer Training, Specific program area inspections training, Technical guidance, Workshops. MTO Aggregate inspectors</p>  |

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>construction (Fuel storage)</p> | <p>are re-trained at least bi-annually as to the formal protocol to ensure that source water protection and vulnerable areas are considered in the preparation of technical hydrogeological reports at the permit application stage. Aggregate staff are also trained to use the standardized text with respect to fuel storage and handling. Aggregate inspectors are trained to focus on fuel handling and storage during annual compliance inspections. In May 2016, the MTO Highway Standards Branch (Soils and Aggregates Section) provided training to the MTO Regional Aggregate Sections and MTO Aggregate Inspectors on source water protection and implementation requirements of source protection policies prepared under the Clean Water Act, 2006 (CWA). The training will be repeated in 2018. The role of the source protection program and plan policies as well as their legal effect and operational implications are the focus of training. Training also includes an overview of prescribed threats (specifically fuel handling and storage) and the vulnerability science applied (WHPA, IPZ, etc.). The above protocol is reaffirmed and amendments to the protocol implemented.</p> |
|------------------------------------|---|

**Question 20**

Briefly describe, in general terms, how source protection is taken into consideration when planning for and prioritizing inspections for the program areas in the table below.

| <b>MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA</b>                                 | <b>DESCRIPTION</b>   |
|--|--|
| <p>MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage</p> | <p>The ministry’s current program delivery model for proactive compliance inspection program is based on risk analysis. During Year-Start Planning (February-March of each year), inspection priorities are set for each program area at by Divisional Program Leads. The ministry uses a risk based approach to setting each program’s priorities for inspection. Program diagnostics and analyses are conducted as part of the yearly compliance planning process and help inform inspection priorities in the upcoming year. This information along with program specific risk factors is used to identify compliance priorities for each program area. Source protection vulnerability is generally considered as one of the risk factors during risk analysis. District/Area offices use the Integrated Plan direction in conjunction with their own local knowledge and consideration of available resources to select the number and locations of facilities/sites for inspections.</p> |
| <p>MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater</p>                        | <p>The MOECC’s compliance program includes an annual process to plan field inspections for each fiscal year. Planned inspections are determined based on a risk based methodology including many factors such as individual potential for environmental impacts</p>  |

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                       | <p>and site history. Source Protection considerations have been incorporated into this annual risk based inspection planning process for municipal, industrial, commercial and private sewage inspections as a priority area of focus. This ensures that the specific risks associated with potential drinking water threats are included when planning field inspections. The lists of known prescribed instruments issued in vulnerable areas and any that have been determined to be a significant threat are included and considered during compliance assessment planning and prioritization activities.</p>   |
| <p>MOECC: Pesticides</p>              | <p>Inspection guidance is provided to District Offices as part of the Integrated Planning process. Regional Pesticide Specialists provide technical assistance to District Officers when undertaking Pesticides Inspections.</p>  |
| <p>MOECC: Water Taking</p>            | <p>The ministry's current program delivery model for proactive compliance inspection program is based on risk analysis. During Year-Start Planning (February-March of each year), inspection priorities are set for each program area at by Divisional Program Leads. The ministry uses a risk based approach to setting each program's priorities for inspection. Program diagnostics and analyses are conducted as part of the yearly compliance planning process and help inform inspection priorities in the upcoming year. This information along with program specific risk factors is used to identify compliance priorities for each program area. Source protection vulnerability is generally considered as one of the risk factors during risk analysis. District/Area offices use the Integrated Plan direction in conjunction with their own local knowledge and consideration of available resources to select the number and locations of facilities/sites for inspections. SP water quantity vulnerable area data has recently been available with the Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division of the ministry. Sites with active water taking permits located within SP water quantity vulnerable areas will be identified and compliance inspections will be planned based on risk analysis during Year-Start Planning process for FY 2018-19.</p> |
| <p>MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids</p> | <p>The MOECC carries out annual proactive inspections at agricultural operations operating under approved Nutrient Management Strategies, Plans and Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Plans. Each year regulated operations are identified and each one is assigned an overall risk score. Several risk factors are considered and these vary somewhat depending on the sub-program involved; among the risk factors considered is Source Protection vulnerable area information. Sites that intersect with source protection vulnerable areas with the highest risk scores (ie. scores of 8 or greater) are assigned relatively higher inspection priority risk scores. This approach ensures that sites where regulated activities may be considered a significant drinking water threat are identified amongst the highest priority for inspection. Districts offices are instructed to select inspection targets from the risk ranked lists and are encouraged to select higher priority sites. Districts are responsible for the ultimate decision of which sites they chose</p>   |



