

## AGENDA

### Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee

**Date:** March 1, 2012

**Time:** 1 pm

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

Welcome and Introductions		
<b>1.0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Agenda Review</li> <li>b. Notice of Proxies</li> <li>c. Adoption of the Agenda (D)</li> <li>d. Declarations of Interest</li> <li>e. Approval of Minutes – January 12 and February 9, 2012 (D) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► draft minutes attached as a separate document</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. Status of Action Items – Staff Report Attached (D) .....</li> <li>g. Correspondence – none</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Pg.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
		<i>Chair Stavinga</i>
Source Protection Plan		
<b>2.0</b>	<p><b>Source Protection Plan Development</b> – Staff Report attached (D) .....</p> <p>Members will consider the following for inclusion in the Draft Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Definitions of existing and future activities</li> <li>b. Exemption to the prohibition policy for future stormwater ponds in WHPA-A</li> <li>c. Addition of complimentary land use planning policies for prohibition</li> <li>d. Revised implementers and roles for road and waterway sign policy</li> <li>e. Revised roles for education policies</li> <li>f. Deletion of quarry policy for transport pathways</li> </ul>	3
		<i>Sommer Casgrain-Robertson</i>
<b>3.0</b>	<p><b>Preliminary Draft Explanatory Document</b> – Staff Report attached (I) .....</p> <p>Members will provide comments on a <i>preliminary draft</i> version of the Explanatory Document (internal draft attached as a separate document for members)</p>	9
		<i>Sommer Casgrain-Robertson</i>
<b>4.0</b>	<p><b>Summary of Comments Received on Draft Policies</b> – Staff Report attached (D)</p> <p>Members will review the <i>Summary of Comments Received on Draft Policies</i> for and consider approving it for inclusion in the Draft Explanatory Document.....</p>	10
		<i>Sommer Casgrain-Robertson</i>
Other		
<b>5.0</b>	<p><b>Community Outreach</b> – Staff Report Attached (D) .....</p> <p>Members &amp; staff report on past activities and upcoming events and opportunities</p>	33
		<i>Chair Stavinga</i>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Other Business</b>	
		<i>Chair Stavinga</i>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Member Inquiries</b>	
		<i>Chair Stavinga</i>
<b>8.0</b>	<p><b>Next Meeting – March 22, 2012</b></p> <p style="color: red; text-align: center;"><b>10 am</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rideau Valley Conservation Authority 3889 Rideau Valley Drive, Manotick</p>	
		<i>Chair Stavinga</i>
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>	
		<i>Chair Stavinga</i>

(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:** February 21, 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:**

<b>Issue</b>		<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Status</b>
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	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> In December, 2011 the Province of Quebec introduced a draft regulation respecting water withdrawals and water protection. This draft regulation introduces new abilities to protect sources of drinking water in Quebec.
3	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>
4	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.
5	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

**MRSPC Member Action Items:**

<b>Issue</b>		<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Status</b>
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>

## 2.0 Source Protection Plan Development

**Date:** February 21, 2011  
**To:** Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee  
**From:** Sommer Casgrain-Robertson, Co-Project Manager  
Mississippi – Rideau Source Protection Region

---

### Background

This staff report captures a number of final details and decisions that need to be addressed in order to complete a Draft Source Protection Plan for public consultation. Most items are a result of comments received on draft policies. The items are:

- a. Definitions of existing and future activities
- b. Exemption to prohibiting future stormwater ponds in WHPA-A
- c. Addition of complimentary land use planning policies
- d. Revised implementers and roles for road and waterway sign policy
- e. Revised roles for education policies
- f. Deletion of quarry policy for transport pathways

### a. Existing and Future Definitions

#### Recommendation:

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approve the definitions for existing and future activities.

For many activities in the Mississippi-Rideau region, draft policies are the same for existing and future (e.g., existing and future spreading of manure is managed). There are however, some activities that will be managed when they are existing but prohibited in future. They are:

- DNAPLs and organic solvent handling and storage
- Licensed fuel facilities
- Waste disposal sites
- Stormwater management facilities and other sewage works (not septic systems)
- Snow / salt storage
- Commercial fertilizer and pesticide storage

For these activities, the Source Protection Plan should establish definitions for “existing” and “future” to help policy implementers avoid grey areas. Grey areas could include:

- Intermittent or seasonal activities
- Expansions of existing activities
- Development proposals that are well underway

It should be noted that only DNAPLs / organic solvent handling and storage are believed to exist in areas in the Mississippi-Rideau region where they would be subject to policies. However, should one of the other activities be discovered to be “existing”, the definitions would apply.

