

Date: March 3, 2011
Time: 1 pm
Location: Rideau Valley Conservation Authority
 3889 Rideau Valley Drive, Manotick

(I) = Information (D) = Decision

Delegations: If you wish to speak to an item on the Agenda please contact Sommer Casgrain-Robertson before the meeting (sommer.robertson@mrsourcewater.ca or 613-692-3571 / 1-800-267-3504 x 1147)

1.0 f) STATUS OF ACTION ITEMS

Date: February 22, 2011
To: Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee
From: Sommer Casgrain-Robertson, Co-Project Manager
Mississippi – Rideau Source Protection Region

Recommendation:

1. That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee receive the Status of Action Items staff report for information.

Staff & Chair Action Items:

Issue		Action	Lead	Status
1	Questions for OMAFRA	OMAFRA staff will provide responses to some outstanding questions following their presentation on January 6, 2011	Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	In Progress OMAFRA staff is currently gathering responses. They will be sent to Sommer for distribution to members.
2	Vacant “Other Interest” seat on the MRSPC	Fill the vacancy on the MRSPC	Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	Complete Interviews were held February 15 and Pieter Leenhouts was appointed to the SPC.
3	Vacant “City of Ottawa” seat on the MRSPC	Fill the vacancy on the MRSPC	City of Ottawa staff	In Progress City of Ottawa staff are in the process of filling this seat
4	Ottawa River Watershed Inter-Jurisdictional Committee	Encourage MOE to take the lead role in establishing an Ottawa River watershed inter-jurisdictional committee	Chair Stavinga & Brian Stratton	Ongoing Baird completed a proposal to revise Ottawa’s IPZ-2s and delineate IPZ-1s and IPZ-2s for Gatineau’s intakes. Chair Stavinga is drafting a letter to send this proposal to the MOE.
5	Uranium	MVC and local Health Units work together to raise public awareness about naturally occurring uranium in drinking water	Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	In Progress Jean-Guy Albert will continue to encourage Health Canada to release their “Uranium and Drinking Water” fact sheet they developed.
6	Compensation Models	Staff to collect other compensation models (e.g. Ottawa wetland policy, Alternate Land Use Services).	Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	In Progress Staff will build this in to the Source Protection Plan work plan.

MRSPC Member Action Items:

Issue		Action	Lead	Status
1	Drainage Act is under review	Follow the process to see if it will impact source protection work	Peter McLaren & Richard Fraser	In Progress Peter and Richard are following the review and will inform the Committee of any concerns they have.
2	Members were concerned that attendance might be low at public open houses and groups who should be involved in the process are not	Members were asked to provide Sommer with contact information for groups they feel should be involved in the process – they will be added to our mailing list.	All Members	Ongoing
3	OFEC Conference Calls & Training Sessions	Richard Fraser will provide the MRSPC with updates on OFEC conference calls & training sessions	Richard Fraser	Ongoing
4	Community Outreach opportunities	Members to notify Sommer of potential events and opportunities to engage the public about source protection	All members	Ongoing

1.0 g)

CORRESPONDENCE

Date: February 22, 2011
To: Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee
From: Sommer Casgrain-Robertson, Co-Project Manager
Mississippi – Rideau Source Protection Region

Recommendation

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee receive the Correspondence for information.

Attached Correspondence:

Correspondence From:		Regarding:	Response:
1	Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Committee February 15, 2011	Seeking support for two motions they recently approved: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Request that OMAFRA amend the <i>Nutrient Management Act</i> to allow for the requirement of a Nutrient Management Strategy/Plan for livestock operations with over 5 nutrient units in WHPAs and IPZs2. Request that the Environmental Farm Plan program be modified to make it an acceptable Assessment and Action plan for agricultural operations in WHPAs and IPZs	The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee will consider these motions at an upcoming meeting (a staff report will be prepared).

February 15, 2011

DELIVERED BY EMAIL

TO:

Chairs and Project Managers
Ontario Source Protection Committees

Dear Chairs & Project Managers:

Re: Nutrient Management Act & Environmental Farm Plan Program

Please find attached two motions passed at a recent meeting of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Committee.