|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>to inspect and they rely on their local knowledge when making their final choices.</p> <p>The MOECC carries out annual proactive inspections at hauled sewage sites and processed organic waste sites. Each year regulated operations are identified and each one is assigned an overall risk score. Several risk factors are considered and these vary somewhat depending on the sub-program involved; among the risk factors considered is Source Protection vulnerable area information. Sites that intersect with source protection vulnerable areas with the highest risk scores (ie. scores of 8 or greater) are assigned relatively higher inspection priority risk scores. Districts are responsible for the ultimate decision of which sites they chose to inspect and they rely on their local knowledge when making their final choices. However, they are provided the risk ranked lists as a resource and are encouraged to select higher priority sites.</p> |
| MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits (Fuel storage) | Safe Drinking Water Branch does not prioritize Municipal Drinking Water System inspections strictly based on source protection as the branch is mandated by the Compliance and Enforcement Regulation to inspect all municipal residential systems every year, without exception.   |
| OMAFRA: Nutrient Management   | NULL  |
| MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)                                       | MNRF utilizes a risk based compliance approach to plan for aggregate inspections based on a scale of High, Medium and Low priority. Licences and Permits that fall within source protection policy areas and/or have fuel storage within areas identified by a source protection policy are considered High Risk for the purposes of planning for inspections.  |
| MTO: Aggregates -road construction (Fuel storage)                     | All MTO permit sites are inspected every year by MTO staff and fuel storage is one of the prescribed elements that must be checked as part of the formal written compliance audit.  |

**Question 21**

Briefly describe, in general terms, how each ministry program area ensures PI holders comply with their instrument for the program areas in the table below.

| MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA                                 | DESCRIPTION  |
|---|--|
| MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage | Processes in place: Inspection, Order, Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments, Provincial offense notice (ticket), Referral to internal investigations department, Voluntary abatement measures.  |
| MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater                        | Processes in place: Inspection, Order, Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments, Provincial offense notice (ticket), Referral to internal investigations department, Voluntary abatement measures.  |
| MOECC: Pesticides                                     | Processes in place: Inspection, Order, Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments, Referral to internal investigations department, self-reporting, Voluntary abatement measures.  |
| MOECC: Water Taking                                   | Processes in place: Inspection, Order, Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments, Provincial offense notice (ticket), Referral to internal investigations department, self-reporting, Voluntary abatement measures. The ministry conducts planned inspections to assess compliance of a water taking activity against the terms and conditions of an active Permit To Take Water and related regulatory requirements. Inspections also assess conformance to applicable policies, guidelines and procedures. Ministry staff may also conduct reactive inspections if they become aware of a complaint or concern linked to a particular site. Where a Permit To Take Water inspection finds non-compliance, Incident Response reporting and related abatement action will commence. Various approaches may be used by inspectors to require proponents to bring an operation into compliance with legal requirements including: Voluntary abatement, Issuance of Order or Ticket, Referral to the Ministry's Investigation and Enforcement Branch with a recommendation to undertake a prosecution The approach taken by the inspector will depend on the severity and nature of the violation as well as the compliance history of the party in question. Inspectors may refer to the Ministry's following documents to assist them in determining the most appropriate compliance approach in any particular instance: General Inspection Guidance Manual Part A, Inspection Guidance Manual Part B, Permit To Take Water, Compliance Policy: Applying Abatement and Enforcement Tools |
| MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids                        | Processes in place: Inspection, Order, Referral to internal investigations department, Voluntary abatement measures, Provincial offense notice (ticket). The ministry conducts inspections at agricultural operations to assess compliance with regulatory requirements. Ministry staff may also conduct reactive inspections if they become aware of a complaint or concern linked to a particular operation. Where non-compliance with prescribed instrument requirements or other regulatory requirements are identified the ministry takes action to bring sites into compliance. Various approaches may be used by inspectors to ensure   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>proponents bring an operation into compliance with legal requirements. MOECC inspectors of hauled sewage/processed organic waste (aka biosolids) sites assess compliance with the terms/conditions within the applicable prescribed instrument(s) associated with the operation as well as other applicable regulatory requirements made under the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Water Resources Act. In the event any terms or conditions are contained in an instrument to address Source Protection policy requirements, compliance with those terms/conditions is addressed as part of the regular inspection activities. When ministry inspectors identify non-compliance with legal requirements during an inspection, various abatement actions may be taken to address non-compliance, ranging from providing guidance and information to issuing corrective orders.</p>        |
| <p>MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits (Fuel storage)</p> | <p>Processes in place: Inspection, Order, Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments, Referral to internal investigations department, Voluntary abatement measures. Municipal drinking water systems are inspected annually to confirm compliance with the requirements set out in their prescribed instrument (Municipal Drinking Water Licence and Drinking Water Works Permit).</p>   |
| <p>OMAFRA: Nutrient Management</p>   | <p>NULL</p>   |
| <p>MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)</p>                                       | <p>Processes in place: Inspection, Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments, self-reporting.</p>   |
| <p>MTO: Aggregates -road construction (Fuel storage)</p>                     | <p>Processes in place: Inspection, Order, Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments, self-reporting. Every MTO permit site, whether active or not, is inspected annually by MTO aggregates staff and a Compliance Assessment Report is filed with the MTO for the purpose of assessing compliance with the Aggregate Resources Act, Regulations, AROPS, the site plan, and any conditions of the permit. Fuel storage is one of the prescribed elements that is verified in the compliance assessment. When an MTO permit is actively being used by an MTO contractor, MTO Aggregate Inspectors have the legal authority to verify and enforce compliance with site plan and operational requirements, including fuel storage conditions. Contract Administrators are also required to verify that site plan conditions are being adhered to for the duration of an MTO contract.</p> |

## Land Use Planning - Questions 22 - 23

### Question 22a

Where the Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MMA) is the planning approval authority for day-to-day *Planning Act* decisions within source protection areas, or where MMA is the approval authority for the official plan and zoning by law conformity exercises municipalities are required to undertake, please provide a description of how MMA ensures their *Planning Act* decisions conform with the approved source protection plans (specifically, the policies on List A - Significant threat policies that affect decisions under the *Planning Act* and *Condominium Act*, 1998)?

Response: Through the review and approval of Official Plans, MMA, in consultation with MOECC, ensures Official Plan policies conform to the significant drinking water threat policies and have regard to other policies. In addition, MMA ensures designated vulnerable areas, as identified in approved assessment reports are identified in Official Plan schedules and protected, improved or restored as is required to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

### Question 22b

In what other ways does MMA integrate source protection considerations into their business or operational processes? Please provide a brief description of each.

Response: MMA takes source protection into consideration in its review of new planning documents (official plans, comprehensive zoning bylaws) and development applications as applicable.

### Question 23a

In total, how many municipalities (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) within the SPR/A are required to complete:

i) Official Plan (OP) conformity exercises for source protection?

Response: 3

ii) Zoning by-law (ZBL) conformity exercises for source protection?

