

## **AGENDA**

### **Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee**

**Date:** January 12, 2012

**Time:** 1 pm

**Location:** Rideau Valley Conservation Authority – Monterey Boardroom  
3889 Rideau Valley Drive, Manotick

<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>		
<b>1.0</b>	a. Agenda Review b. Notice of Proxies c. Adoption of the Agenda (D) d. Declarations of Interest e. Approval of Minutes – December 15, 2011 (D) ▶ draft minutes attached as a separate document f. Status of Action Items – Staff Report Attached (D) ..... g. Correspondence – none	<b>Pg.</b>       1
<b>Chair Stavinga</b>		
<b>Source Protection Plan</b>		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Comments Received on Draft Policies – Staff Reports Attached (D)</b> Members will review comments received on the following draft policies and consider revising the policies: a. Waste Disposal Sites..... b. Sewage Works ..... c. Aquaculture ..... d. ASM, NASM and Outdoor Livestock Areas ..... e. Commercial Fertilizer..... f. Pesticide ..... g. Snow and Road Salt..... h. Transportation Corridors.....	       3 11 18 23 29 34 40 49
<b>Sommer Casgrain-Robertson</b>		
<b>Other</b>		
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Community Outreach – Staff Report Attached (D) .....</b> Members & staff report on past activities and upcoming events and opportunities	<b>55</b> <b>Chair Stavinga</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Other Business</b>	<b>Chair Stavinga</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Member Inquiries</b>	<b>Chair Stavinga</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Next Meeting – February 9, 2012</b> 1 pm Rideau Valley Conservation Authority 3889 Rideau Valley Drive, Manotick	<b>Chair Stavinga</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>	<b>Chair Stavinga</b>

**(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](mailto:sommer.robertson@mrsourcewater.ca) or 613-692-3571 / 1-800-267-3504 x 1147)

## 1.0f STATUS OF ACTION ITEMS

**Date:** January 4, 2012  
**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 Status of Action Items for information.

**Staff & Chair Action Items:**

Issue		Action	Lead	Status
1	O. Reg 903	A member suggested O. Reg 903 be added as applicable law under Ontario's Building Code	Patricia Larkin and Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	<b>In Progress</b> Staff and members are working on a transport pathway draft policy idea to be considered by the Committee at a future meeting
2	Vacant City of Ottawa seat on SPC	Fill the vacancy on the MRSPC	City of Ottawa staff	<b>In Progress</b> City of Ottawa staff are in the process of filling this seat
3	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	<b>Ongoing</b> École Polytechnique de Montréal submitted a Canadian Water Network proposal called <i>Source Water Protection In Surface Waters: Evaluating novel monitoring strategies for the prioritization of threats and the prevention of waterborne disease outbreaks</i> . To begin they are organizing a Canadian consortium on source protection. They have invited the City of Ottawa, Gatineau and the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region to participate in an initial meeting on December 8, 2011.

Issue		Action	Lead	Status
4	Uranium	MVC and local Health Units work together to raise public awareness about naturally occurring uranium in drinking water	Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	<b>In Progress</b> Health Canada released a “Uranium and Drinking Water” fact sheet. It is available on their website at <a href="http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ewh-semt/pubs/water-eau/uranium-eng.php">http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ewh-semt/pubs/water-eau/uranium-eng.php</a>
5	Compensation Models	Staff to collect other compensation models (e.g. Ottawa wetland policy, Alternate Land Use Services).	Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	<b>In Progress</b> Staff will present their findings to the Committee at a future meeting and integrate wording into the general narrative of the Source Protection Plans.

### MRSPC Member Action Items:

Issue		Action	Lead	Status
1	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	<b>Ongoing</b>
2	OFEC Conference Calls & Training Sessions	Richard Fraser will provide the MRSPC with updates on OFEC conference calls & training sessions	Richard Fraser	<b>Ongoing</b>
3	Community Outreach opportunities	Members to notify Sommer of potential events and opportunities to engage the public about source protection	All members	<b>Ongoing</b>

## **2.0a            Comments Received on Draft Policies Waste Disposal Sites**

**Date:**            **January 4, 2012**  
**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 approve the revised waste disposal site policies for inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plans.

### **Background**

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, government ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination and overuse of lakes, rivers and groundwater where they are a source of drinking water.

Policies will address the following types of activities under certain circumstances:

- **Waste disposal sites** (including the 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
- Aircraft de-icing
- Transportation corridors
- Transport pathways

Policies must address activities considered a significant drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones

Policies can address activities considered a moderate or low drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones
- Highly Vulnerable Aquifers

Once draft policies have been developed and undergone pre-consultation, they must be compiled into Source Protection Plans. A plan is required for each watershed, so the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee must develop two Source Protection Plans, one for the Mississippi Valley watershed and one for the Rideau Valley watershed.

### **Policy Development**

Draft policies to address the establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act were developed as follows:

Policy Ideas were generated by municipal staff, source water staff and sector experts.

Draft Policies were approved by the Source Protection Committee at their May 5, 2011 meeting.

### **Source Protection Authorities**

- Draft policies were endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority at their July 20, 2011 meeting.
- Draft policies were endorsed by the Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority at their July 23, 2011 meeting.

### **Potential Implementers**

- Federal
  - Environment Canada
    - Draft policies were mailed on December 5, 2011 for review and comment.
- Municipalities
  - Draft policies were mailed on October 5 and 6, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all municipal staff on October 20, 2011
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all council members on October 21, 2011
- Ministries
  - Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A forum was held for all eastern Ontario ministry staff on October 18, 2011.

### **Industry Associations**

Conservation Ontario mailed letters to the following industry associations on August 22, 2011 inviting them to review draft policies:

- Ontario Municipal Engineers Association
- Ontario Waste Management Association

### General Public

- Five open houses were held on November 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24, 2011 to solicit input.

### Draft Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must now consider all comments received on the draft policies
- Draft Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 35 day comment period
  - At least two public meetings must be held (one in each watershed); and
  - Notices must be sent to all municipalities, implementers and properties with potential significant threats

### Proposed Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must then consider all comments received on the draft Source Protection Plans
- Proposed Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 30 day comment period
- All comments received will be submitted to the MOE along with the proposed Plans for review

### Comments Received on Draft Policies

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee requested comments on their draft policies by December 2, 2011. Of those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft policies regarding waste disposal sites, the following tables summarize:

- Who submitted comments; and
- What the comments were.

The following table lists those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft waste disposal sites policies. The table indicates who we received a comment submission from and who indicated they would be providing comments in the coming weeks (indicated by *italics*). Some bodies have indicated that they require additional time to review the draft policies. Comments received after December 16, 2011 will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at a future meeting, prior to draft Plans being approved and posted for public consultation.

	Comments Received From	Comments Pending
<b>Municipalities</b>	Carleton Place Central Frontenac Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Frontenac North Grenville Smiths Falls South Frontenac Tay Valley Westport  Frontenac County County of Lanark	Augusta Beckwith <i>Elizabethtown-Kitley</i> Lanark Highlands Montague <i>Ottawa</i> <i>Perth</i> Rideau Lakes  United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
<b>Ministries</b>	MMAH	<i>MOE</i>

	MNDM	
<b>Federal</b>		Environment Canada
<b>Public</b>	40 people attended the open houses	

The following table summarizes all the comments received by December 16, 2011 on waste disposal sites draft policies and how staff proposes each comment be addressed.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	Supports or did not oppose the draft policies	Carleton Place Central Frontenac Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Frontenac North Grenville Smiths Falls South Frontenac Tay Valley Westport  Frontenac County Lanark County  MMAH MNDM  Open house participants	n/a	n/a
2	<b>Waste-2 &amp; 5</b> Take into consideration the enforcement of the compliance date, "no later than the five year review" is difficult and compliance varies greatly, when developing implementation time lines or monitoring policies.	MMAH	Yes	The compliance date will be revisited if concerns are raised by municipalities. The implementer may also be changed to a ministry (we are awaiting clarification from the MOE regarding which policy tools can be used).
3	<b>Waste-5</b> Could "closing a mine" be included in the monitoring policy	SPC Member	Yes	Policy wording was changed to include regulating the eventual closure and abandonment of waste disposal sites.
4	<b>Waste-5</b> Mine water systems such as mill process water treatment and discharge and tailings facilities are regulated as industrial sewage systems by MOE. MNDM would not have a direct role in implementing source protection policies to address significant threats from mine water systems. For new mines in the HVA, MNDM requires the proponent	MNDM	Yes	MNDM has been removed as a policy implementer. The storage, treatment and discharge of mine tailings policies will be directed at the MOE.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
	file a certified closure plan. These plans have prescribed content that addresses the protection of water quality. MNDM only receives the closure plans. Therefore, it is not an instrument through which source protection policy intent (such as considering impacts to drinking water for future mines in the HVA) can be achieved.			

### Policies for Draft Source Protection Plans

After considering both the comments received and formatting requirements for Source Protection Plans, staff recommend including the following policies in the Draft Source Protection Plans to address:

- The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act

#### Note the following changes:

- Policies have been added to address existing waste disposal sites even though they are very unlikely
- Part IV policy tools (risk management plans and Section 57 prohibition) have been used to address PCB waste storage as we understand these can be used for waste threats where there is no prescribed instrument for the activity.
- Former policy "Waste-3" that directed municipalities to include vulnerable area maps in their Official Plans has been removed. This policy was only permissible as a companion policy when using a Land Use Planning policy tool. Prohibiting future PCB waste storage sites is now proposed to be accomplished through Part IV policy tools instead of Land Use Planning.
- The policy to address the future storage, treatment and discharge of mine tailings in the HVA has been removed for now pending further regulatory clarification from agencies.