The first motion requests that OMAFRA amend the *Nutrient Management Act* allowing for the requirement of an approved Nutrient Management Strategy/Plan for livestock operations with over 5 nutrient units in vulnerable areas (WHPAs and IPZs).

The second motion requests that the Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association and Environmental Farm Plan staff consult with the MOE and DWSP to make modifications to the Environmental Farm Plan program to make it an acceptable Assessment and Action Plan for agricultural operations in vulnerable areas (WHPAs and IPZs).

The Source Protection Committee for the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula requests that all Source Protection Committees consider endorsing these resolutions. These motions have also been forwarded to the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, and the Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association.

Should questions arise, please do not hesitate to contact our Project Manager, Don Smith, at 519-470-3000 Extension 101 or d.smith@waterprotection.ca.

Respectfully,



Mike Traynor,
Chair
Source Protection Committee

SAUGEEN, GREY SAUBLE, NORTHERN BRUCE PENINSULA SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MOTION

DATE: JANUARY 28, 2011

MOTION #: SPC-11-133

MOVED BY: MITCH TWOLAN

SECONDED BY: KEN FURLONG

WHEREAS the nineteen Source Protection Committees across Ontario are now developing policies to deal with the twenty-one prescribed threats to drinking water as specified in the Provincial Table of Drinking Water Threats;

AND WHEREAS six of those twenty-one threats deal with the application, storage or management of Agricultural Source Material (ASM) or Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) and/or the use of land as livestock grazing or pasture land;

AND WHEREAS the *Nutrient Management Act* (NMA) with its requirements for Nutrient Management Strategies/Plans was created following the Walkerton Water Crisis specifically to deal with minimizing the risk of agricultural contaminants impacting on source water;

AND WHEREAS it is an objective of the Source Protection policy development process to utilize existing legislation whenever possible to minimize threats to drinking water in vulnerable areas;

AND WHEREAS the present NMA under Reg. 267/03 Part IV limits requirements for approved Nutrient Management Strategies/Plans to operations requiring building permits for livestock facilities or/and operations over 300 nutrient units (NU) therefore minimizing the ability to deal with these agricultural threats in vulnerable areas;

THEREFORE the Source Protection Committee for Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula requests that the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) amend the *Nutrient Management Act* to allow for the requirement of an approved Nutrient Management Strategy/Plan for livestock operations with over five NUs in vulnerable areas within Wellhead Protection Areas and Intake Protection Zones;

AND FURTHER THAT the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Committee will circulate this resolution to all Source Protection Committees in Ontario for their support.

Carried

SAUGEEN, GREY SAUBLE, NORTHERN BRUCE PENINSULA SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MOTION

DATE: JANUARY 28, 2011

MOTION #: SPC-11-134

MOVED BY: KEN FURLONG

SECONDED BY: LES NICHOLS

WHEREAS the nineteen Source Protection Committees across Ontario are now developing policies to deal with the twenty-one prescribed threats to drinking water as specified in the Provincial Table of Drinking Water Threats;

AND WHEREAS fourteen of those twenty-one threats involve activities that are carried out on farms across Ontario;

AND WHEREAS the Ontario Environmental Farm Plan (EFP) program is an excellent tool to evaluate these threats on Ontario farms;

AND WHEREAS the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) presently will not recognize EFP as a usable option because it is voluntary and confidential;

AND WHEREAS there will be some farm operations within designated vulnerable areas of Wellhead Protection Areas (WHPA) and Intake Protection Zones (IPZ) pursuant to the *Clean Water Act* that will be required to produce "Risk Assessment Plans";

AND WHEREAS the present EFP process could stay technically unchanged with the addition of a "sign-off" system that would allow those operations requiring "Risk Assessment Plans" to utilize their EFP as that "Risk Assessment Tool & Plan";

AND WHEREAS this would potentially greatly reduce the cost of creating the Risk Assessment Plan and utilize an existing, recognized, proven program developed specifically for agriculture;

THEREFORE the Source Protection Committee for Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula requests that Ontario Soil & Crop Improvement Association (OSCIA) and EFP staff consult and negotiate with MOE/Source Water Protection staff to make modifications to the EFP

AND FURTHER THAT the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Water Protection Committee will circulate this resolution to all Source Water Protection Committees in Ontario for their support.