Response: 3

### Question 23b

Of these municipalities, how many have:

i) how many have completed their OP conformity exercise

Response: 2

ii) completed OP conformity exercise but under appeal

Response: 0

iii) OP conformity exercise in process

Response: 1

iv) not started their OP conformity exercise

Response: 0

v) completed their ZBL conformity exercises

Response: 0

vi) completed ZBL conformity exercise but under appeal

Response: 0

vii) ZBL conformity exercise in process

Response: 2

viii) not started their ZBL conformity exercise

Response: 1

**Education and Outreach - Question 24 - 26**

**Question 24a**

(i) What method(s) are being used to implement E&O policies in the SPR/A?

| Method   | Municipalities | Ministry |
|--|----------------|----------|
| Development and distribution of educational materials for general public   | YES            | NO       |
| Development and distribution of educational materials for target audiences including developers, builders, landowners, farmers, etc. | YES            | NO       |
| In-person workshops  | YES            | NO       |
| Site visits  | YES            | NO       |
| Source protection content for websites   | YES            | NO       |
| Educational videos (e.g., YouTube  | NO             | NO       |
| Podcasts   | NO             | NO       |
| Collaboration with other bodies (e.g., ministries, local organizations, etc.   | YES            | NO       |
| Other  | NO             | NO       |

ii) Identify the ways in which outreach efforts were conducted to reach target audiences about source water protection? Choose all that apply.

| Method   | Municipalities | Ministry |
|--|----------------|----------|
| Social media promotion   | YES            | NO       |
| Traditional media advertising  | YES            | NO       |
| Site visits  | YES            | NO       |
| Integration with other outreach programs or campaigns (e.g., Community Environment Days, etc.) | YES            | NO       |
| Articles in publications   | YES            | NO       |

|  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| Information kiosks at events/festivals | YES | NO |
| Other                                  | NO  | NO |

**Question 24b**

i) Describe how the SPA is evaluating the implementation of its E&O policies?

Thames Centre

No formal evaluation criteria has been set.

Central Elgin

Regarding the Elgin Area Primary water system intake protection zones, the population in the port community that surrounds this area can be transient in nature. A large number of boaters, cottagers and tourists who may be unfamiliar with the proximity of the intake come to the area during the summer months. To help to address this issue marinas up stream of the IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 have been approached and are willing participants in ongoing outreach and education. There is no formal evidence; however, marina operators continue to stock factsheets and maintain signs detailing the IPZ's at their facilities. With respect to evaluation of the effectiveness, the municipality will continue discussions with boaters etc. to gauge knowledge about Source Water Protection.

Central Elgin contracted Kettle Creek Conservation Authority to undertake a comprehensive outreach and education campaign which has included outreach to the general public as well as targeted audiences such as the Canadian Coast Guard and fire departments. Feedback from these presentations has been anecdotal. However, the Coast Guard was particularly appreciative of the information noting that they were unaware of the IPZs.

While there is no direct evaluation of this form of outreach, Facebook posts on the subject matter have been shared and liked. In addition, over 10,000 attended the public day of the Children's Water Festival which promoted the message of source water protection and conservation. The #ichoosetapwater campaign consisted of a video contest and a reusable water bottle giveaway. After learning more about source water protection and water conservation students were asked to take a water pledge. Fifty three students pledged to choose tap water and change everyday behavior in order to protect water sources.

Kettle Creek SPA

The SPA has been sharing E&O knowledge and information through Lake Erie Region's Implementation Working Group, however no formal evaluation process has been established.

**Question 25**

What did the E&O policy(ies) that were implemented target in the SPR/A?

Response: Threats (significant)

**Signage - Question 27**

**Question 27**

Complete the table below to indicate the number of source water protection signs that have been installed in the SPR/A for the reporting periods noted.

| <b>REPORTING PERIOD</b>   | <b>Number of signs installed on provincial highways (Column A)</b> | <b>Number of signs installed on municipal roads (Column B)</b> | <b>Number of signs at other locations (if applicable) (Column C)</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|---|--|--|--|--------------|
| Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year)     | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0            |
| Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1) | 0  | 24   | 0  | 24           |
| Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2) | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0            |
| Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3) |  |  |  |              |

**Incentives - Question 28, 29**

**Question 28**

If applicable to the SPR/A, complete the table below indicating the type of incentive(s) (e.g., PI application fees waived, funding, other non-financial incentives, etc.) that was made available (whether as a policy in the SPP or not), the source that provided the incentive(s), the prescribed drinking water threat activity(ies) to which it relates, the degree to which the incentive(s) assisted with the implementation of SPP policies that address significant drinking water threat activity(ies), and include any comments.

| <b>Type of Incentive</b>      | <b>Source of Incentive</b> | <b>Prescribed Drinking Water Threat(s) (Select One or More)</b> | <b>Degree to which Incentive(s) Assisted with the Implementation of SPP Policies Addressing SDWTs</b> | <b>Comments</b> |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| No incentives made available* | N/A                        | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

\* No incentives were offered in 2017 in Central Elgin and Malahide. Prior to that the municipality, paid to decommission abandoned wells within the WHPA A, B, and C for the Belmont Water Supply.