### Policies

#### **Waste Policy #1 (new policies to address unlikely existing activities)**

##### Existing waste disposal sites:

Within six months of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, where an existing waste disposal site is a significant drinking water threat, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) shall review the Waste Certificate of Approval issued pursuant to the *Environmental Protection Act* or the Sewage Certificate of Approval that was issued pursuant to the *Ontario Water Resources Act* to determine if it includes modern design, operational, monitoring and reporting requirements as well as requirements for eventual closure and abandonment that collectively manage the risk so that it ceases to be a significant drinking water threat. If the Certificate of Approval does not currently contain conditions to ensure the activity ceases to be significant, the MOE shall amend it to include additional terms and conditions that ensure the waste disposal site ceases to be a significant drinking water threat. If an approval does not currently exist or has expired, the MOE shall issue an Environmental Compliance Approval containing terms and conditions that will address the threat so that it ceases to be significant. This policy applies to the following types of waste disposal sites within the meaning of Part B of the *Environmental*



*Protection Act* shall conform with this policy:

- Application of untreated septage to land
- Waste disposal site – landfarming of petroleum refining waste
- Waste disposal site – liquid industrial waste injection into a well
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (hazardous waste)
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (municipal waste)
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (solid non-hazardous industrial or commercial waste)
- Waste disposal site – storage of hazardous waste at disposal sites
- Waste disposal site – Storage of waste described in clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste
- Storage, treatment and discharge of tailings from mines

### **Waste Policy #2 (formerly “Waste-1”)**

Future waste disposal sites where they would be a significant drinking threat are prohibited. Accordingly, decisions to issue, otherwise create or amend Environmental Compliance Approvals under the *Environmental Protection Act* or under the *Ontario Water Resources Act* for the following types of waste disposal sites within the meaning of Part B of the *Environmental Protection Act* shall conform with this policy:

- Application of untreated septage to land
- Waste disposal site – landfarming of petroleum refining waste
- Waste disposal site – liquid industrial waste injection into a well
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (hazardous waste)
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (municipal waste)
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (solid non-hazardous industrial or commercial waste)
- Waste disposal site – storage of hazardous waste at disposal sites
- Waste disposal site – Storage of waste described in clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste
- Storage, treatment and discharge of tailings from mines

### **Waste Policy #3 (new policies to address unlikely existing activities)**

Existing PCB waste storage within the meaning of Part B of the *Environmental Protection Act* is designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the *Clean Water Act*, requiring a Risk Management Plan in areas where the threat is significant. The Risk Management Plans for these activities shall be established by [to be determined] and shall include operational, monitoring and reporting requirements as well as requirements for eventual closure and abandonment that collectively manage the risk so that it ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.

### **Waste Policy #4 (formerly “Waste-2”)**

Future PCB waste storage within the meaning of Part B of the *Environmental Protection Act* where it would be a significant drinking water threat is designated as prohibited under Section 57 of the *Clean Water Act* in areas where the threat would be significant.

### **Waste Policy #5 (formerly “Waste-4”)**

Future Waste Disposal Sites in the HVA

The MOE shall consider the potential impact on drinking water sources during their review of applications for Environmental Compliance Approvals pursuant to the *Environmental Protection Act* and the *Ontario Water Resources Act* for the establishment of new waste disposal sites within the meaning of Part V of the *Environmental Protection Act* where they would be a moderate or low threat throughout the HVA. This policy applies to the following types of waste disposal sites within the meaning of Part B of the *Environmental Protection Act* shall conform

with this policy:

- Application of untreated septage to land
- Waste disposal site – landfarming of petroleum refining waste
- Waste disposal site – liquid industrial waste injection into a well
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (hazardous waste)
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (municipal waste)
- Waste disposal site – landfilling (solid non-hazardous industrial or commercial waste)
- Waste disposal site – storage of hazardous waste at disposal sites
- Waste disposal site – Storage of waste described in clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste
- storage, treatment and discharge of tailings from mines

### **Waste Policy 6 (formerly “Waste-5”)**

#### Future PCB waste storage sites in the HVA

The MOE and Environment Canada shall consider the potential impact on drinking water sources during their review of proposals for new PCB waste storage sites where they would be a low threat throughout the HVA and when regulating the eventual closure and abandonment of these sites.

### **Monitoring the Effectiveness of the Waste Disposal Site Policies**

#### **Waste Policy #1**

##### Existing Waste Disposal Sites

The MOE shall provide the Source Protection Authority with a copy of the amended Certificate of Approval or newly issued Environmental Compliance Approval or, if not amended an explanation of the existing factors or measures that adequately manage the risk posed by existing waste disposal sites.

#### **Waste Policy #2**

##### Future Waste Disposal Sites

The MOE shall notify the Source Protection Authority when procedures have been put in place to implement this policy such as guidance for Environmental Officers, amendments to applications and related documents.

#### **Waste Policy #3**

##### Existing PCB Waste Storage Sites

The Risk Management Official shall report annually to the Source Protection Authority with the information required in Section 65 of Regulation 287/07 related to the previous calendar year. This will provide administrative, enforcement and compliance results for the Risk Management Plan policy.

#### **Waste Policy #4**

##### Future PCB Waste Storage Sites

The Risk Management Official shall report annually to the Source Protection Authority with the information required in Section 65 of Regulation 287/07 related to the previous calendar year. This will provide administrative, enforcement and compliance results for the Section 57 Prohibition policy.

**Waste Policy #5****Future Waste Disposal Sites in the HVA**

The MOE is requested to notify the Source Protection Authority on an ongoing basis of any applications received and the decisions rendered regarding applications for new waste disposal sites throughout the HVA. This can be accomplished by adding the Source Protection Authority to the distribution list of future notices or approvals issued.

**Waste Policy #6****Future PCB Waste Storage Sites in the HVA**

The MOE and Environment Canada are requested to notify the Source Protection Authority on an ongoing basis of any applications received and the decisions rendered regarding applications for new PCB waste storage sites throughout the HVA. This can be accomplished by adding the Source Protection Authority to the distribution list of future notices or approvals issued.

In addition to these policies, the Draft Source Protection Plans would also contain:

- A preamble briefly explaining the policy intent
- Policy codes
- Reference to locations (maps) and circumstances where the policies would apply
- Definitions of “existing” and “future”
- A Restricted Land Use policy to assist with the implementation of Risk Management Plan or Section 57 prohibition policies (this has been requested by a number of municipalities so staff are working on legal wording)
- An invitation to all implementers to provide the Source Protection Authority with feedback about the effectiveness of the policies and suggestions for improvement on an ongoing basis.
- Associated education and outreach policies

## **2.0b            Comments Received on Draft Policies Sewage Works**

**Date:**            **January 4, 2012**  
**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 approve the revised sewage works policies for inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plans.

### **Background**

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, government ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination and overuse of lakes, rivers and groundwater where they are a source of drinking water.

Policies will address the following types of activities under certain circumstances:

- Waste disposal sites (including the 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
- Aircraft de-icing
- Transportation corridors
- Transport pathways

Policies must address activities considered a significant drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones

Policies can address activities considered a moderate or low drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones
- Highly Vulnerable Aquifers

Once draft policies have been developed and undergone pre-consultation, they must be compiled into Source Protection Plans. A plan is required for each watershed, so the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee must develop two Source Protection Plans, one for the Mississippi Valley watershed and one for the Rideau Valley watershed.

### **Policy Development**

Draft policies to address the establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage were developed as follows:

Policy Ideas were generated by municipal staff, source water staff and sector experts.

Draft Policies were approved by the Source Protection Committee at their July 7, 2011 meeting.

### **Source Protection Authorities**

- Draft policies were endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 21, 2011 meeting.
- Draft policies were endorsed by the Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 22, 2011 meeting.

### **Potential Implementers**

- Municipalities
  - Draft policies were mailed on October 5 and 6, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all municipal staff on October 20, 2011
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all council members on October 21, 2011
- Ministries
  - Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment
  - A forum was held for all eastern Ontario ministry staff on October 18, 2011

### **Industry Associations**

Conservation Ontario mailed letters to the following industry associations on August 22, 2011 inviting them to review draft policies:

- Cement Association of Canada
- Ontario Association of Sewage (OASIS)
- Ontario Onsite Wastewater Association

### **General Public**

- Five open houses were held on November 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24, 2011 to solicit input.

### **Draft Source Protection Plans**

- Source Protection Committees must now consider all comments received on the draft policies
- Draft Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 35 day comment period
  - At least two public meetings must be held (one in each watershed); and

- Notices must be sent to all municipalities, implementers and properties with potential significant threats

#### Proposed Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must then consider all comments received on the draft Source Protection Plans
- Proposed Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 30 day comment period
- All comments received will be submitted to the MOE along with the proposed Plans for review

#### **Comments Received on Draft Policies**

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee requested comments on their draft policies by December 2, 2011. Of those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft policies regarding sewage works, the following tables summarize:

- Who submitted comments; and
- What the comments were.

The following table lists those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft sewage works policies. The table indicates who we received a comment submission from and who indicated they would be providing comments in the coming weeks (indicated by *italics*). Some bodies have indicated that they require additional time to review the draft policies. Comments received after December 16, 2011 will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at a future meeting, prior to draft Plans being approved and posted for public consultation.

	<b>Comments Received From</b>	<b>Comments Pending</b>
<b>Municipalities</b>	Carleton Place Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls Tay Valley Westport  County of Lanark	Beckwith Montague <i>Ottawa</i> <i>Perth</i> Rideau Lakes  United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
<b>Ministries</b>		MOE
<b>Public</b>	40 people attended the open houses (including affected property owners)	

The following table summarizes all the comments received by December 16, 2011 on sewage works draft policies and how staff proposes each comment be addressed.