Carried

3.0 Draft Policy Ideas: On-Site Sewage (Septic) Systems

Date: February 22, 2011
To: Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee
From: Sommer Casgrain-Robertson, Co-Project Manager
Mississippi – Rideau Source Protection Region

Recommendation 1:

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approve the Draft Policy Ideas for on-site sewage systems under 10,000 litres per day and direct staff to undertake pre-consultation with potential policy implementers and engage potentially affected persons and bodies.

Background

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees (SPC) are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, Provincial Ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination or overuse of lakes, rivers and aquifers that supply municipal drinking water.

Most source protection policies will manage land use activities that could contaminate sources of drinking water, although prohibition can be used as a tool of last resort. All policies will be compiled into Source Protection Plans which will undergo thorough public consultation.

Source Protection Plans:

- Must contain policies to address significant drinking water threats; and
- May contain policies to address moderate and/or low drinking water threats.

Policy Tools

Policies addressing significant threats can use one or more of the following tools:

- Education and Outreach
- Incentives
- Monitoring
- Provincial instruments (add conditions/requirements to a provincial approval)
- Land Use Planning (restrict or manage land uses)
- Risk Management Plans (require risk mitigation strategies to be implemented)
- Prohibition
- Other
 - Specify Actions (that would help implement the Plan or achieve it's objectives)
 - Stewardship Programs
 - Best Management Practices
 - Pilot Programs
 - Research

Mississippi-Rideau Plan Development

In the Mississippi-Rideau region, policies will be developed in four stages:

1. Draft Policy Ideas:
 - A municipal working group, local experts and staff will develop initial policy ideas
 - These ideas will be vetted by the SPC who can approve them as draft concepts
2. Draft Policy Concepts
 - Staff will seek input from those people/bodies who would be affected by the policy concepts and who have been tasked with implementing policy concepts
 - The SPC will consider all input and may amend the concepts (draft policies)
3. Draft Source Protection Plan
 - Will be posted for a 35 day public comment period (including public meetings)
 - The SPC will consider all comments and may amend the policies (proposed policies)
4. Proposed Source Protection Plan
 - Will be posted for a 30 day comment period
 - All comments will be submitted to the MOE for their consideration when reviewing the proposed Source Protection Plan for possible approval

Drinking Water Threats

Certain land use activities involving chemicals or pathogens (e.g. bacteria) are considered a drinking water threat if they take place close to a municipal well or upstream of a municipal water treatment plant intake. This is because a leak, spill or runoff could soak into the ground and contaminate groundwater or runoff property and contaminate a lake or river. If this happened near a municipal well or intake, municipal drinking water could become contaminated.

The province has determined that under certain circumstances the following land use activities are considered drinking water threats. To be a threat most of the activities below must involve a minimum amount of material, be occurring on a minimum size area and/or involve a certain type of chemical. All the threat circumstances are listed in a provincial table accessible from the “Assessment Report” page of our website (www.mrsourcewater.ca).

The provincial drinking water threat categories are:

- Waste disposal sites or application of untreated septage to land
- **Sewage storage, treatment, transmission or disposal**
- Agricultural source material (e.g. manure) storage, management or application
- Non-agricultural source material (e.g. biosolids) storage, handling or application
- Farm animal pasturing, grazing, outdoor confinement areas or farm yards
- Fertilizer storage, handling or application
- Pesticide storage, handling or application
- Fuel storage or handling
- Dense Non-aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPLSs) storage or handling
- Organic solvents storage or handling
- Road salt storage, handling or application
- Snow storage
- Airplane de-icing

Sewage

The remainder of this staff report discusses sewage storage, treatment, transmission or disposal as it relates to septic systems that are located on one lot and have a daily design flow of 10,000 litres per day or less. The staff report provides:

- Background information about this significant drinking water threat; and
- Draft policy ideas for how it could be addressed in a Source Protection Plan.