**Sewage System Inspections - Questions 30a, 30b, 30c**

**Question 30a**

How many on-site sewage systems in the SPA require inspections in accordance with the Ontario Building Code (OBC) (i.e., once every five years)?

Response: 0

**Question 30b**

Of these, how many on-site sewage systems were inspected (i.e., cumulative running tally of systems inspected)?

Response: 0

**Question 30c**

How many of the on-site sewage systems inspected required:

Minor maintenance work (e.g., pump out)?

Response: 0

Major maintenance work (e.g., tank replacement)?

Response: 0

**Environmental Monitoring - Questions 31**

**Question 31**

If applicable to the SPR/A, complete the table below where information about drinking water issues is available. Begin by identifying the drinking water system(s) and any associated drinking water issue(s)/parameter(s) (chemical or pathogen) that have been identified, then indicate whether an Issue Contributing Area (ICA) was delineated for the identified issue(s), and any observations in the concentration or trend for each issue.

| <b>Drinking Water System</b> | <b>Drinking Water Issue / Parameter</b> | <b>ICA Delineated For This Issue</b> | <b>Observations</b> | <b>Actions/Behavioural Changes Contributing to Change in Observations (Optional)</b> |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| N/A                          | N/A                                     | N/A                                  | N/A                 | N/A  |

**Transport Pathways - Questions 32 - 34**

**Question 32a**

How many notices about transport pathways (meaning a condition of land resulting from human activity (e.g., pits and quarries, improperly abandoned wells, geothermal system, etc.) that increases the vulnerability of a raw water supply of a drinking water system) did the SPA receive from municipalities in this reporting period (as per O. Reg. 287/07, ss. 27(3))?

Response: 0



**Question 32b**

What actions did the SPR/A take as a response to receiving these notices (e.g., SPR/A provided information to municipalities about changes in vulnerability, etc.)? Please describe below.

Response: N/A

**Question 33**

Provide specific information on actions taken by any person or body to reduce the impacts that transport pathways could have on sources of drinking water (e.g., number of wells properly abandoned by municipalities and/or private landowners in accordance with O. Reg. 903, etc.)?

Response: No actions this reporting period. All transport pathways were abandoned previously in 2014 under an incentive program.

**Municipal Integration - Questions 35 - 38**

**Question 35a**

In total, how many municipalities (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) within the SPR/A are subject to SPP policies (any policy tool)?

Response: 3

**Question 35b**

Complete the table below by indicating the number of municipalities (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) within the SPR/A that have integrated/are integrating source protection knowledge/science into the following municipal program areas/activities.

| <b>Municipal Program Areas/Activities</b>                              | <b>Number of municipalities that have integrated/are integrating source into program areas/activities</b> |
|--|---|
| Road salt storage/application  | 3   |
| Snow storage   | 3   |
| Pesticide storage/application  | 3   |
| Hazardous waste storage  | 3   |
| Organic solvents storage   | 3   |
| Municipal fuel storage (e.g., for heating, maintenance vehicles, etc.) | 3   |
| Municipal well maintenance and operations                              | 3   |
| Municipal water quantity   | 3   |
| Stormwater infrastructure maintenance                                  | 3   |
| Other. Please provide a description below.                             | 0   |

**Question 36a**

Of the total number of municipalities within the SPR/A that are subject to SPP policies and have a legal responsibility for day-to-day land use planning or municipal building permit decisions, how many are integrating source protection requirements into the following program areas?