### **Intermittent or Seasonal Activities**

Should a timeframe be stipulated after which an existing activity would be considered “future”?

- Seasonal activities could include the storage of snow, salt and commercial pesticide and fertilizer.
  - These activities require a risk management plan for existing and are prohibited in future. When the Committee created draft policies for these activities they chose to manage existing locations, not prohibit them, despite their seasonal nature.
- Intermittent activities could pertain to any activity as any one of them could temporarily stop for a variety of reasons (e.g., renovation, expansion, fire, natural disaster, and sale).
  - Many of these activities require a risk management plan for existing and are prohibited in future. When the Committee created draft policies for these activities they chose to manage existing activities so that businesses were not forced to close and infrastructure did not have to be rebuilt. However, overtime the expectation is that there will be fewer existing activities as businesses close or change and infrastructure is decommissioned.
  - The municipal working group indicated that two years was a common timeframe in zoning for existing activities to lose their “legal non-conforming” status. This could be an appropriate timeframe for intermittent activities to lose their “existing” status.

### **Expansions of Existing Activities**

Should existing threat activities be permitted to expand?

- Expansions can be considered a “future” activity and therefore prohibited or expansions can be considered part of the “existing” activity and allowed subject to risk mitigation measures. Businesses that use DNAPLs or organic solvents are the only known existing activities that would be affected.
  - The municipal working group indicated that expansions that do not require additional planning or regulatory approvals should be permitted (these would be difficult to regulate and the group felt existing businesses should be allowed to make the best use of their existing space)
  - They also indicated that expansions requiring additional planning or regulatory approvals should only be permitted if there is no expansion to the activity (e.g., the size of a building could be increased to create a larger storefront but not to create a larger storage area for chemicals or nutrients).

### **Development Proposals Well Underway**

How should the policies address situations during the transition period?

- An activity may not be occurring but its development could be at various stages of negotiation, application or approval.
  - The municipal working group indicated that “complete applications” should be allowed to proceed as existing activities because at this stage proponents have invested a lot of money and it is not appropriate to change the rules in the middle of the process. Many municipalities are already using draft policies to flag proposals at the consultation stage that they may not allow to proceed because it could be something that will be prohibited by the Source Protection Plan. In some cases an interim control by-law may be required to suspend these applications.

## Proposed Definitions

Based on input from the municipal working group on February 16, where the words “existing” or “future” appear before an activity or land use cited in a policy, the meaning would be as follows:

*An **existing** activity or land use is one that:*

- *Is present and permitted under current regulations on the date of the approval of this Source Protection Plan*
- *Is usually occurring on the property but has been interrupted for a maximum of 24 months due to temporary circumstances such as fire, renovation or change of ownership*
- *Is not yet underway but associated with an approved development or a development for which a complete application for regulatory and planning approvals has been submitted.*

*Expansions are considered existing if they:*

- *Do not require additional regulatory or planning approvals*
- *Require additional regulatory or planning approvals but do not involve an expansion of the activity (i.e. an expansion of the structure only)*

*A **future** activity or land use is one that:*

- *Is proposed to commence after the date the Source Protection Plan is approved and takes effect.*
- *Involves an expansion that requires additional regulatory or planning approvals*

## b. Exemption to Stormwater Pond Prohibition

### Recommendation:

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approve the exemption to the stormwater prohibition policy.

The current draft policies for WHPA-A (100 metres around a municipal well) are:

Prohibit Future Activities	Manage Future Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Waste disposal sites</li><li>• Stormwater ponds</li><li>• Sewage treatment plant and other large sewage works</li><li>• Commercial fertilizer storage (retail)</li><li>• Pesticide storage (manufacturing, retail, custom application)</li><li>• Road salt and snow dumps</li><li>• Licensed fuel facilities and refineries</li><li>• DNAPLs and organic solvents</li><li>• Aircraft de-icing runoff</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Septic systems</li><li>• Municipal sewers</li><li>• ASM, NASM, Outdoor Livestock Areas</li><li>• Commercial fertilizer storage (other)</li><li>• Pesticide storage (other)</li><li>• Road salt application and snow piles</li><li>• Unlicensed fuel facilities</li><li>• Heating oil</li></ul>

These policies were designed to prohibit high risk and unnecessary activities in WHPA-A while allowing lower risk and activities necessary for residential development to be established in

WHPA-A subject to adequate management measures. The financial impact of prohibiting residential development in WHPA-A (an area of 8 acres) was deemed unreasonable.