The Threat

As noted above (in bold), one of the provincial threat categories is sewage, specifically:

- The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.

This staff report proposes draft policy ideas for sewage systems regulated under Ontario's *Building Code Act*. They are:

- Septic systems:
 - With a daily design sewage flow of 10,000 litres / day or less; and
 - Contained on one lot.
- Holding tanks:
 - With a daily design sewage flow of 10,000 litres / day or less; and
 - Contained on one lot.

Future staff reports will propose draft policy ideas for sewage systems regulated under the *Ontario Water Resources Act*. They are:

- Septic systems:
 - With a daily design sewage flow of more than 10,000 litres / day; and/or
 - Not contained on one lot.
- Holding tanks:
 - With a daily design sewage flow of more than 10,000 litres / day; and/or
 - Not contained on one lot.
- Municipal sewage works (e.g. sewage treatment plants, sewers)

Where is it a Significant Threat?

Septic systems and holding tanks are a significant drinking water threat:

- In the following locations; and
- Under the following circumstances.

Locations	Circumstances
Wellhead Protection Areas (WHPA) with a vulnerability score of 10	Septic System: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earth pit privy, privy vault, cesspool or leaching bed as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg 350/06 (Building Code) made under the <i>Building Code Act</i>. • A discharge from the system may result in one or more pathogens in ground or surface water.
Intake Protection Zones (IPZ) with a vulnerability score of 10	Holding Tank: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system requires or uses a holding tank for the retention of hauled sewage at the site where it is produced before its collection by a hauled sewage system and is subject to the <i>Building Code Act</i>. • A spill from the tank may result in the presence of one or more pathogens in groundwater or surface water.

Maps showing the location of WHPAs and IPZs and their vulnerability scores are available on the “Assessment Report” pages of our website (www.mrsourcewater.ca). In the Mississippi-Rideau region vulnerability scores of 10 are only found in:

Drinking Water System	WHPA			
	100 m	2 year	5 year	25 year
Almonte	whole area	partial area		
Carp	whole area	partial area		
Kemptville	whole area	partial area		
Merrickville	whole area	partial area		
Munster	whole area	partial area		
Richmond	whole area	partial area		
Westport	whole area	partial area		

Drinking Water System	IPZ		
	IPZ-1	IPZ-2	IPZ-3
Carleton Place	whole area		
Perth	whole area		
Smiths Falls	whole area		
Ottawa – Britannia & Lemieux Island			

Existing and Future Significant Threats

In the Mississippi-Rideau region there are some existing septic systems and holding tanks that are significant drinking water threats. There are also some areas where future septic systems and holding tanks could be constructed creating new significant drinking water threats.

Drinking Water System		Existing Significant Threats	Future Significant Threats	
WHPA	Almonte	5	Possible	Within the urban boundary new sewage systems may be allowed where municipal services are not available Outside the urban boundary new sewage systems are allowed
	Kemptville	115*		
	Merrickville	140*		
	Munster	0		
	Carp	0	Not Possible	WHPA area scored 10 is fully developed on municipal services
	Richmond	0		
	Westport	0	Not Possible	New sewage systems are not allowed within the urban boundary (encompasses the entire WHPA area scored 10)

* These two numbers will drop significantly if the municipal well casings are successfully deepened through the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program grant.

Drinking Water System		Existing Significant Threats	Future Significant Threats	
IPZ	Carleton Place	0	Not Possible	New development is only allowed on municipal services in the IPZ area scored 10
	Perth	0		
	Smiths Falls	0		
	Ottawa – Britannia & Lemieux Island	No vulnerability score of 10 so a significant threat is not possible		

Existing Regulations

The *Building Code Act*, 1992 and Ontario Regulation 350/06 (Ontario Building Code) regulate on-site sewage systems that are:

- Contained on one lot; and
- Have a daily design sewage flow of not more than 10,000 litres per day.

The Building Code contains:

- Technical and administrative requirements for the construction, alteration and repair of on-site sewage systems; and
- General requirements for the operation and maintenance of existing on-site sewage systems.