| <b>Number of municipalities within SPR/A with day-to-day responsibility for land use planning decisions (column A)</b> | <b>Number of municipalities integrating source protection requirements into land use planning decisions (column B)</b> | <b>Percent Integrating Source Protection Column B / Column A</b> |
|--|--|--|
| 3  | 3  | 100%   |

| <b>Number of municipalities within SPR/A with day-to-day responsibility for building permit decisions (column A)</b> | <b>Number of municipalities integrating source protection requirements into building permit decisions (column B)</b> | <b>Percent Integrating Source Protection Column B / Column A</b> |
|--|--|--|
| 3  | 3  | 100%   |

**Question 36b**

Indicate the number or estimated percentage of subject municipalities (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) that are integrating source protection into the business processes listed in the table below.

| <b>Business Processes</b>   | <b>Number or estimated percentage of subject municipalities integrating source protection</b> |
|---|---|
| Staff involved with land use planning and/or section 59 policies trained in source protection   | 3   |
| Staff guidance documents updated/produced for evaluating land use planning applications conforming with/having regard to SPP policies               | 1   |
| Planning design and technical guidelines updated/produced for source protection considerations for applicants                                       | 1   |
| Strategy and timeline established to undertake OP & ZBL conformity exercise   | 1   |
| Planning documents updated  | 3   |
| Planning maps/schedules updated to show vulnerable areas  | 3   |
| Siting/placement of activities away from vulnerable areas   | 3   |
| Complete planning application requirements (i.e., supporting documentation such as stormwater management plan, master environmental servicing plan, | 3   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| lot grading plan, etc. needed)   |   |
| Procedures in place to flag where section 59 policies apply including mechanism/process to facilitate exchange of information about development application process and the issuance of section 59 notices | 3 |
| Steps taken (e.g., municipal by-law, conservation authority regulation, etc.) to reduce the number of applications that require RMO screening  | 1 |
| Public works operations  | 3 |
| Other. Please provide a description.   | 0 |

**Enumerated Threats - Question 39a**

**Question 39a**

Complete the table below by first indicating which of the listed significant drinking water threats were being engaged in (i.e., enumerated as ‘existing’ significant threats/threats) at the time of SPP approval. Lead SPAs will be maintaining a running tally of progress made in addressing significant threats that were on the ground before plans were approved. The running tally consists of the formula: A+B-C-D where:

A = Original estimate of SDWT engaged in/enumerated when SPP approved

B = Additional SDWT identified after first SPP approved as a result of field verification (i.e., not part of original estimate of SDWT)

C = SDWT included in enumeration estimates at time of plan approval but subsequently determined through field verification that: (i) it was not actually engaged in at a particular location after all OR (ii) it was no longer engaged in (e.g., land may still have an agricultural operation but owner no longer applying pesticides for their own reasons)

D = SDWT addressed because policy is implemented\* (\*Note: Where multiple policy tools address any given threat sub-category, implemented means that actions associated with at least one policy tool have been completed/are in place.) SPAs may use their local discretion in which policy tool they wish to reflect as being implemented.

| Threat ID | Prescribed Drinking Water Threats  | A | B | C | D | Remaining (A+B-C-D) |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|---|---------------------|
| 1         | The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                   |
| 2         | The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.                | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                   |
| 3         | The application of agricultural source material to land.   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                   |
| 4         | The storage of agricultural source material.   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                   |
| 5         | The management of agricultural source material.  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                   |
| 6         | The application of non-agricultural source material to land.   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                   |

|    |  |          |          |          |          |          |
|----|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 7  | The handling and storage of non-agricultural source material.  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 8  | The application of commercial fertilizer to land.  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 9  | The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer to land.   | 1        | 0        | 1        | 0        | 0        |
| 10 | The application of pesticide to land.  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 11 | The handling and storage of pesticide.   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 12 | The application of road salt.  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 13 | The handling and storage of road salt.   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 14 | The storage of snow.   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 15 | The handling and storage of fuel.  | 1        | 0        | 0        | 1        | 0        |
| 16 | The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid.  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 17 | The handling and storage of an organic solvent.  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 18 | The management of runoff that contains chemicals used in the de-icing of aircraft.   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 19 | The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard. O. Reg. 385/08, s. 3. | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 20 | Water taking from an aquifer without returning the water to the same aquifer or surface water body.                              | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 21 | Reducing recharge of an aquifer.   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 22 | Local Threat: Transportation of Oil and Fuel Products Through a Pipeline   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
|    | <b>Total</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>0</b> |