A municipality has now raised an alternative scenario that would require allowing a stormwater pond to be established at the outer limit of WHPA-A in exchange for the remaining WHPA-A to be held in municipal ownership and kept in a natural state. It would be subject to demonstrating that there is minimal connection between the surface and groundwater aquifer supplying the municipal well.

This idea was discussed at the municipal working group on February 16 and they were comfortable adding the following wording to the prohibition policy:

Current policy:

- Prohibit future stormwater ponds in WHPA-A and IPZ scored 10
- Permit future stormwater ponds elsewhere if built to Enhanced Level Protection standards

Proposed Change:

Exemption from the prohibition in WHPA-A if:

- WHPA-A is a municipally owned natural area
- It can be demonstrated that there is little hydrogeological connection
- The stormwater pond is located at the outer perimeter of WHPA-A with a minimum separation distance of 30 m from the well

### **c. Adding Complementary Land Use Planning Policies**

**Recommendation:**

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approve the inclusion of complimentary land use planning policies.

The MOE has recommended that complimentary land use planning policies be added where land uses (not activities) are prohibited in future. This would apply to our draft policies that prohibit future waste disposal sites and large sewage works through the prescribed instrument tool. Since planning approvals is often the first step in establishing a land use, complimentary land use planning policies would “help inform proponents at the beginning of the development process”.

Adding complimentary land use planning policies would mean municipalities would have to amend their zoning bylaws to prohibit waste disposal sites and sewage works listed in the policy. Official plans must already be amended to conform with significant threat policies.

A simple line will be added to each policy enacting complimentary land use planning policies (a separate policy is not required).

## d. Revised Roles for Road and Waterway Signs

### **Recommendation:**

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approve the revised implementer for waterways signs.

The waterway sign policy was discussed at the February 16 working group meeting in light of comments received from Parks Canada. It was agreed that municipalities were the logical implementer for both municipal road and waterway signs but that source protection staff should play an administrative role. The following arrangements were decided upon and will be reflected in revised policy wording.

Reminder, **these policies are not legally binding:**

### Current Policy:

- Signs on provincial roads
  - *MTO will be the implementer*
  - MTO will design a standardized sign in collaboration with source protection regions and MOE
  - MTO will produce, install and maintain the signs
- Signs on primary municipal roads
  - *Municipalities will be the implementer*
  - Source protection staff will identify sign locations in collaboration with municipalities
  - Municipalities will produce, install and maintain the signs
- Signs on recreational waterways
  - *MNR and Parks Canada will be the implementer*

### Proposed Change:

- Signs on recreational waterways
  - *Municipalities will be the implementer*
  - Source protection staff will identify sign locations in collaboration with municipalities, MNR, Parks Canada and others
  - Source protection staff will seek any necessary permits or approvals for installing the signs (e.g. from the Parks Canada superintendent)
  - Municipalities will produce, install and maintain the signs

## e. Revised Roles for Education Policies

### **Recommendation:**

That the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee approve the revised education and outreach roles.



Many municipalities submitted comments on the draft policies that indicated they were reluctant to implement education policies because they felt these should be implemented at a regional scale. Some municipalities recommended the conservation authorities or the MOE. This was discussed at the municipal working group meeting on February 16 and it was agreed that municipalities should remain the implementer but source protection staff need to play an administrative role. The following arrangements were decided upon and will be reflected in revised policy wording.

- “Living in the Drinking Water Zone” Education Policy
  - *Municipalities will be the implementer*
  - Source protection staff will compile information and resources about activities that pose a drinking water threat and how they can be addressed (best management practices).
  - Municipalities will disseminate this information to residents and businesses in their municipality that are in a WHPA and IPZ. Dissemination can be done through existing channels (e.g., tax bill, municipal newsletter and website)
- “Travelling Through the Drinking Water Zone” Education Policy
  - *Municipalities will be the implementer*
  - Source protection staff will work with municipalities to identify local mobile activities that pose a drinking water threat
  - Source protection staff will work with municipalities to identify opportunities to raise awareness about WHPA and IPZ locations and the importance of spill prevention and response within these sectors (e.g., industry training sessions)

## **f. Deletion of Quarry Policy Addressing Transport Pathways**

### **Recommendation:**

Source water staff is currently discussing this issue with the MOE. A recommendation to keep or delete the draft policy will be made to the Source Protection Committee at their March 1 meeting.

Draft policy “pathways-2” calls on the MOE to consider the potential cumulative impact on municipal drinking water sources during review of applications for approvals such as Permit to Take Water and Environmental Compliance Approvals associated with new aggregate extraction activities in WHPAs. MOE staff in their review of the preliminary draft Source Protection Plan provided the following comment regarding this policy.