Enforcement of the Act and Code

- Enforcement is assigned to “Principal Authorities”
- Principal Authorities can be municipalities, conservation authorities or Health Units
- In the Mississippi-Rideau region the Principal Authorities for our WHPAs and IPZs are:

Principal Authority	Jurisdiction
Conservation Authority	Ottawa: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Carp, Munster, Richmond
Health Unit	Leeds, Grenville and Lanark: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Almonte, Kemptville, Merrickville, Westport, Carleton Place, Perth and Smiths Falls
Municipality	Rideau Lakes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Westport

New Mandatory Maintenance Inspection Program

Recent amendments to the Ontario Building Code require sewage systems located in designated areas to be inspected, maintained, and replaced or upgraded where necessary, to ensure they continue to protect drinking water.

Where: Designated areas are where septic systems and holding tanks are a significant drinking water threat (WHPAs scored 10 and IPZs scored 10).

When: All septic systems and holding tanks that are a significant drinking water threat must be inspected within five years of the Assessment Report being approved. These and all new systems must then be inspected once every five years thereafter.

The purpose of the inspection is to ensure systems are functioning properly and are in compliance with Section 8.9, Division B of the Building Code. If the inspection shows that the system is failing, the Building Code provides authority to require upgrades or replacements.

Policy Options

There are many policy tools that can be used to address significant drinking water threats. Some are existing tools (education and outreach, incentives, monitoring, provincial instruments, and land use planning). Others were newly created under the *Clean Water Act* (Risk Management Plans and Prohibition).

For some drinking water threats, only some policy tools exist or are allowed to be used. The following chart shows what policy tools are available to address sewage systems regulated under the *Building Code Act* that are a significant threat.

Policy Tool	Address Sewage Systems under <i>Building Code Act</i>
Education and Outreach	Yes
Incentives	Yes
Monitoring	Yes
Provincial instruments	No provincial instruments exist
Land Use Planning	Yes
Risk Management Plans	<i>Clean Water Act</i> regulations do not allow this tool to be used for sewage threats
Prohibition (under the Clean Water Act)	<i>Clean Water Act</i> regulations do not allow this tool to be used for sewage threats
Other	Yes – The MOE suggests that the “Specify Actions tool can be used to support the implementation and administration of the new mandatory maintenance inspection program.

Draft Policy Ideas

Draft policy ideas have been developed to address on-site sewage systems regulated by Ontario's *Building Code Act*. These ideas were developed by staff in conjunction with:

- Local experts; and
- Our municipal working group
 - Meeting #2 (January 20, 2011) and Meeting #3 (February 17, 2011)

The draft policy ideas are outlined in two attached tables: one table addresses existing significant threats and the other table addresses future significant threats.

Rationale

Each Source Protection Committee has to write an Explanatory Document to accompany their Source Protection Plan. This document must provide a rationale for each source protection policy. It will therefore be important to document at each stage of policy development, why Committees approve certain draft ideas, concepts and policies.

At their January 6, 2011 meeting, the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approved a qualitative evaluation framework to help them evaluate different policy options and ultimately decide which ones to use. The framework has four categories: Impact/Effectiveness, Acceptance, Cost and Practicality. At each stage of our policy development process (draft policy ideas, draft policy concepts, draft policies and proposed policies) this evaluation framework will be used by the Committee to make decisions. This will form the content of their Explanatory Document.

Below, staff used the four main categories of the framework to do an initial review of the draft policy ideas being proposed for sewage systems:

Impact / Effectiveness

- Septic systems are designed to reduce or eliminate pathogens in the liquid they discharge. Therefore, ensuring septic systems are functioning properly in vulnerable areas can be an effective approach to ensure they cease to be a significant drinking water threat.
- Existing threats where municipal services are available:
Municipal sewer infrastructure has also been identified by the province as a significant drinking water threat (due to the potential for leakage), however municipal sewers transport sewage away from a vulnerable area for off-site treatment and disposal. For this reason they are a preferred alternative to on-site sewage (septic) systems in vulnerable areas. Therefore it is proposed that where municipal sewer services are available, failing septic systems would have to be decommissioned and the development connected to municipal services. This policy approach would phase out septic systems over time where the alternative of municipal services exists.
- Future threats where municipal services are available:
To prevent unnecessary new significant threats from being created, it is proposed that municipalities establish a by-law using their authority under the *Municipal Act* to require new development to connect to municipal services where feasible. This would prevent future significant threats in these situations.
- Future threats where municipal services are not available:
Where municipal services are not available it is proposed that new septic systems be tertiary treatment systems unless deemed unnecessary by the principal authority (this would provide a higher level of effluent treatment where warranted). New septic systems would also be subject to the new mandatory maintenance inspection program which would require an inspection every five years to ensure the system is functioning properly and not posing a significant drinking water threat.