<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Addressed</b>	<b>Staff Recommendation</b>
<b>1</b>	Supports or did not oppose the draft policies	Carleton Place Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls	<b>N/a</b>	

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
		Tay Valley Westport  County of Lanark  MMAH  Open house participants		
2	More information is required about potential Certificate of Approval conditions before the prescribed instrument tool should be used to address stormwater.	Town of Carleton Place	Yes	The pre-consultation letter to the MOE requested information about what additional conditions may be required. We are awaiting a response.
3	<b>Sewage Works-1</b> Would like to see the installation of continuous liners as a recognized response to reduce potential threat created by older existing sewers located in WHPA scored 10.	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	Our draft policy would require municipalities to inspect their sanitary sewers every five years and address any problems. It does not outline specific remediation work or best management practices.
4	<b>Sewage Works-1</b> The monitoring and maintenance dates shall align with the PPCP (Pollution Prevention and Control Plan) process (once every 5 years)	Town of Smiths Falls	No	Policy wording was not revised. Aligning the sewer system maintenance program schedule with the PPCP process can be left up to the discretion of the municipalities.
5	<b>Sewage Works-2</b> Clarification is needed to ensure that sewage works are designed, constructed and tested in accordance with force main standards, but are not required to operate as force mains and can operate on gravity feed.	Town of Smiths Falls	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to more clearly articulate the desired standard for new sewers.
6	<b>Sewage Works-2</b> Change "forcemain standards" wording to refer to OPSS Polyvinyl Chloride PVC Pressure Pipe (Class 150) or Ductile Iron (Class 52).	Municipality of North Grenville	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to more clearly articulate the desired standard for new sewers.
7	<b>Sewage Works-6</b> Could complication arise where a rural property abuts (and is outside) a designated service area would be ordered to connect?	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	Policy wording was revised to more clearly articulate when connection to sewer services would be required.
8	<b>Sewage Works-5</b> Large septic systems should be prohibited in all IPZ-10's	Town of Smiths Falls	No	This prohibition could have implications for development in some small areas and it is felt that septic systems can be adequately managed. Individual municipalities however, could prohibit

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
				through their planning process.
9	<b>Sewage Works-7</b> Does not believe that stormwater and stormwater retention ponds represent a significant enough threat to be prohibited within WHPA areas.	Municipality of North Grenville	Yes	This concern was discussed with the municipality and it was agreed that policy wording would remain the same.

### Policies for Draft Source Protection Plans

After considering both the comments received and formatting requirements for Source Protection Plans, staff recommend including the following policies in the Draft Source Protection Plans to address:

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

### Policies

#### SEPTIC SYSTEMS (regulated under the *Ontario Water Resources Act*)

##### **Sewage Works Policy #1 (formerly “Sewage Works-5” and “Sewage Works-6”)**

Existing and Future Septic Systems Regulated under the *Ontario Water Resources Act*

Where a septic system (existing and/or future) is or would be a significant drinking water threat, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) shall review the Certificate of Approval or Environmental Compliance Approval to determine if it includes design, operational, monitoring and reporting requirements that collectively manage the risk so that it is not a significant drinking water threat. If the instrument does not currently contain conditions to ensure the activity ceases to be significant, the MOE shall amend it within six months of the Source Protection Plan taking effect to include additional terms and conditions that ensure the septic system ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.

*Note that Policy\_\_\_ requiring connection to municipal sewer services in some situations also applies to septic systems regulated under the *Ontario Water Resources Act*.*

#### SANITARY SEWERS AND RELATED PIPES

##### **Sewage Works Policy #2 (formerly “Sewage Works-1”)**

Sanitary Sewer Maintenance Program

Within one year of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, the municipality shall implement a sanitary sewer maintenance program in areas where sewers and related pipes are a significant drinking water threat. Where possible, the program should include sewer pipe cleaning followed by a camera inspection focused on identifying areas of infiltration. Pressure testing of pipes may also be conducted in lieu of camera inspection. Remedial work is required if areas of significant leakage are identified. Each portion of the sewer network shall be subject to the maintenance program at five year intervals.

##### **Sewage Works Policy #3 (formerly “Sewage Works-2”)**

Advanced Sewer Design Standards

The MOE shall ensure that Environmental Compliance Approvals issued for new or replacement



sanitary sewers and related pipes located in areas where they would be a significant drinking water threat are constructed of watermain quality pipe, pressure tested in place at a pressure of 350 kPa (50psi) without leakage using the testing methodology in *Ontario Provincial Standard Specification 412* (OPSS 412) of the OPS.

## **STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES**

### **Sewage Works Policy #4 (new policy to address unlikely existing activity)**

Within six months of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, where an existing stormwater management facility is a significant drinking water threat, the MOE shall review the Certificate of Approval to determine if it includes modern design, operational, monitoring and reporting requirements that collectively manage the risk so that it ceases to be a significant drinking water threat. If a Certificate of Approval does not currently contain conditions to ensure the activity ceases to be significant, the MOE shall amend it to include additional terms and conditions that ensure the stormwater management facility ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.

### **Sewage Works Policy #5 (formerly “Sewage Works-7”)**

Future stormwater management facilities in the IPZ scored 10 and WHPA-A are prohibited. Accordingly, decisions to issue, otherwise create or amend Environmental Compliance Approvals under the *Ontario Water Resources Act* shall conform with this policy.

### **Sewage Works Policy #6 (formerly “Sewage Works-4”)**

Where a stormwater management facility is proposed where it would be a significant drinking water threat in the IPZ 8 to 9 or WHPA-B, the facility shall be built to Enhanced Level Protection standards as described in the *Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual*, MOE 2003. Accordingly, decisions to issue, otherwise create or amend Environmental Compliance Approvals under the *Ontario Water Resources Act* shall conform with this policy.

## **OTHER SEWAGE WORKS**

### **Sewage Works Policy #7 (formerly “Sewage Works-3” combined with a new policy to address unlikely existing activities)**

Where an existing combined sewer, wastewater treatment facility or outfall, industrial sewage treatment facility or outfall or the storage of sewage is a significant drinking water threat, the MOE will review the Certificate of Approval to determine if it includes modern design, operational, monitoring and reporting requirements that collectively manage the risk so that it ceases to be a significant drinking water threat. If a Certificate of Approval does not currently contain conditions to ensure the activity ceases to be significant, the MOE shall amend it within six months of the Source Protection Plan taking effect to include additional terms and conditions that ensure the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.

### **Sewage Works Policy #8 (formerly “Sewage Works-7”)**

Future combined sewers, wastewater treatment facilities and outfalls, industrial sewage treatment facilities and outfalls and the storage of sewage where they would be a significant drinking threat are prohibited. Accordingly, decisions to issue, otherwise create or amend Environmental Compliance Approvals under the *Ontario Water Resources Act* shall conform with this policy.

## **Monitoring the Effectiveness of the Sewage Works Policies**

### **Sewage Works Policy #1,**

#### **Managing Risks through the Prescribed Instrument – Significant Threats**

1. The Ministry of the Environment shall notify the Source Protection Authority when all existing approvals governing septic system regulated under the *Ontario Water Resources Act* have been amended and procedures have been put in place to address future approvals.
2. The Ministry of the Environment shall add the Source Protection Authority to the distribution of list of future approvals governing septic systems regulated under the *Ontario Water Resources Act* in areas where the threat would be significant.

### **Sewage Works Policy #2**

#### **Sanitary Sewer Maintenance Program**

The municipality shall provide the Source Protection Authority with annual documentation related to the Sanitary Sewer Maintenance Program such as proposed method, schedule, remedial work planned and work carried out.

### **Sewage Works Policy #3**

#### **Advanced Sewer Design Standards**

The Ministry of the Environment shall notify the Source Protection Authority when procedures have been put in place to address future approvals for sanitary sewers and related pipes. The Ministry of the Environment shall add the Source Protection Authority to the distribution list of future approvals in areas where the threat would be significant.

### **Sewage Works Policies #4, #6 and #7**

#### **Existing Sewage Works**

The Ministry of the Environment shall provide the Source Protection Authority with a copy of the amended Certificate of Approval or, if not amended an explanation of the existing factors or measures that adequately manage the risk posed by existing sewage works.

### **Sewage Works Policies #5 and #8**

#### **Future Sewage Works**

The MOE shall notify the Source Protection Authority when procedures have been put in place to implement this policy such as guidance for Environmental Officers, amendments to applications and related documents.

In addition to these policies, the Draft Source Protection Plans would also contain:

- A preamble briefly explaining the policy intent
- Policy codes
- Reference to locations (maps) and circumstances where the policies would apply
- Definitions of “existing” and “future”
- A Restricted Land Use policy to assist with the implementation of the Risk Management Plan policy (this has been requested by a number of municipalities so staff are working on legal wording)
- An invitation to all implementers to provide the Source Protection Authority with feedback about the effectiveness of the policies and suggestions for improvement on an ongoing basis.
- Associated education and outreach policies

## **2.0c            Comments Received on Draft Policies Aquaculture**

**Date:**            **January 4, 2012**  
**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 approve the revised aquaculture policies for inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plans.

### **Background**

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, government ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination and overuse of lakes, rivers and groundwater where they are a source of drinking water.

Policies will address the following types of activities under certain circumstances:

- Waste disposal sites (including the 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
- Aircraft de-icing
- Transportation corridors
- Transport pathways

Policies must address activities considered a significant drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones

Policies can address activities considered a moderate or low drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones
- Highly Vulnerable Aquifers

Once draft policies have been developed and undergone pre-consultation, they must be compiled into Source Protection Plans. A plan is required for each watershed, so the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee must develop two Source Protection Plans, one for the Mississippi Valley watershed and one for the Rideau Valley watershed.

### **Policy Development**

Draft policies to address the management of agricultural source material – aquaculture were developed as follows:

Policy Ideas were generated by municipal staff and source water staff.

Draft Policies were approved by the Source Protection Committee at their September 1, 2011 meeting.

### **Source Protection Authorities**

- Draft policies were endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 21, 2011 meeting.
- Draft policies were endorsed by the Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 22, 2011 meeting.

### **Potential Implementers**

- Municipalities
  - Draft policies were mailed on October 5 and 6, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all municipal staff on October 20, 2011
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all council members on October 21, 2011
- Ministries
  - Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment
  - A forum was held for all eastern Ontario ministry staff on October 18, 2011

### **General Public**

- Five open houses were held on November 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24, 2011 to solicit input.