- “This policy does not fit under the authority of the transport pathway provisions of the regulation and must be removed. Permit to Take Water applications will only deal with water quantity and have little, if any, bearing on transport pathways. This is not an appropriate tool to address transport pathways. MOE has already evaluated the Permit to Take Water and Environmental Compliance Approvals for aggregate extraction with respect to water quantity and quality”.

### **3.0            *Preliminary Draft* Explanatory Document**

**Date:**            **February 21, 2012**  
**To:**              **Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee**  
**From:**          **Sommer Casgrain-Robertson, Co-Project Manager**  
                     **Mississippi – Rideau Source Protection Region**

---

#### **Background**

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

Source Protection Plans must also be accompanied by a companion “Explanatory Document” which outlines the reasons and rationale for each policy choice.

#### **Mississippi-Rideau Region**

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee is responsible for developing a Source Protection Plan and Explanatory Document for the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region. Proposed versions of the Plan and Explanatory Document must be submitted to the Minister of the Environment for review no later than August 20, 2012. Draft and proposed versions of these documents must undergo two rounds of public consultation before being submitted to the Minister.

#### **Explanatory Document**

Ontario Regulation 287/07 sets out six items that must be included in Explanatory Documents:

1. Reasons for prohibiting an existing activity
2. How climate change considerations impacted policies
3. Reasons for each policy
4. Statement that non-regulatory measure is sufficient to address a significant threat
5. How financial implications affected policy decisions
6. Summary of comments received

Staff have developed a preliminary draft version of the Explanatory Document. It is attached as a separate document for members review. All comments received from Committee members will be incorporated into a second preliminary draft version which will be presented to the Committee for their review and approval at their March 22, 2012 meeting.

#### **Attached as a separate document for members:**

- *Preliminary Draft* Explanatory Document

## **4.0 Summary of Comments Received on Draft Policies**

**Date:** February 21, 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 Summary of Comments Received on Draft Policies and direct staff to include it in the Draft Explanatory Document.

### **Background**

Before Source Protection Plans and Explanatory Documents are developed, draft source protection policies must be created. These draft policies must then go through early engagement and pre-consultation with key stakeholders before being included in Draft Source Protection Plans. Explanatory Documents must include a summary of comments received on draft policies and how they were considered by the Committee.

### **Mississippi-Rideau Region**

The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee worked closely with municipal staff, local sector experts and neighbouring regions to develop draft policies throughout most of 2011. In the fall of 2011, these draft policies were shared formally with municipalities, provincial ministries, health units, other policy implementers, affected property owners, interested industry associations and the public for review and comment.

### **Summary of Comments**

Staff have developed a summary of the comments that were received on the draft policies. This summary must form part of the Draft Explanatory Document.

### **Attached:**

- Summary of Comments Received on Draft Policies, February 21, 2012

Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region

## **Summary of Comments Received on Draft Policies**

*February 21, 2012*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

WASTE DISPOSAL SITES .....	3
SEPTIC SYSTEMS .....	3
SEWAGE WORKS .....	5
AQUACULTURE .....	6
ASM, NASM AND OUTDOOR LIVESTOCK AREAS .....	6
COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER .....	7
PESTICIDE .....	8
SNOW AND ROAD SALT .....	9
FUEL OIL .....	11
LIQUID FUEL .....	13
DNAPLs AND ORGANIC SOLVENTS .....	14
AIRCRAFT DE-ICING .....	15
TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS .....	15
EDUCATION AND OUTREACH .....	15
ROAD AND WATERWAY SIGNS .....	16
TRANSPORT PATHWAYS .....	17
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS .....	17

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

MOE	Ministry of the Environment
MMAH	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
OMAFRA	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
MTO	Ministry of Transportation
MCS	Ministry of Consumer Services <i>(oversees the Technical Standards and Safety Authority)</i>
MNDM	Ministry of Northern Development and Mines
TSSA	Technical Standards and Safety Authority
SPC	Source Protection Committee <i>(for the Mississippi-Rideau region)</i>
RMO	Risk Management Official <i>(main responsibility is administering Risk Management Plans)</i>
IPZ	Intake Protection Zone
WHPA	Wellhead Protection Area

## OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS

As of February 13, 2012 the following stakeholders had provided comments about draft policies:

- Carleton Place
- Drummond/North Elmsley
- Merrickville-Wolford
- Mississippi Mills
- North Frontenac
- North Grenville
- Smiths Falls
- South Frontenac
- Tay Valley
- Westport
- Frontenac County
- Lanark County
- Kingston, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington Health Unit
- MMAH
- MNDM
- MOE
- MTO
- OMAFRA
- MCS
- TSSA
- Environment Canada
- Parks Canada
- Canadian Fertilizer Institute
- Smart About Salt Council
- Ontario Good Roads Association
- Affected property owners (approx. 10)
- Open house participants (approx. 40)

### Scope of Review

- Municipalities focused on reviewing policies that would apply in their municipality.
- Government agencies focused on reviewing policies that they would have to implement.
- Industry associations reviewed policies that pertained to their sector.
- Property owners reviewed policies that might affect activities on their property.
- The general public reviewed most policies.