**Question 39b**

Please provide comments below to explain the overall progress made in addressing these significant threats. Include the percentage of overall progress made in the comments provided. The percentage of overall progress made in addressing local threats and conditions that are taking place on the landscape is determined by taking the total number in column D (i.e., SDWT addressed because policy is implemented) from the table above (reportable #39a) and dividing it into the number that is derived by adding the total numbers in columns A and B and then subtracting this sum total from the total in column C. In other words, overall progress made =  $D/A+B-C$ .

Response: For the Kettle Creek Source Protection Plan there were no significant drinking water threats identified for the Belmont Well system. For the Elgin Area Primary Water Supply, there were two drinking water threats identified. The first was bulk storage of commercial fertilizer. This practise was ceased in 2014 and the storage tank that was utilized by McAsphalt Industries was removed in January 2018. The final significant drinking water threat was for the bulk storage of fuel. This location was

identified as the bulk storage container at the Elgin Area Primary Water supply for the stand by generator. This threat has since been mitigated through a Risk Management Plan.

**Assessment Report Information Gaps - Question 40**

**Question 40**

Provide a summary of steps taken to further assess or implement the work plans described in technical rules #30.1 (Water Budget Tier 3), #50.1 (GUDI for WHPA-E or F), and #116 (ICA) through amendments carried out under section 34 or section 36 of the Clean Water Act.

Response: N/A

**Other Reporting Items - Question 41**

**Question 41**

Does the SPA have any other item on which it wishes to report? If so, please explain.

Response: Kettle Creek Source Protection Authority, in collaboration with Lake Erie Source Protection Region, has developed and produced a Kettle Creek Source Protection Area Annual Report. The report is written for the public, the SPC and local stakeholders. It provides a snapshot of the program’s progress in the Kettle Creek watershed and is designed to complement the provincially-required Annual Progress Report and Supplemental Form.

**Source Protection Outcomes - Question 42**

**Question 42**

What positive outcomes (e.g., less water consumption, changes in behaviour, reduction in phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations, less chloride from road salt, reduction in algal blooms, human health protected, etc.), if any, have potentially resulted from the implementation of SPP policies? Please describe the outcomes below.

Response: A local campaign spearheaded by Kettle Creek Conservation Authority and Elgin St. Thomas Public Health promoted the importance of keeping our municipal drinking water safe. The #ichoosetapwater campaign consisted of a video contest and a reusable water bottle giveaway. The contest invited Grades 3 to 7 classes to submit a video highlighting the importance of choosing tap water over bottled water. Classrooms were provided messaging on the importance of keeping municipal drinking water safe to be incorporated into the videos. The winning entry was awarded a cash prize.

**Achievement of SPP Objectives - Question 43**

**Question 43a**

In the opinion of the Source Protection Committee (SPC), to what extent have the objectives of the SPP been achieved in this reporting period?

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Progressing well/on target</b> – majority of the source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well. | ✓ |
| <b>Satisfactory</b> - Some of the source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well.                   |   |
| <b>Limited progress made</b> - A few of source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well.             |   |

**Question 43b**

Please provide comments to explain how the SPC arrived at its opinion. Include a summary of any discussions that might have been had amongst the SPC members, especially where no consensus was reached.

Response: Only two existing significant drinking water threats were identified in the Kettle Creek Source Protection Area when the Plan took effect. Since implementation of the plan, both threats (100%) have been addressed: one no longer exists and the other was managed through a Risk Management Plan (RMP). Additionally, many of the applicable plan policies (68%) that address significant drinking water threats are implemented or in progress. It is important to note that no response was required/not applicable for 25% of the plan policies that address significant drinking water threats.