### Draft Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must now consider all comments received on the draft policies
- Draft Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 35 day comment period
  - At least two public meetings must be held (one in each watershed); and

- Notices must be sent to all municipalities, implementers and properties with potential significant threats

#### Proposed Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must then consider all comments received on the draft Source Protection Plans
- Proposed Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 30 day comment period
- All comments received will be submitted to the MOE along with the proposed Plans for review

#### **Comments Received on Draft Policies**

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee requested comments on their draft policies by December 2, 2011. Of those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft policies regarding aquaculture, the following tables summarize:

- Who submitted comments; and
- What the comments were.

The following table lists those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft aquaculture policies. The table indicates who we received a comment submission from and who indicated they would be providing comments in the coming weeks (indicated by *italics*). Some bodies have indicated that they require additional time to review the draft policies. Comments received after December 16, 2011 will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at a future meeting, prior to draft Plans being approved and posted for public consultation.

	<b>Comments Received From</b>	<b>Comments Pending</b>
<b>Municipalities</b>	Carleton Place Mississippi Mills Smiths Falls Tay Valley  County of Lanark	Beckwith <i>Ottawa</i> <i>Perth</i> Rideau Lakes  United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
<b>Ministries</b>	OMAFRA	<i>MOE</i> MNR
<b>Public</b>	40 people attended the open houses	

The following table summarizes all the comments received by December 16, 2011 on aquaculture draft policies and how staff proposes each comment be addressed.

<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Addressed</b>	<b>Staff Recommendation</b>
<b>1</b>	Supports or did not oppose the draft policies	Carleton Place Mississippi Mills Smiths Falls Tay Valley  OMAFRA  Open house participants	<b>n/a</b>	

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
2	<b>Aqua-1</b> Aquaculture operations are currently not regulated under the Nutrient Management Act. We recommend that an education and outreach program for future operations would be valuable.	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording was revised to remove any reference to the Nutrient Management Act. An education and outreach program is proposed to address all threat activities, including aquaculture.

### Policies for Draft Source Protection Plans

After considering both the comments received and formatting requirements for Source Protection Plans, staff recommend including the following policies in the Draft Source Protection Plans to address:

- The management of agricultural source material – aquaculture

#### Policies

##### **Aquaculture Policy #1 (new policy to address unlikely existing activities)**

Where the use of land or water for aquaculture is a moderate drinking water threat, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) shall, within six months of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, review and if necessary amend, the existing Sewage Certificate of Approval and / or Permit to Take Water to ensure that existing aquaculture operations have in place risk management measures that adequately protect source water.

##### **Aquaculture Policy #2 (formerly “Aqua-1”)**

Where the use of land or water for aquaculture is proposed in an Intake Protection Zone with a score of 9 or 10 where it would be a moderate drinking water threat, the MOE shall consider the potential impact on drinking water sources during their review of applications for approvals under the *Ontario Water Resources Act*. Environmental Compliance Approvals and Permits to Take Water should contain terms and conditions that require aquaculture operations have in place risk management measures that adequately protect source water.

##### **Aquaculture Policy #3 (formerly “Aqua-2”)**

Where the use of land or water for aquaculture is proposed in an Intake Protection Zone with a score of 9 or 10 where it would be a moderate drinking water threat, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources shall consider the potential impact on drinking water sources during their review of applications for approvals under the *Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act* and the Aquaculture Regulations. When approving a location for the establishment of a new aquaculture operation, preference should be given to locations outside of the Intake Protection Zones scored 9 or 10 to prevent the establishment of the threat activity.

In addition to these policies, the Draft Source Protection Plans would also contain:

- A preamble briefly explaining the policy intent
- Policy codes
- Reference to locations (maps) and circumstances where the policies would apply
- Definitions of “existing” and “future”
- A Restricted Land Use policy to assist with the implementation of Risk Management Plan policies (this has been requested by a number of municipalities so staff are working on legal wording)

- An invitation to all implementers to provide the Source Protection Authority with feedback about the effectiveness of the policies and suggestions for improvement on an ongoing basis.
- Associated education and outreach policies

## **2.0d            Comments Received on Draft Policies                   ASM, NASM and Outdoor Livestock Areas**

**Date:**            **January 4, 2012**  
**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 approve the revised ASM, NASM and outdoor livestock areas draft policies for inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plans.

### **Background**

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, government ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination and overuse of lakes, rivers and groundwater where they are a source of drinking water.

Policies will address the following types of activities under certain circumstances:

- Waste disposal sites (including the 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
- Aircraft de-icing
- Transportation corridors
- Transport pathways

Policies must address activities considered a significant drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones

Policies can address activities considered a moderate or low drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones
- Highly Vulnerable Aquifers



Once draft policies have been developed and undergone pre-consultation, they must be compiled into Source Protection Plans. A plan is required for each watershed, so the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee must develop two Source Protection Plans, one for the Mississippi Valley watershed and one for the Rideau Valley watershed.

## **Policy Development**

Draft policies to address:

- the storage and application of agricultural source material;
- the storage, handling and application of non-agricultural source material; and
- farm animal pasturing, grazing, outdoor confinement areas or farm yards, were developed as follows:

Policy Ideas were generated by municipal staff, source water staff and sector experts.

Draft Policies were approved by the Source Protection Committee at their September 1, 2011 meeting.

### **Source Protection Authorities**

- Draft policies were endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 21, 2011 meeting.
- Draft policies were endorsed by the Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 22, 2011 meeting.

### **Potential Implementers**

- Municipalities
  - Draft policies were mailed on October 5 and 6, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all municipal staff on October 20, 2011
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all council members on October 21, 2011
- Ministries
  - Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment
  - A forum was held for all eastern Ontario ministry staff on October 18, 2011.

### **Industry Associations**

Conservation Ontario mailed letters to the following industry associations on August 22, 2011 inviting them to review draft policies:

- Ontario Agri Business Association

### Potentially Affected Property Owners

- Properties with potential significant threats received fact sheets on November 4, 2011 outlining draft policies for their review and comment.

### General Public

- Five open houses were held on November 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24, 2011 to solicit input.

### Draft Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must now consider all comments received on the draft policies
- Draft Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 35 day comment period
  - At least two public meetings must be held (one in each watershed); and
  - Notices must be sent to all municipalities, implementers and properties with potential significant threats

### Proposed Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must then consider all comments received on the draft Source Protection Plans
- Proposed Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 30 day comment period
- All comments received will be submitted to the MOE along with the proposed Plans for review

### Comments Received on Draft Policies

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee requested comments on their draft policies by December 2, 2011. Of those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft policies regarding ASM, NASM and outdoor livestock areas, the following tables summarize:

- Who submitted comments; and
- What the comments were.

The following table lists those individuals and bodies who were asked to review ASM, NASM and outdoor livestock area policies. The table indicates who we received a comment submission from and who indicated they would be providing comments in the coming weeks (indicated by *italics*). Some bodies have indicated that they require additional time to review the draft policies. Comments received after December 2, 2011 will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at a future meeting, prior to draft Plans being approved and posted for public consultation.

	Comments Received From	Comments Pending
<b>Municipalities</b>	Carleton Place Mississippi Mills Smiths Falls Tay Valley  County of Lanark	Beckwith <i>Ottawa</i> <i>Perth</i> Rideau Lakes  United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
<b>Ministries</b>	OMAFRA	<i>MOE</i> MNR
<b>Public</b>	40 people attended the open houses	

The following table summarizes all the comments received by December 16, 2011 on ASM, NASM and outdoor livestock areas draft policies and how staff proposes each comment be addressed.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	Supports or did not oppose the draft policies	Carleton Place Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls Tay Valley Westport  County of Lanark  OMAFRA  Open house participants	n/a	
2	Supports the policies, however they will be financially impacted so they are going to look into the funding opportunities.	Affected property owner	Yes	Property owner was given information about funding programs they would be eligible for, including the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program.
3	Suggest using alternative definitions of ASM and NASM based on O.Reg 267/03.	OMAFRA	No	MOE stated a definition of ASM and NASM in the Tables of Threat Circumstances under the Clean Water Act so we are obligated to use those definitions.
4	Removal of any reference to NASM application, handling and storage specifications from the policy.	OMAFRA	Yes	Our draft policies did not include any specifications.
5	<b>SML-1</b> RMO/RMI be shared with Perth and Smiths Falls	Township of Drummond/North Elmsley	Yes	The role of Risk Management Officer and inspector will be discussed with municipalities in early 2012. They will decide who will fulfill the role.
6	<b>SML-1</b> In terms of risk management is there a clear direction regarding how to manage the risk for outdoor livestock areas? This is a concern as ASM and NASM seem straight forward.	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	The risk management plan policy is not prescriptive but rather is meant to provide opportunity for discussion, flexibility and agreement between the Risk Management Official and the person engaged in the activity. Common best management practices would likely suffice in most cases. These may include measures such as restricting livestock access to watercourses.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
7	<b>SML-1</b> Policy wording change to – “Nutrient Management Strategies, Nutrient Management Plans and/or Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) plans developed under the Nutrient Management Act (NMA) can be used to fulfill this requirement”	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to reflect this suggestion.
8	<b>SML-1</b> Policy wording change to – “Small, non-intensive farms (where the number of farm animals is not sufficient to generate 5 or more nutrient units of manure annually) or a concentration of <1 nutrient units per acre of cropland.”	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to incorporate this suggestion.
9	<b>E&amp;O-1</b> Policy wording change to – “including small, non-intensive farms (where the number of farm animals is not sufficient to generate 5 or more nutrient units of manure annually) or a concentration of <1 nutrient units per acre of cropland.”	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to incorporate this suggestion.
10	<b>E&amp;O-1</b> Perhaps this policy should include large farms, small intensive farms and other operations.	OMAFRA	No	All farms may receive information through the “Living and Working in the Drinking Water Zone” Education and Outreach program (e.g., if information is included in the property tax bill mail out). However, the intention of the policy is to target farms not subject to mandatory policies.