### Response

In general there was wide spread support for the draft policies and a sense that the policies were reasonable and implementable. The tables in the following sections outline specific comments that were made about a draft policy or set of draft policies. Aside from these comments, stakeholders expressed support for, or did not object to, the draft policies they reviewed.

## WASTE DISPOSAL SITES

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Land Use Planning Policies</b> We encourage the use of complementary land use planning policies when prohibiting land uses through other policy tools.	MOE	Yes	Land use planning policies will be added if municipal staff are supportive (this will be discussed at our Feb 16 municipal working group meeting).
2	<b>Waste-1</b> Consider using policy language that more directly prohibits the activity instead of prohibiting the Ministry from issuing approvals.	MOE	Yes	Policy wording was revised to prohibit the activity.
3	<b>Waste-2 &amp; 3</b> Using “no later than the five year review” as a compliance date for policies that amend official plans and zoning bylaws could be difficult to enforce because not all municipalities comply with the five year requirement.	MMAH	No	None of the municipalities affected by these policies raised concerns about the compliance date. The date will not be revised unless they raise concerns.
4	<b>Waste-5</b> Could “closing a mine” be included in the monitoring policy	SPC Improvement	Yes	Monitoring policy wording was revised to include regulating the eventual closure and abandonment of waste disposal sites.
5	<b>Waste-5</b> MNMD clarified that mine water systems, including tailings facilities, can only be regulated by the MOE through an Environmental Compliance Approval for industrial sewage systems under the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> .	MNMD	Yes	MNMD was removed as a policy implementer. Policies regarding the storage, treatment and discharge of mine tailings will only be directed at the MOE.

## SEPTIC SYSTEMS

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Septic-1</b> Principal Authorities should report on decisions rendered (or copy the Source Protection Authority on notices issued).	SPC improvement	Yes	The monitoring policy was revised to include this requirement. Revised wording has been circulated to Principal Authorities for review.
2	<b>Septic-1</b> Principal Authorities may wish to refer to MMAH information on maintenance inspections for approaches to evaluate existing systems.	MMAH	Yes	This suggestion will be communicated to Principal Authorities.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
3	<b>Septic-2</b> We are unaware that this is currently a mandatory program, clarification is required.	Municipality of North Grenville	Yes	Inspections must be completed in mandatory areas (WHPAs and IPZs scored 10) within five years of the Assessment Report being approved. These dates will be included in the Source Protection Plan for clarity.
4	<b>Septic-2</b> Province should address concerns about the cost to implementing the septic maintenance inspection program	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	Concerns about the cost of the septic maintenance inspection program will be communicated to the principal authorities, the MMAH and the MOE.
5	<b>Septic-2</b> Inspection guideline developed by MMAH does not form part of Ontario Regulation 315/10.	MMAH		Policy wording has been revised to reference the regulation and associated guidelines.
6	<b>Septic-3</b> Concerned that policy wording could require connection to sewer services outside of designated serviced areas in some situations.	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	Policy wording was revised to clearly state that connection is not required outside designated service areas.
7	<b>Septic-3</b> The policy only requires new development on existing lots to connect to sanitary sewers, not new development on new lots.	MMAH	Yes	Policy wording was revised to capture new development on any type of lot (existing or newly created).
8	<b>Septic-3</b> Should verify that authority for this policy exists under the <i>Planning Act</i> or <i>Clean Water Act</i> because it cannot be required under the <i>Building Code Act</i> . Additionally, SPCs may wish to propose to MMAH that new policies be referenced in the Building Code list of applicable law.	MMAH	Yes	Municipalities have authority under the <i>Municipal Act</i> to require mandatory connection to municipal sewer services.  Adding new policies to the Building Code list of applicable law will be discussed with municipalities.
9	<b>Septic-4</b> Need to provide a more detailed description of the lot grading and drainage plan that is required.	SPC improvement	Yes	A principal authority suggested requiring a " <i>lot grade and drainage plan showing existing grade and proposed final grade elevations referenced to a geodetic benchmark</i> ".
10	<b>Septic-4</b> Not clear on the objectives of the lot grade and drainage plan.  Not all designs for on-site systems require additional lot grading.	Town of Mississippi Mills  MMAH	Yes	Lot grading is used to ensure runoff is directed away from septic systems to prevent beds from becoming oversaturated and rainwater from becoming contaminated. It also ensures grading is away from wells.
11	<b>Septic-4</b> An Official Plan amendment may be necessary for a municipality to require certain studies as per section 21(5) of the <i>Planning Act</i>	MMAH	Yes	This caution will be communicated to municipalities and Principal Authorities for their consideration.