Acceptance

- The mandatory maintenance inspection program may affect fewer than 20 property owners in the region (once the size of vulnerable areas are reduced in Kemptville and Merrickville following the successful completion of their Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program grant project)
- The proposed policy ideas do not prevent existing or new development in vulnerable areas, they simply ensure municipal services are used where available and new septic systems utilize tertiary treatment where warranted.
- Draft policy concepts will be provided to potentially affected property owners for review and their input and comments provided to the SPC prior to considering a draft policy for the draft Source Protection Plan.

Cost

- The cost of the mandatory maintenance inspection program will be funded by the principal authority.
 - Under the Ontario Building Code, principal authorities may charge fees to recover the costs of maintenance inspection programs.
 - There are relatively few existing septic systems to be inspected, however the proposed draft policy ideas allow new septic systems to be established where municipal services are not available. These new systems would fall under the inspection program.
- It is expensive to construct a new septic system or hook up to municipal services. Due to the costs involved, it seemed reasonable to phase out existing septic systems where municipal services existed. This allows people who have a new or well functioning septic system to continue using that system until such time as it needs replacing or major upgrades. At that point the policy requires them to pay to hook up to municipal services rather than investing the money in a new septic system.

- It is hoped that municipalities will provide low interest long-term loans to help people connect to municipal services

Practicality

- The maintenance inspection program has already been made mandatory through changes to the Ontario Building Code and will be implemented by local principal authorities.
- The proposed draft policy ideas will help ensure the use of best management practices where new septic systems are being designed and constructed under the Building Code.
- Best management practices would also form the basis of an education and outreach program regarding proper operation and maintenance of a septic system.
- Monitoring would be achieved through regular reports from the principal authorities.

Moderate and Low Threats

Potential policies to address moderate and low drinking water threats could be discussed at a future Committee meeting later in 2011 once required policies for significant threats are well underway.

Additional Information

- MOE Memorandum: On-Site Sewage (Septic) Systems – Changes to the Ontario Building Code and what it means for Ontario's Clean Water Act (October 2010).
- MOE Bulletin: Threats Related to On-Site Sewage (Septic) Systems (January 2011)

Attached:

- Draft Policy Ideas for On-Site Sewage (Septic) Systems Regulated under the *Building Code Act*: Existing Significant Drinking Water Threat
- Draft Policy Ideas for On-Site Sewage (Septic) Systems Regulated under the *Building Code Act*: Future Significant Drinking Water Threat

Draft Policy Ideas for On-Site Sewage (Septic) Systems Regulated under the Building Code
EXISTING DRINKING WATER THREATS

Situation	Description	Policy Tool and Concept	Monitoring Policy	Implementer	Legal Effect**	Location	Compliance Date
#1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing on-site sewage system identified as a significant threat Municipal sewer services not available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify Actions: Implement and administer the mandatory on-site sewage system maintenance inspection program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority to provide to the Source Protection Committee (SPC) an annual report on the results of the maintenance inspection program (number of inspections, number of failures and remediation notices, number of system pump-outs and compliance orders issued). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must comply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within five years of the approval of the assessment report (2016). Five year intervals thereafter.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education and Outreach: Educate on-site sewage system owners about vulnerable areas, the mandatory maintenance inspection program and the importance of proper operation and maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementer to provide an annual report to the SPC on the education and outreach activities and their outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined
#2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing on-site sewage system identified as a significant threat Municipal sewer services available* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify Actions: Implement and administer the mandatory on-site sewage inspection program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority to provide to the SPC an annual report on the results of the maintenance inspection program (number of inspections, number of failures and remediation notices, number of system pump-outs and compliance orders issued). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must comply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within five years of the approval of the assessment report (2016). Five year intervals thereafter.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Planning: Establish a by-law requiring connection to municipal sewer and decommissioning of existing on-site sewage system where inspectors determine the need for replacement or major upgrade (i.e., failing sewage systems). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality to notify the SPC when the by-law has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must conform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within six months of Source Protection Plan taking effect.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education and Outreach: Educate on-site sewage system owners about vulnerable areas, the mandatory maintenance inspection program and the importance of proper operation and maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementer to provide an annual report to the SPC on the education and outreach activities and their outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined

*The term “available” means geographically, technically and economically feasible.

**All public bodies must comply with monitoring policies.

**Draft Policy Ideas for On-Site Sewage (Septic) Systems Regulated under the Building Code
FUTURE DRINKING WATER THREAT**

Situation	Description	Policy Tool and Concept	Monitoring Policy	Implementer	Legal Effect**	Location	Compliance Date
#3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed on-site sewage system on an existing vacant lot of record Municipal sewer services not available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify Actions: 1) Tertiary treatment systems required unless deemed unnecessary by the Principal Authority. 2) Lot grading plans must be prepared. 3) New systems will become part of the ongoing mandatory on-site sewage system maintenance inspection program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority to notify the Source Protection Committee (SPC) once new requirements are being implemented. Principal Authority to provide to the SPC an annual report on the implementation of the new requirements. Principal Authority to provide to the SPC an annual report on the results of the maintenance inspection program (number of inspections, number of failures and remediation notices, number of system pump-outs and compliance orders issued). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must comply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptonville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 6 months of Source Protection Plan taking effect. Inspection program at 5 year intervals.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education and Outreach: Educate on-site sewage system owners about vulnerable areas, the mandatory maintenance inspection program and the importance of proper operation and maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementer to provide an annual report to the SPC on the education and outreach activities and their outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptonville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined
#4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed on-site sewage system on an existing vacant lot of record Municipal sewer services available* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Planning: Establish a by-law requiring connection to municipal sewer services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality to notify the SPC when the by-law has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must conform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptonville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within six months of Source Protection Plan taking effect.
#5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area where current zoning would permit residential development or lot creation Municipal sewer services not available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Planning: Ensure review process for new residential development and lot creation considers the protection of municipal source water (e.g., lot size / configuration, lot characteristics). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality to provide a report to the SPC regarding review of lot size requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must conform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptonville) Ottawa (Munster) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within six months of Source Protection Plan taking effect.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify Actions: 1) Tertiary treatment systems required unless demonstrated to be unnecessary. 2) Lot grading plans required. 3) New systems subject to the ongoing mandatory on-site sewage system maintenance inspection program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority to notify the Source Protection Committee (SPC) when new requirements have been set. Principal Authority to provide to the SPC an annual report on the implementation of the new requirements. Principal Authority to provide an annual report to the SPC on the results of the maintenance inspection program (number of inspections, number of failures and remediation notices, number of system pump-outs and compliance orders issued). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must comply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptonville) Ottawa (Munster) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within six months of Source Protection Plan taking effect. Inspection program at 5 year intervals.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education and Outreach: Educate on-site sewage system owners about vulnerable areas, the mandatory maintenance inspection program and the importance of proper operation and maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementer to provide an annual report to the SPC on the education and outreach activities and their outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptonville) Ottawa (Munster) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined
#6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area where current zoning would permit residential development or lot creation Municipal sewer services available* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Planning: Establish a by-law requiring connection to municipal sewer services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality to notify the SPC when the by-law has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must conform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 All municipalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within six months of Source Protection Plan taking effect.
#7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area where lot creation currently not permitted Municipal sewer services not available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Planning: Maintain current zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality to notify the SPC regarding need for zoning amendment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must conform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 All municipalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon Source Protection Plan taking effect.
#8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area where lot creation currently not permitted Municipal sewer services available* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Planning: Maintain current zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality to notify the SPC regarding need for zoning amendment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must conform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 All municipalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon Source Protection Plan taking effect.
#9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment / renovation using existing on-site sewage system Municipal sewer services not available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify Actions: 1) Part 10 and 11 review under the Ontario Building Code must use well-documented technical information to determine that the current on-site sewage system is adequate to service the proposed redevelopment / renovation. 2) If the sewage system is deemed inadequate to service the proposed redevelopment / renovation a new tertiary treatment system is required (unless deemed unnecessary by the Principal Authority), lot grading plan must be prepared, and the new system will become part of the mandatory septic system maintenance inspection program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority to provide an annual report to the SPC on the process used to approve redevelopment on existing on-site sewage systems. Principal Authority to provide an annual report to the SPC on the results of the maintenance inspection program (number of inspections, number of failures and remediation notices, number of system pump-outs and compliance orders issued). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must comply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptonville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within six months of Source Protection Plan taking effect. Inspection program at 5 year intervals.
#10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment / renovation using existing on-site sewage system Municipal sewer services available* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify Actions: Part 10 and 11 review under the Ontario Building Code must use well-documented technical information to determine that the current on-site sewage system is adequate to service the proposed redevelopment / renovation. Land Use Planning: Establish a by-law requiring connection to municipal sewer services and decommissioning of existing on-site sewage system for use where the sewage system is deemed inadequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality to notify the SPC when the by-law has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must conform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHPA 10, IPZ 10 Mississippi Mills (Almonte) Merrickville/Wolford (Merrickville) North Grenville (Kemptonville) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within six months of Source Protection Plan taking effect.