### Policies for Draft Source Protection Plans

After considering both the comments received and formatting requirements for Source Protection Plans, staff recommend including the following policies in the Draft Source Protection Plans to address:

- the storage and application of agricultural source material;
- the storage, handling and application of non-agricultural source material; and
- farm animal pasturing, grazing, outdoor confinement areas or farm yards

### Policies

#### Risk Management Plans – Agricultural Source Material

The existing or future land application or storage of agricultural source material in any quantity is designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the *Clean Water Act*, requiring a Risk Management

Plan in areas where the threat is or would be significant (WHPA scored 10 and IPZ scored 8 to 10). The Risk Management Plans for existing activities shall be established by [to be determined]. Small, non-intensive farms (where the number of farm animals is not sufficient to generate 5 or more nutrient units of manure annually or a concentration of <1 nutrient units per acre of cropland) and activities that are governed by Nutrient Management Strategies or Nutrient Management Plans developed under the *Nutrient Management Act* are exempt from this policy.

#### Risk Management Plans – Non-Agricultural Source Material

The existing or future land application, handling or storage of non-agricultural source material is designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the *Clean Water Act*, requiring a Risk Management Plan in areas where the threat is or would be significant except where these activities are governed by a NASM Plan developed under the *Nutrient Management Act*. The Risk Management Plans for existing activities shall be established by [to be determined]

#### Risk Management Plans – Outdoor Livestock Areas

The existing or future use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard is designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the *Clean Water Act*, requiring a Risk Management Plan in areas where the threat is or would be significant. The Risk Management Plans for existing activities shall be established by [to be determined] Small, non-intensive farms (where the number of farm animals is not sufficient to generate 5 or more nutrient units of manure annually or a concentration of <1 nutrient units per acre of cropland) and activities that are governed by Nutrient Management Strategies developed under the *Nutrient Management Act* are exempt from this policy.

### **Monitoring the Effectiveness of the Policies**

#### Risk Management Plans

The Risk Management Official shall report annually to the Source Protection Authority with the information required in Section 65 of Regulation 287/07 related to the previous calendar year. This will provide administrative, enforcement and compliance results for the Risk Management Plan policies.

In addition to these policies, the Draft Source Protection Plans would also contain:

- A preamble briefly explaining the policy intent
- Policy codes
- Reference to locations (maps) and circumstances where the policies would apply
- Definitions of “existing” and “future”
- A Restricted Land Use policy to assist with the implementation of the Risk Management Plan policy (this has been requested by a number of municipalities so staff are working on legal wording)
- An invitation to all implementers to provide the Source Protection Authority with feedback about the effectiveness of the policies and suggestions for improvement on an ongoing basis.
- Associated education and outreach policies

## **2.0e            Comments Received on Draft Policies Commercial Fertilizer**

**Date:**            **January 4, 2012**  
**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 approve the revised commercial fertilizer policies for inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plans.

### **Background**

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, government ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination and overuse of lakes, rivers and groundwater where they are a source of drinking water.

Policies will address the following types of activities under certain circumstances:

- Waste disposal sites (including the 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
- Aircraft de-icing
- Transportation corridors
- Transport pathways

Policies must address activities considered a significant drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones

Policies can address activities considered a moderate or low drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones
- Highly Vulnerable Aquifers

Once draft policies have been developed and undergone pre-consultation, they must be compiled into Source Protection Plans. A plan is required for each watershed, so the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee must develop two Source Protection Plans, one for the Mississippi Valley watershed and one for the Rideau Valley watershed.

## **Policy Development**

Draft policies to address the storage, handling or application of fertilizer were developed as follows:

Policy Ideas were generated by municipal staff, source water staff and sector experts.

Draft Policies were approved by the Source Protection Committee at their September 1, 2011 meeting.

### **Source Protection Authorities**

- Draft policies were endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 21, 2011 meeting.
- Draft policies were endorsed by the Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 22, 2011 meeting.

### **Potential Implementers**

- Municipalities
  - Draft policies were mailed on October 5 and 6, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all municipal staff on October 20, 2011
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all council members on October 21, 2011
- Ministries
  - Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment
  - A forum was held for all eastern Ontario ministry staff on October 18, 2011.

### **Industry Associations**

Conservation Ontario mailed letters to the following industry associations on August 22, 2011 inviting them to review draft policies:

- Canada Fertilizer Institute (CFI)
  - Draft policies were requested and mailed on November 8, 2011 for review and comment
- Crop Life Canada
- Ontario Agri Business Association
- Ontario Trucking Association

### Potentially Affected Property Owners

- Properties with potential significant threats received fact sheets outlining draft policies for their review and comment.
- Fuel oil and septic system fact sheets were mailed on:
  - October 14 to properties in Merrickville and Munster
  - October 18 to properties in Kemptville, Almonte, Richmond and Carp
  - October 19 to properties in Westport
- All other fact sheets were mailed on November 4, 2011 (this included properties that received septic system and/or fuel oil fact sheets in addition to other topics).

### General Public

- Five open houses were held on November 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24, 2011 to solicit input.

### Draft Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must now consider all comments received on the draft policies
- Draft Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 35 day comment period
  - At least two public meetings must be held (one in each watershed); and
  - Notices must be sent to all municipalities, implementers and properties with potential significant threats

### Proposed Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must then consider all comments received on the draft Source Protection Plans
- Proposed Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 30 day comment period
- All comments received will be submitted to the MOE along with the proposed Plans for review

### Comments Received on Draft Policies

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee requested comments on their draft policies by December 2, 2011. Of those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft policies regarding commercial fertilizer, the following tables summarize:

- Who submitted comments; and
- What the comments were.

The following table lists those individuals and bodies who were asked to review commercial fertilizer policies. The table indicates who we received a comment submission from and who indicated they would be providing comments in the coming weeks (indicated by *italics*). Some bodies have indicated that they require additional time to review the draft policies. Comments received after December 16, 2011 will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at a future meeting, prior to draft Plans being approved and posted for public consultation.

	Comments Received From	Comments Pending
<b>Municipalities</b>	Carleton Place Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls Westport	<i>Ottawa</i> <i>Perth</i> Rideau Lakes  United Counties of Leeds and Grenville



	County of Lanark	
<b>Ministries</b>	OMAFRA	<i>MOE</i>
<b>Industry Associations</b>	CFI	
<b>Public</b>	40 people attended the open houses	

The following table summarizes all the comments received by December 16, 2011 on commercial fertilizer draft policies and how staff proposes each comment be addressed.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	Supports or did not oppose the draft policies	Carleton Place Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls Westport  County of Lanark  OMAFRA  Canadian Fertilizer Institute  Open house participants	n/a	
2	Provided information about codes of practice and the 4R Nutrient Stewardship Initiative that could form part of risk management plans. The Urban Fertilizer Council's "Greener Lawns" publication could be used for the E&O program	Canadian Fertilizer Institute	Yes	The Canadian Fertilizer Institute plans to distribute new codes of practice to Risk Management Officials as they become available and also notify them when training courses for the 4R Stewardship Initiative are being offered.
3	<b>Fertilizer-3</b> The application of commercial fertilizers should also apply to municipal Parks and Recreation Departments.	Town of Smiths Falls	Yes	The policy would apply to all non-residential application of commercial fertilizer.
4	<b>Fertilizer-3</b> Policy wording change to – "Nutrient Management Plans and Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Plans developed under the Nutrient Management Act can be used to fulfill this requirement."	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to reflect this suggestion.

### Policies for Draft Source Protection Plans

After considering both the comments received and formatting requirements for Source Protection Plans, staff recommend including the following policies in the Draft Source Protection Plans to address:

- The storage, handling or application of fertilizer.

## **Policies**

### Risk Management Plans – Commercial Fertilizer

The following activities related to commercial fertilizer are designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the *Clean Water Act*, requiring a Risk Management Plan in areas where the threat is or would be significant unless the activity is governed by Nutrient Management Plans developed under the *Nutrient Management Act*:

- Existing handling and storage for retail sale
- Existing and future non-residential handling and storage in relation to application
- Existing and future non-residential application

The Risk Management Plan must demonstrate / ensure compliance with Canadian Fertilizer Institute guidelines and codes of practice where appropriate. The Risk Management Plans for existing activities shall be established by [to be determined]

### Prohibition – Future Handling and Storage of Commercial Fertilizer for Retail Sale

The future handling and storage of commercial fertilizer for retail sale is designated as prohibited under Section 57 of the *Clean Water Act* in areas where the threat would be significant.

## **Monitoring the Effectiveness of the Commercial Fertilizer Policies**

### Risk Management Plans

The Risk Management Official shall report annually to the Source Protection Authority with the information required in Section 65 of Regulation 287/07 related to the previous calendar year. This will provide administrative, enforcement and compliance results for the Risk Management Plan policies.

### Prohibition in Accordance with Section 57 of the *Clean Water Act*

The Risk Management Official shall report annually to the Source Protection Authority with the information required in Section 65 of Regulation 287/07 related to the previous calendar year. This will provide administrative, enforcement and compliance results for the Section 57 Prohibition policies.

In addition to these policies, the Draft Source Protection Plans would also contain:

- A preamble briefly explaining the policy intent
- Policy codes
- Reference to locations (maps) and circumstances where the policies would apply
- Definitions of “existing” and “future”
- A Restricted Land Use policy to assist with the implementation of the Risk Management Plan policy (this has been requested by a number of municipalities so staff are working on legal wording)
- An invitation to all implementers to provide the Source Protection Authority with feedback about the effectiveness of the policies and suggestions for improvement on an ongoing basis.
- Associated education and outreach policies

## **2.0f            Comments Received on Draft Policies Pesticide**

**Date:**            **January 4, 2012**  
**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 approve the revised pesticide policies for inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plans.

### **Background**

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, government ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination and overuse of lakes, rivers and groundwater where they are a source of drinking water.