## SEWAGE WORKS

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Sewage Works-1</b> Would like to see the installation of continuous liners recognized as a response to reduce the potential threat posed by older existing sewers located in WHPA scored 10.	Town of Mississippi Mills	No	Policy wording was not revised. The draft policy requires municipalities to inspect their sanitary sewers every five years and take any necessary corrective action. It does not specify types of remediation work. This should be left to the discretion of the municipality.
2	<b>Sewage Works-1</b> The monitoring and maintenance dates shall align with the Pollution Prevention and Control Plan (PPCP) process which is once every 5 years.	Town of Smiths Falls	Yes	The policy allows for municipalities to aligning the sewer system maintenance program schedule with the PPCP process. The compliance date of one year is to initiate policy implementation (e.g., establish a process) not complete the sewer maintenance.
3	<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 clearly state that sewers do not have to operate as force mains.
4	<b>Sewage Works-2</b> Change "forcemain standards" wording 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.
5	<b>Sewage Works-4</b> More information is required about what potential Certificate of Approval conditions could be required before the prescribed instrument tool is used to address stormwater.	Town of Carleton Place	Pending	The MOE is currently analyzing their existing programs to determine what changes, if any, will be required to ensure that instruments issued by the ministry manage the activity such that it is not a significant drinking water threat. We await their response.
6	<b>Sewage Works-5</b> Large septic systems should be prohibited in all IPZs scored 10	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 through their planning process.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
7	<b>Sewage Works-6</b> Concerned that policy wording could require connection to sewer services outside of designated serviced areas in some situations.	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	Policy wording was revised to clearly state that connection is not required outside designated service areas.
8	<b>Sewage Works-7</b> We feel that stormwater and stormwater retention ponds do not represent a significant enough threat to be prohibited within WHPAs.	Municipality of North Grenville	Yes	The policy may be revised to allow a new stormwater pond to be constructed in WHPA-A if WHPA-A is municipally owned natural space. This would be an incentive for municipalities to retain ownership of WHPA-A for new developments and maintain it in a natural state.

## AQUACULTURE

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

## ASM, NASM AND OUTDOOR LIVESTOCK AREAS

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Financial Impact</b> Supports the policies but they will be financially impacted so they are going to pursue available funding opportunities.	Affected property owner	Yes	Property owner was given information about funding programs they are eligible for including the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program.
2	<b>Definitions</b> Suggest using the definitions of ASM and NASM that are in Ontario Regulation 267/03 under the <i>Nutrient Management Act</i> .	OMAFRA	No	MOE stated a definition of ASM and NASM in the Tables of Threat Circumstances under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> so we are obligated to use those definitions.
3	<b>SML-1</b> Remove NASM application, handling and storage from the policy because category 2 and 3 NASM already requires a NASM Plan.	OMAFRA	Yes	The policy was revised to state that a NASM Plan exempts the person from requiring a Risk Management Plan. The policy will be used to address category 1 NASM.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
4	<b>SML-1</b> Is there clear direction about how to manage the risk posed by outdoor livestock areas? Would like to see OMAFRA take a lead role in negotiating risk management measures for outdoor livestock areas.	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	Common best management practices would likely suffice which may include restricting livestock access to watercourses. OMAFRA has been asked to play a role in negotiating risk management plans for all agricultural operations. Provincial discussions are currently underway about what role they could play.
5	<b>SML-1</b> Change policy wording to: "Nutrient Management Strategies, Nutrient Management Plans and/or Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) plans developed under the <i>Nutrient Management Act</i> (NMA) can be used to fulfill this requirement"	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to incorporate this suggestion.
6	<b>SML-1</b> Change policy wording 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.

## COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Information and Training</b> Information about codes of practice and the 4R Nutrient Stewardship Initiative was provided which could form part of risk management plans. The Urban Fertilizer Council's "Greener Lawns" publication was also provided and could be used in the education and outreach programs.	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.
2	<b>Fertilizer-3</b> This policy should also apply to the application of fertilizer by municipal parks and recreation departments.	Town of Smiths Falls	Yes	The policy would apply to all non-residential application of commercial fertilizer.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
3	<b>Fertilizer-3</b> Change policy wording to: “Nutrient Management Plans and Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Plans developed under the <i>Nutrient Management Act</i> can be used to fulfill this requirement.”	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to reflect this suggestion.