*The term “available” means geographically, technically and economically feasible.

**All public bodies must comply with monitoring policies

4.0 Community Outreach

Date: February 22, 2011
To: Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee
From: Sommer Casgrain-Robertson, Co-Project Manager
Mississippi – Rideau Source Protection Region

Recommendation:

1. That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee receive the Community Outreach staff report for information.

Background

Staff and MRSPC members participate in many different community outreach activities to raise awareness and understanding of the source protection planning process. These activities include information booths at events, presentations at meetings and articles in newsletters and local papers. It is important that staff and members keep each other informed about the activities they are involved in so that we can coordinate our participation and prepare appropriate materials in advance. This includes coordinating with our neighbouring regions for outreach covering Eastern Ontario.

Past Activities

Members & staff are asked to give a verbal update on any other activities that took place in the past month related to source protection.

1. *Eastern Regions Meeting*
 - o Feb 7, Brockville (Brian and Sommer attended)
2. *Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association Annual Meeting*
 - o February 8 and 9, Niagara Falls (Peter McLaren attended)
3. *Municipal Working Group Meeting*
 - o February 17, Perth (Allison, Sommer, Bev Millar, Drew Lampman, George Braithwaite and Mary Wooding attended)
4. *One-on-One Meetings with Municipal Staff*
 - o Carleton Place, Smiths Falls, Rideau Lakes, Montague, Perth, Tay Valley, Beckwith and Drummond / North Elmsley

Upcoming Activities

Members & staff are asked to give a verbal update about any other activities they know about in the coming months related to source protection.

1. *Provincial Chairs Meeting*
 - o March 7 & 8, Toronto (Chair Stavinga, Sommer and Allison attending)
2. *Municipal Working Group Meetings*
 - o March 24, Perth (Allison, Sommer, Drew Lampman and Mary Wooding attending)
 - o April 21, Perth (Allison, Sommer, Eleanor Renaud and Mary Wooding attending)
 - o May 19, Perth (Allison, Sommer, George Braithwaite, Patricia Larkin, Carol Dillon and Mary Wooding attending)

3. *Eastern Regions Meetings*

- March 28, Brockville (Sommer, Brian and Allison attending)
- April 18, Brockville (Sommer, Brian and Allison attending)
- May 30, Brockville (Sommer, Brian and Allison attending)
- June 27, Brockville (Sommer, Brian and Allison attending)