Policies will address the following types of activities under certain circumstances:

- Waste disposal sites (including the 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
- Aircraft de-icing
- Transportation corridors
- Transport pathways

Policies must address activities considered a significant drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones

Policies can address activities considered a moderate or low drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones
- Highly Vulnerable Aquifers

Once draft policies have been developed and undergone pre-consultation, they must be compiled into Source Protection Plans. A plan is required for each watershed, so the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee must develop two Source Protection Plans, one for the Mississippi Valley watershed and one for the Rideau Valley watershed.

## **Policy Development**

Draft policies to address the storage, handling or application of pesticide were developed as follows:

Policy Ideas were generated by municipal staff, source water staff and sector experts.

Draft Policies were approved by the Source Protection Committee at their September 1, 2011 meeting.

### **Source Protection Authorities**

- Draft policies were endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 21, 2011 meeting.
- Draft policies were endorsed by the Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 22, 2011 meeting.

### **Potential Implementers**

- Municipalities
  - Draft policies were mailed on October 5 and 6, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all municipal staff on October 20, 2011
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all council members on October 21, 2011
- Ministries
  - Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment
  - A forum was held for all eastern Ontario ministry staff on October 18, 2011.

### **Industry Associations**

Conservation Ontario mailed letters to the following industry associations on August 22, 2011 inviting them to review draft policies:

- Crop Life Canada
- Ontario Agri Business Association
- Ontario Trucking Association

### **Potentially Affected Property Owners**

- Properties with potential significant threats received fact sheets on November 4, 2011 outlining draft policies for their review and comment.

### General Public

- Five open houses were held on November 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24, 2011 to solicit input.

### Draft Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must now consider all comments received on the draft policies
- Draft Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 35 day comment period
  - At least two public meetings must be held (one in each watershed); and
  - Notices must be sent to all municipalities, implementers and properties with potential significant threats

### Proposed Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must then consider all comments received on the draft Source Protection Plans
- Proposed Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 30 day comment period
- All comments received will be submitted to the MOE along with the proposed Plans for review

### Comments Received on Draft Policies

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee requested comments on their draft policies by December 2, 2011. Of those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft policies regarding pesticide, the following tables summarize:

- Who submitted comments; and
- What the comments were.

The following table lists those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft pesticide policies. The table indicates who we received a comment submission from and who indicated they would be providing comments in the coming weeks (indicated by *italics*). Some bodies have indicated that they require additional time to review the draft policies. Comments received after December 16, 2011 will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at a future meeting, prior to draft Plans being approved and posted for public consultation.

	Comments Received From	Comments Pending
<b>Municipalities</b>	Carleton Place Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls Tay Valley Westport  County of Lanark	Beckwith <i>Ottawa</i> <i>Perth</i> Rideau Lakes  United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
<b>Ministries</b>	OMAFRA	<i>MOE</i>
<b>Public</b>	40 people attended the open houses	

The following table summarizes all the comments received by December 16, 2011 on pesticide draft policies and how staff proposes each comment be addressed.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	Supports or did not oppose the draft policies	Carleton Place Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls Tay Valley Westport  County of Lanark  OMAFRA  Most open house participants	n/a	
2	Is there background information relating to the decision to omit herbicides as a drinking water threat?	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	The <i>Pesticide Act</i> defines “pesticide” as a substance used to control pests including weeds, fungi and nematodes so herbicides are included in the threat. The substances listed in the Tables of Drinking Water Threats are active ingredients in herbicides, nematicides (used to control nematodes) and fungicides.
3	Thresholds are too low	South Frontenac	Yes	This concern will be forwarded to the MOE for their consideration when reviewing the current Tables of Drinking Water threats.
4	<b>Pesticides – 3 &amp; 4</b> Is spraying herbicides under order of a designated Weed Inspector (Weed Act) not a concern in a WHPA 10 or IPZ 9/10 area?	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	The application of pesticide in these areas could be a significant drinking water threat depending on the type of pesticide and the size of the application area. The application of pesticide ordered by the Weed Inspector must comply with the rules for exemptions under Ontario’s Cosmetic Pesticide Ban and the application would be subject to requirements of the <i>Pesticide Act</i> and Regulation 63/09. The draft source protection policies support the existing regulatory regime for pesticides and rely on them to manage the threat. However, the draft policies do call on the MOE to step up inspections in vulnerable areas and ensure that the Grower Pesticide Safety Course is required for all pesticide use that is or would be a significant threat (i.e. ensure there is no regulatory gap).
5	<b>Pesticides – 2, 3 &amp; 4</b> Suggest using wording such as ‘MOE encourages operators to be certified	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to reflect this suggestion.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
	under the Ontario Pesticide Education Program” and to encourage farm operators to use licensed applicators.			

### Policies for Draft Source Protection Plans

After considering both the comments received and formatted requirements for Source Protection Plans, staff recommend including the following policies in the Draft Source Protection Plans to address:

- The storage, handling or application of pesticide.

### Policies

#### **Pesticide Policy #1 (new policy added to address unlikely existing activities)**

##### Risk Management Plans – Existing Handling and Storage of Pesticide, Commercial

The existing handling and storage of pesticide at a manufacturing, processing or wholesaling facility, retail outlet or custom applicator’s storage yard is designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the *Clean Water Act*, requiring a Risk Management Plan in areas where the threat is significant.

#### **Pesticide Policy #2 (formerly “Pesticide-1”)**

##### Prohibition – Future Handling and Storage of Pesticide, Commercial

The future handling and storage of pesticide at a manufacturing, processing or wholesaling facility, retail outlet or custom applicator’s storage yard is designated as prohibited under Section 57 of the *Clean Water Act* in areas where the threat would be significant.

#### **Pesticide Policy #3 (formerly “Pesticide-2”)**

##### Prioritizing Inspections in the Vulnerable Areas

The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) shall prioritize inspections related to pesticide use in vulnerable areas where pesticide application, handling and storage is or would be a significant drinking water threat.

#### **Pesticide Policy #4 (formerly “Pesticide-3”)**

##### Grower Pesticide Safety Course

The MOE shall ensure that the Grower Pesticide Safety course is required for the application, handling and storage of all pesticides in vulnerable areas where these activities are or would be a significant drinking water threat.

#### **Pesticide Policy #5 (formerly “Pesticide-4”)**

##### Approvals under the *Pesticide Act*

Where existing or future pesticide use is or would be a significant drinking water threat, the MOE shall review the approvals issued under the *Pesticide Act* to determine if they include measures that adequately manage the risk so that it ceases to be or will not become significant. If an existing approval issued under the *Pesticide Act* does not currently contain adequate terms and conditions, the MOE shall amend it within six months of the Source Protection Plan taking effect to include additional terms and conditions that ensure the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.

## **Monitoring the Effectiveness of the Pesticide Policies**

### **Pesticide Policy #1 and #2**

#### Section 57 Prohibition

The Risk Management Official shall report annually to the Source Protection Authority with the information required in Section 65 of Regulation 287/07 related to the previous calendar year. This will provide administrative, enforcement and compliance results for the Section 57 Prohibition and Section 58 Risk Management Plan policies.

### **Pesticide Policy #3**

#### Prioritizing Inspections

The MOE shall notify the Source Protection Authority when procedures have been put in place to ensure inspections are prioritized in the vulnerable areas where pesticide use is or would be a significant threat.

### **Pesticide Policy #4**

#### Grower Pesticide Safety Course

The MOE shall provide an annual report to the Source Protection Authority regarding the status of the implementation of this policy.

### **Pesticide Policy #5**

#### Approvals under the *Pesticide Act*

The MOE shall notify the Source Protection Authority when procedures have been put in place to address future approvals issued under the *Pesticide Act* within the vulnerable areas. The MOE shall provide the Source Protection Authority with a copy of amended existing approvals, if any, and add the Source Protection Authority to the distribution list of future approvals in areas where the threat would be significant.

In addition to these policies, the Draft Source Protection Plans would also contain:

- A preamble briefly explaining the policy intent
- Policy codes
- Reference to locations (maps) and circumstances where the policies would apply
- Definitions of “existing” and “future”
- A Restricted Land Use policy to assist with the implementation of the Risk Management Plan policy (this has been requested by a number of municipalities so staff are working on legal wording)
- An invitation to all implementers to provide the Source Protection Authority with feedback about the effectiveness of the policies and suggestions for improvement on an ongoing basis.
- Associated education and outreach policies



## **2.0g          Comments Received on Draft Policies Road Salt and Snow**

**Date:**          **January 4, 2012**  
**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 approve the revised snow storage and road salt application, handling or storage policies for inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plans.

### **Background**

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, government ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination and overuse of lakes, rivers and groundwater where they are a source of drinking water.

Policies will address the following types of activities under certain circumstances:

- Waste disposal sites (including the 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**
- Aircraft de-icing
- Transportation corridors
- Transport pathways

Policies must address activities considered a significant drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones

Policies can address activities considered a moderate or low drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones
- Highly Vulnerable Aquifers

Once draft policies have been developed and undergone pre-consultation, they must be compiled into Source Protection Plans. A plan is required for each watershed, so the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee must develop two Source Protection Plans, one for the Mississippi Valley watershed and one for the Rideau Valley watershed.

## **Policy Development**

Draft policies to address snow storage and road salt application, handling or storage were developed as follows:

Policy Ideas were generated by municipal staff, source water staff and sector experts.

Draft Policies were approved by the Source Protection Committee at their May 5, 2011 meeting.

### **Source Protection Authorities**

- Draft policies were endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority at their July 20, 2011 meeting.
- Draft policies were endorsed by the Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority at their July 23, 2011 meeting.

### **Potential Implementers**

- Federal
  - Environment Canada
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 31, 2011 for review and comment.
- Municipalities
  - Draft policies were mailed on October 5 and 6, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all municipal staff on October 20, 2011
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all council members on October 21, 2011
- Ministries
  - Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ministry of Transportation (MTO)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A forum was held for all eastern Ontario ministry staff on October 18, 2011.