## PESTICIDE

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Inclusion of Herbicides</b> 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. This means herbicides are included in the threat. The substances listed in the Tables of Drinking Water Threats are active ingredients in herbicides, nematocides (used to control nematodes) and fungicides.
2	<b>Golf Course</b> If pesticide application rates at the golf course surrounding the Perth intake do not reach the “significant drinking water threat” circumstances set by the province, best management practices would still improve water quality at the intake.	Open house participant	Yes	The education and outreach program will disseminate information in IPZs and WHPAs scored 8 or higher to promote and encourage best practices for all threats (including pesticide application and storage).
2	<b>Pesticides – 3 &amp; 4</b> Is spraying herbicides under order of a designated Weed Inspector ( <i>Weed Act</i> ) not a concern in a WHPA scored 10 or an IPZ scored 9 or 10?	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	The application of pesticide ordered by a 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 Ontario Regulation 63/09. 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 drinking water areas and ensure that a Pesticide Safety Course is required for all pesticide use that is or would be a significant threat (to ensure there is no regulatory gap).

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
3	<b>Pesticides – 2, 3 &amp; 4</b> Suggest using wording such as “MOE encourages operators to be certified under the Ontario Pesticide Education Program” and encourage farm operators to use licensed custom applicators who are required to have an Operators License.	OMAFRA	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to reflect this suggestion.

## SNOW AND ROAD SALT

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Private Wells</b> Concerned about road salt in private well water	Open house participants	Yes	The intent of encouraging all municipalities to develop road salt management plans is to decrease the amount of road salt used to treat each weather event to help protect regional groundwater.
2	<b>Chloride Testing</b> Sodium is naturally high in groundwater in some areas so testing could create a false correlation with road salt. It does not seem necessary to test more frequently than the current requirement of once per 60 months. More frequent testing would lead to more unnecessary Adverse Water Quality notifications.  Testing for chloride annually seems excessive (there has never been a documented problem). This policy should reflect the current 60 month testing regime.	Town of Mississippi Mills       Municipality of North Grenville	No	This cannot be a legally binding policy, rather it is a recommendation that municipalities test more frequently than the current five year requirement. The policy was therefore not revised.
3	<b>Environment Canada</b> The draft policy approach aligns with Environment Canada's Code of Practice with the implementation of BMPs being undertaken by municipal road organizations. This should minimize duplication efforts by implicated stakeholders.	Environment Canada	Yes	The policy was created to avoid duplication.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
4	<b>Salt/Snow-1</b> Municipality does not currently prepare a Salt Management Plan because of low salt usage. Policy should be directed to county level governments	Municipality of North Grenville	No	Where the application of road salt is considered a significant drinking water threat, the policy must address all application (upper and lower tier municipal roads). Most upper tier municipalities already have Road Salt Management Plans because of their higher salt usage.
5	<b>Salt/Snow-1</b> Can we manage “contaminant content”?  How will the assessment of the effectiveness of measures implemented be achieved?	SPC improvements	Yes	Policy wording was revised to remove specific reference to “the contaminant content of snow” and providing an assessment of the effectiveness of measures to address snow. These would be difficult to achieve.  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.
6	<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?  Would like to see the policy require facility managers and contractors to be Smart About Salt accredited and all sites be certified.	Town of Smiths Falls  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.
7	<b>Salt/Snow-2, 3 and 4</b> Revise the monitoring policies to require municipalities to report how many facility managers of privately owned buildings and private sector contractors have become certified, accredited or enrolled in the Smart About Salt program	Ontario Good Roads Association	Yes	Policies were revised to request information about how many contractors and sites became accredited, certified or enrolled in the program.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
8	<p><b>Salt/Snow-4</b> Concerned about municipalities having to offer Smart about Salt to private contractors, unless they are providing contracted services to the municipality. The province should regulate private sector salt users.</p> <p>MOE should be the implementer as the program has a regional scope.</p> <p>Concerned about the possibility of undertaking Smart about Salt training, offering this training and submitting annual reports. Policy should be directed to county level governments</p>	<p>Town of Mississippi Mills</p> <p>Township of Drummond/North Elmsley</p> <p>Municipality of North Grenville</p>	Yes	<p>Municipalities can approach other agencies (e.g. other municipalities, conservation authorities) to deliver education and outreach policies on their behalf, including offering Smart About Salt training. This will be discussed at our Feb 16 municipal working group meeting.</p> <p>The comment will also be forwarded to the MOE for their consideration in playing a role in implementing smart salt practices.</p>
9	<p><b>Salt/Snow-4</b> Municipality should encourage facility managers to become accredited and use certified contractors</p>	Ontario Good Roads Association	Yes	Policy was revised to encourage municipalities to promote certification.
10	<p><b>Salt/Snow- 1 to 4</b> Suggested wording changes to help accomplish policy intent</p>	Smart About Salt Council	Yes	Policy wording was revised to incorporate suggestions from the Smart About Salt Council.