### **Industry Associations**

Conservation Ontario mailed letters to the following industry associations on August 22, 2011 inviting them to review draft policies:

- BOMA Canada (Building Owners and Managers Association)
- Landscape Ontario
  - Draft policies were requested and mailed on November 8, 2011 for review and comment
- Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA)

- Draft policies were requested and mailed on November 8, 2011 for review and comment
- Salt Institute
  - Draft policies were requested and mailed on November 8, 2011 for review and comment
- Smart about Salt Council
  - Draft policies were requested and mailed on November 8, 2011 for review and comment

### **Potentially Affected Property Owners**

- Properties with potential significant threats received fact sheets outlining draft policies for their review and comment on November 4, 2011.

### **General Public**

- Five open houses were held on November 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24, 2011 to solicit input.

### Draft Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must now consider all comments received on the draft policies
- Draft Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 35 day comment period
  - At least two public meetings must be held (one in each watershed); and
  - Notices must be sent to all municipalities, implementers and properties with potential significant threats

### Proposed Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must then consider all comments received on the draft Source Protection Plans
- Proposed Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 30 day comment period
- All comments received will be submitted to the MOE along with the proposed Plans for review

### **Comments Received on Draft Policies**

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee requested comments on their draft policies by December 2, 2011. Of those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft policies regarding snow storage and road salt application, handling or storage, the following tables summarize:

- Who submitted comments; and
- What the comments were.

The following table lists those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft snow storage and road salt application, handling or storage. The table indicates who we received a comment submission from and who indicated they would be providing comments in the coming weeks (indicated by *italics*). Some bodies have indicated that they require additional time to review the draft policies. Comments received after December 16, 2011 will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at a future meeting, prior to draft Plans being approved and posted for public consultation.

	Comments Received From	Comments Pending
<b>Municipalities</b>	Carleton Place Central Frontenac Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Frontenac North Grenville Smiths Falls South Frontenac Tay Valley Westport  Frontenac County County of Lanark	Augusta Beckwith <i>Elizabethtown-Kitley</i> Lanark Highlands Montague <i>Ottawa</i> <i>Perth</i> Rideau Lakes  United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
<b>Ministries</b>		MOE MTO
<b>Federal</b>		<i>Environment Canada</i>
<b>Industry Associations</b>	OGRA Smart about Salt Council	Landscape Ontario Salt Institute
<b>Public</b>	40 people attended the open houses	

The following table summarizes all the comments received by December 16, 2011 on snow storage and road salt application, handling or storage draft policies and how staff proposes each comment be addressed.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	Supports or did not oppose the draft policies	Carleton Place Central Frontenac Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Frontenac North Grenville Smiths Falls South Frontenac Tay Valley Westport  Frontenac County County of Lanark  Ontario Good Roads Association Smart About Salt Council  Open house participants	n/a	n/a
2	Concerned about road salt in private wells	Open house participants	Yes	The intent of encouraging all municipalities to develop road salt management plans is to

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
				decrease the amount of road salt used to treat each weather event to help protect regional groundwater.
3	Groundwater monitoring would be a highly subjective exercise, as sodium is naturally occurring. It could create a false correlation with road salt use. It is our opinion that we do not want to exceed the MOE requirement of testing once per 60 months.	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	This concern was discussed with the municipality and staff are OK with the draft policy to annually test for chloride.
4	Testing for chloride annually seems excessive (never been a documented problem). This policy should reflect the MOE's current five year testing regime.	Municipality of North Grenville	Yes	This concern was discussed with the municipality and staff are OK with the draft policy to annually test for chloride.
5	Raw water testing for chloride should be mandatory for significant threat areas and conducted annually for municipalities with groundwater	SPC Member	No	A policy to test for chlorides cannot be mandatory because it does not address the threat. It is a monitoring activity to track elevated levels of a potential contaminant.
6	Clarification needed that existing and future road salt application in the HVA is a low threat	SPC Member	Yes	Road salt application is listed as a low threat (cannot be moderate) according to the Provincial Tables of Circumstance.
7	Suggested wording changes to help accomplish policy intent	Smart About Salt Council	Yes	Staff worked with the Smart About Salt Council to finalize draft policy wording.
8	Would like to see the policy require facility managers and contractors to be Smart About Salt accredited and all sites be certified.	Ontario Good Roads Association	No	Since Smart About Salt accreditation and certification is relatively new in eastern Ontario, requiring it at this stage could create implementation problems. The current policy approach is to promote and make available the Smart About Salt program. In future source protection plans it may become appropriate to require certification.
9	<b>Salt/Snow-1</b> Currently do not prepare Salt Management Plans because of low salt usage. Concerned about the possibility of undertaking Smart about Salt training, offering this training and submitting annual reports. Policy should be directed to county	Municipality of North Grenville	No	The policy is directed at any municipality applying road salt in an area where it is considered a significant threat (county or lower tier roads). Most county governments already have Road Salt Management Plans because of their high salt usage.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
	level governments			
10	<b>Salt/Snow-1</b> Can we manage “contaminant content”	SPC Member	Yes	Policy wording was revised and there is no longer a reference to the contaminant content of snow.
11	<b>Salt/Snow-1</b> How will the assessment of the effectiveness of measures implemented be achieved?	SPC Member	Yes	Specific reference to providing an assessment of the effectiveness of measures to address snow has been removed from the monitoring policy as this would be difficult to achieve. However, receiving a copy of the Salt Management Plan, annual review report and general feedback from the municipality should provide information about the effectiveness of the policy overall.
12	<b>Salt/Snow-2</b> If the Smart about Salt program is offered there is no guarantee that private contractors or landowners would attend. Could this be an obligation for licence renewal where applicable?	Town of Smiths Falls	No	Since Smart About Salt accreditation and certification is relatively new in eastern Ontario, requiring it at this stage could create implementation problems. The current policy approach is to promote and make available the Smart About Salt program. In future source protection plans it may become appropriate to require certification.
13	<b>Salt/Snow-1 &amp; 2</b> Separate policy description to distinguish between road salt application and snow piles.	SPC Member	No	Policy wording has been revised to improve clarity but they were kept as a single policy since road salt and snow issues are being address together by the same two tools.
14	<b>Salt/Snow-4</b> MOE should be the implementer as the program has a regional scope.	Township of Drummond/North Elmsley	Yes	Municipalities could approach other agencies (e.g. other municipalities, conservation authorities) to deliver education and outreach policies on their behalf. The comment will also be forwarded to the MOE for their consideration in playing a role in implementing smart salt practices.
15	<b>Salt/Snow-4</b> Concerned about draft policies suggesting a municipal role to offer Smart about Salt to private	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	Municipalities could approach other agencies (e.g. other municipalities, conservation authorities) to deliver

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
	contractors, unless they are providing contracted services to the municipality. The province should regulate private sector salt users.			education and outreach policies on their behalf. The comment will also be forwarded to the MOE for their consideration in playing a role in implementing smart salt practices.

### Policies for Draft Source Protection Plans

After considering both the comments received and formatted requirements for Source Protection Plans, staff recommend including the following policies in the Draft Source Protection Plans to address:

- snow storage and road salt application, handling or storage

#### Policies

##### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #1 (new policy to address unlikely existing activities)**

The existing storage or road salt and storage of snow (at snow dumps where snow is hauled from another location) are designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the *Clean Water Act*, requiring a Risk Management Plan in areas where the threat is significant. The Risk Management Plans shall be established by [to be determined]

##### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #2 (formerly “Salt/Snow-5”)**

###### Prohibition – Future Road Salt Storage and Storage of Snow (Snow Dumps)

The future storage of road salt and storage of snow (at snow dumps where snow is hauled from another location) are designated as prohibited under Section 57 of the *Clean Water Act* in areas where the threat would be significant.

##### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #3 (formerly “Salt/Snow-1”)**

###### Road Salt Management Plans – Significant Threats

Within one year of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, upper and lower tier municipalities with roads, sidewalks and municipally owned parking lots in the vulnerable areas where road salt application and snow storage (snow piles) is or would be a significant drinking water threat, shall prepare and implement a Road Salt Management Plan for these areas in accordance with Environment Canada’s Code of Practice for the Environmental Management of Road Salts.

##### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #4 (formerly “Salt/Snow-2”)**

###### Smart Salt Practices – Significant Threats

Within one year of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, municipalities that have areas where road salt application and/or snow storage (snow piles) is or would be a significant drinking water threat shall:

- Undertake initiatives such as a municipal staff training program to encourage smart salt practices for municipally owned parking lots, sidewalks and other public facilities
- Promote the Smart About Salt program to private contractors and managers of private facilities and encourage them to become Smart About Salt certified

##### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #5 (formerly “Salt/Snow-3”)**

###### Road Salt Management Plans – Low Threats throughout the HVA Areas

Upper and lower tier municipalities with roads, sidewalks and municipally owned parking lots in the vulnerable areas where road salt application and snow storage (snow piles) is or would be a

low drinking water threat throughout the HVA areas, are encouraged to prepare and implement a Road Salt Management Plan in accordance with Environment Canada's Code Of Practice for the Environmental Management of Road Salts.

### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #6 (formerly "Salt/Snow-4")**

#### Smart Salt Practices – Low Threats throughout the HVA Areas

Municipalities that have areas where road salt application and/or snow storage (snow piles) is or would be a low drinking water threat throughout the HVA areas are encouraged to:

- Undertake initiatives such as a municipal staff training program to encourage smart salt practices for municipally owned parking lots, sidewalks and other public facilities

Promote the Smart About Salt program to private contractors and managers of private facilities and encourage them to become Smart About Salt certified.

### **Monitoring the Effectiveness of the Snow and Road Salt Policies**

### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #1 and #2**

#### Risk Management Plans and Section 57 Prohibition

The Risk Management Official shall report annually to the Source Protection Authority with the information required in Section 65 of Regulation 287/07 related to the previous calendar year. This will provide administrative, enforcement and compliance results for the Risk Management Plan and Prohibition policies.

### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #3**

#### Road Salt Management Plans – Significant Threats

The municipality shall provide the Source Protection Authority with a copy of the Road Salt Management Plan and a copy of the annual review report referred to in the Environment Canada Code of Practice for the Environmental Management of Road Salts.

### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #4**

#### Smart Salt Practices – Significant Threats

The municipality shall provide an annual report to the Source Protection Authority that includes:

- a description of the initiatives that were undertaken to promote smart salt practices to municipal staff
- an indication of the level of participation in the private sector (numbers of contractors and sites certified)

### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #5**

#### Road Salt Management Plans – Outside of Significant Threat Areas

The municipality is requested to provide the Source Protection Authority with a copy of the Road Salt Management Plan and a copy of the annual review report referred to in the Environment Canada Code of Practice for the Environmental Management of Road Salts.

### **Snow / Road Salt Policy #6**

#### Smart Salt Practices – Outside of Significant Threat Areas

The municipality is encouraged to provide an annual report to the Source Protection Authority that includes:

- a description of the initiatives that were undertaken to promote smart salt practices to municipal staff
- an indication of the level of participation in the private sector (numbers of contractors and sites certified)

This monitoring policy corresponds to low threat policy Salt/Snow-x and is not legally binding.



In addition to these policies, the Draft Source Protection Plans would also contain:

- A preamble briefly explaining the policy intent
- Policy codes
- Reference to locations (maps) and circumstances where the policies would apply
- Definitions of “existing” and “future”
- A Restricted Land Use policy to assist with the implementation of the Risk Management Plan policy (this has been requested by a number of municipalities so staff are working on legal wording)
- An invitation to all implementers to provide the Source Protection Authority with feedback about the effectiveness of the policies and suggestions for improvement on an ongoing basis.
- Associated education and outreach policies

## **2.0h            Comments Received on Draft Policies Transportation Corridors**

**Date:**            **January 4, 2012**  
**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 approve the revised transportation corridors draft policies for inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plans.

### **Background**

Across Ontario, Source Protection Committees are working with municipalities, farmers, property owners, businesses, industries, First Nations, environmental groups, government ministries and the general public. Together they are developing policies to prevent the contamination and overuse of lakes, rivers and groundwater where they are a source of drinking water.

Policies will address the following types of activities under certain circumstances:

- Waste disposal sites (including the 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
- Aircraft de-icing
- **Transportation corridors**
- Transport pathways

Policies must address activities considered a significant drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones

Policies can address activities considered a moderate or low drinking water threat in the following vulnerable areas:

- Wellhead Protection Areas
- Intake Protection Zones
- Highly Vulnerable Aquifers

Once draft policies have been developed and undergone pre-consultation, they must be compiled into Source Protection Plans. A plan is required for each watershed, so the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee must develop two Source Protection Plans, one for the Mississippi Valley watershed and one for the Rideau Valley watershed.

## **Policy Development**

Draft policies to address transportation corridors were developed as follows:

Policy Ideas were generated by municipal staff, source water staff and sector experts.

Draft Policies were approved by the Source Protection Committee at their September 1, 2011 meeting.

### **Source Protection Authorities**

- Draft policies were endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 21, 2011 meeting.
- Draft policies were endorsed by the Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority at their September 22, 2011 meeting.

### **Potential Implementers**

- Municipalities
  - Draft policies were mailed on October 5 and 6, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all municipal staff on October 20, 2011
  - A “working group” meeting was held for all council members on October 21, 2011
- Ministries
  - Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - Ministry of Transportation (MTO)
    - Draft policies were mailed on October 12, 2011 for review and comment.
  - A forum was held for all eastern Ontario ministry staff on October 18, 2011.

### **Industry Associations**

Conservation Ontario mailed letters to the following industry associations on August 22, 2011 inviting them to review draft policies:

- Ontario Trucking Association

### **General Public**

- Five open houses were held on November 14, 16, 21, 22 and 24, 2011 to solicit input.

### Draft Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must now consider all comments received on the draft policies
- Draft Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 35 day comment period
  - At least two public meetings must be held (one in each watershed); and
  - Notices must be sent to all municipalities, implementers and properties with potential significant threats

### Proposed Source Protection Plans

- Source Protection Committees must then consider all comments received on the draft Source Protection Plans
- Proposed Source Protection Plans must then be posted for a 30 day comment period
- All comments received will be submitted to the MOE along with the proposed Plans for review

### **Comments Received on Draft Policies**

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee requested comments on their draft policies by December 2, 2011. Of those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft policies regarding transportation corridors, the following tables summarize:

- Who submitted comments; and
- What the comments were.

The following table lists those individuals and bodies who were asked to review draft transportation corridors policies. The table indicates who we received a comment submission from and who indicated they would be providing comments in the coming weeks (indicated by *italics*). Some bodies have indicated that they require additional time to review the draft policies. Comments received after December 16, 2011 will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at a future meeting, prior to draft Plans being approved and posted for public consultation.

	Comments Received From	Comments Pending
<b>Municipalities</b>	Carleton Place Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls Tay Valley Westport  County of Lanark	Beckwith Montague <i>Ottawa</i> <i>Perth</i> Rideau Lakes  United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
<b>Ministries</b>		MOE MTO
<b>Public</b>	40 people attended the open houses	

The following table summarizes all the comments received by December 16, 2011 on transportation corridors draft policies and how staff proposes each comment be addressed.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	Supports or did not oppose the draft policies	Carleton Place Drummond/North Elmsley Merrickville-Wolford Mississippi Mills North Grenville Smiths Falls Tay Valley Westport  County of Lanark  Open house participants	n/a	
2	<b>Transp-3</b> Province wide effort that would apply to provincial roads only. Concern about county or municipal roads	SPC Member	Yes	The sign policy is proposed for “primary municipal roads” as well as provincial highways.
3	<b>Transp-3</b> MOE instigate the E&O program and municipality responsible for making available the information	Township of Drummond/North Elmsley	No	The education and outreach program is intended to build on existing resources (including information available from the MOE) to the extent feasible. The messages will be straight forward (awareness of the vulnerable areas, the importance of spill prevention and appropriate spill response). Therefore, there will be no need for the municipality to create technical information addressing specific spill prevention measures for hazardous materials etc.
4	<b>Transp-3</b> Concerned about policies suggesting a municipal role toward E&O for safe handling of substances to prevent spills (bullet #2).	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	Policy wording was revised to address this concern. The E&O program will only entail disseminating information about the location of the vulnerable areas and encouraging good steward practices in general.

### Policies for Draft Source Protection Plans

After considering both the comments received and formatted requirements for Source Protection Plans, staff recommend including the following policies in the Draft Source Protection Plans to address:

- transportation corridors

## **Policies**

### Emergency Response Plan Updates

Within one year of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, municipalities shall ensure that local first responders have information about the vulnerable drinking water areas (which will be marked by road and waterway signs) and shall update emergency response plans to include:

- Maps to show the location of municipal drinking water systems and associated vulnerable areas
- Requirements to contain water and chemicals used to suppress fires that occur in these vulnerable areas, if appropriate
- Spill contingency measures for spills of any potential contaminant (e.g. fuel, chemicals, septage) resulting from highway accidents and train derailments that occur in these vulnerable areas, if appropriate

This policy applies to railways and highways as defined in subsection 1(1) of the *Highway Traffic Act*\* within Wellhead Protection Areas and Intake Protection Zones (all scores).

\*a common and public highway, street, avenue, parkway, driveway, square, place, bridge, viaduct or trestle, any part of which is intended for or used by the general public for the passage of vehicles and includes the area between the lateral property lines thereof

### MOE Spill Response Procedures

Within six months of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) shall implement procedures that ensure spills reported within the Wellhead Protection Areas and Intake Protection Zones (all scores) are responded to appropriately given the potential risks to drinking water sources.

### Education and Outreach for Mobile Hazards

Within one year of the Source Protection Plan taking effect, the municipality shall implement an education and outreach initiative targeted at local fuel distributors, sewage haulers, lawn care companies (and others as appropriate) to promote:

- Awareness of the vulnerable areas which will be marked by road signs
  - Spill prevention (i.e. the particular importance of adhering to whatever spill prevention guidelines already exist for the type of business in question when operating in vulnerable drinking water areas)
  - Spill response (procedures to follow in the event of a spill in a vulnerable drinking water area)
- To the extent feasible, the initiatives should use existing orientation and training that the target companies already provide to their employees.

## **Monitoring the Effectiveness of the Fuel Oil Policies**

### Emergency Response Plan Updates

The municipality shall notify the Source Protection Authority regarding any decisions or action taken related to the updating of Emergency Response Plans.

### MOE Spill Response Procedures

The MOE shall notify the Source Protection Authority when procedures have been put in place to respond to spills in vulnerable drinking water areas and provide a description of the new procedures.

### Education and Outreach for Mobile Hazards

The municipality shall provide an annual report to the Source Protection Authority on the implementation, participation and suggestions to improve the effectiveness of the education and outreach initiatives.

In addition to these policies, the Draft Source Protection Plans would also contain:

- A preamble briefly explaining the policy intent
- Policy codes
- Reference to locations (maps) and circumstances where the policies would apply
- Definitions of “existing” and “future”
- A Restricted Land Use policy to assist with the implementation of the Risk Management Plan policy (this has been requested by a number of municipalities so staff are working on legal wording)
- An invitation to all implementers to provide the Source Protection Authority with feedback about the effectiveness of the policies and suggestions for improvement on an ongoing basis.
- Associated education and outreach policies

### **3.0 Community Outreach**

**Date:** January 4, 2012  
**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 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. *Chairs Meeting*
  - January 9, Toronto (Chair Stavinga and Sommer attended)

#### **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. *Eastern Regions Meeting*
  - January 30, Brockville (Sommer and Brian attending)
2. *Municipal Working Group Meeting (Council members and staff)*
  - February 16, Perth (staff and some members attending)