## FUEL OIL

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<p><b>Fuel Oil-1</b> Supports the policies but suggests the quality or grade of oil tank should be considered (not just the type).</p>	Affected property owner	No	Staff looking into this comment
2	<p><b>Fuel Oil-1</b> Supports the policies but feels they should be monitored by oil suppliers and service technicians rather than Risk Management Officials.</p>	Affected property owner	No	We have no legal authority to require oil suppliers and service technicians to ensure compliance with local source protection policies. However, a policy has been directed at the TSSA to strengthen existing requirements for oil tanks and increase the frequency of required inspections in hopes that a Risk Management Plan would not be required in future.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
3	<b>Fuel Oil-1</b> Supports policies but homeowners need time and grants to implement them.	Affected property owner	Yes	Property owners are being strongly encouraged to take advantage of the stewardship program that is funded until December 2012 – including 80% grants to implement fuel risk management measures. The compliance date for the policy will likely be three years.
4	<b>Fuel Oil-1</b> Does not support the policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current regulations are adequate</li> <li>• Concerned about cost of keeping up with regulations for a non-profit organization</li> <li>• Suggests using additives to remove water from tanks</li> <li>• Additional insurance requirements are too much burden and should be the responsibility of the municipality</li> </ul>	Affected property owner	No	<p>Our research showed that current regulations lag behind industry standards established by fuel suppliers and insurance companies. The draft policies would make common industry standards a regulatory requirement.</p> <p>The existing stewardship program provides an 80% grant rate to implement a number of fuel oil risk management measures.</p> <p>Water in tanks is just one cause of fuel spills and leaks, the draft policies are meant to address all primary causes.</p> <p>We cannot require municipalities to cover pollution liability insurance for individuals who store fuel oil. Insurance companies are beginning to reduce premiums when risk mitigation measures have been undertaken.</p>
5	<b>FuelOil-2</b> Changes to current codes are undertaken approximately every five years. TSSA engages stakeholders to consider proposed changes. These proposals then require MCS support to amend the current regulation or <i>Technical Standards and Safety Act</i> , 2000.  TSSA focuses its public education programs in the designated sectors they regulate. TSSA is open to providing ancillary support for source protection education programs.	TSSA	Yes	<p>The recommendations in FuelOil-2 will be forwarded to the TSSA for consideration during their next code change.</p> <p>TSSA will be contacted during policy implementation to explore opportunities to provide supporting material and information and partner on consistent messaging to the fuel sector.</p>



#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
6	<b>FuelOil-2</b> TSSA does not meet the definition of a “public body” under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> so they cannot be named as the implementer of a monitoring policy.	MOE	Yes	The following monitoring policy was removed: <i>TSSA shall provide a response to the Source Protection Authority regarding their consideration of this policy.</i> Through correspondence they will be encouraged to implement this policy and progress will be noted in the annual progress report.
7	<b>FuelOil-3</b> This policy should apply to all fuel stored in association with the drinking water system. Policy should also refer to both the license and permit.	MOE	Yes	Policy wording was broadened to capture all fuel oil being stored and the provincial instruments being used.
8	<b>FuelOil-3</b> Fuel oil stored as part of the drinking water system was intended to be subject to the same risk management measures required in FuelOil-1.	SPC improvement	Yes	Policy wording was revised to clearly reference the risk management measures that are required for fuel stored as part of the drinking water system.
9	<b>FuelOil-3</b> The MOE should copy the Source Protection Authority on new or revised approvals for fuel storage associated with a drinking water system.	SPC improvement	Yes	The monitoring policy was revised to include this requirement.

## LIQUID FUEL

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>LiquidFuel-2</b> Does this include liquid propane fuel as well?	Town of Smiths Falls	Yes	Gaseous fuels are not considered part of the drinking water threat so the policies do not apply to propane.
2	<b>LiquidFuel-3</b> Supports the policies but suggests the quality or grade of oil tank should be considered (not just the type).	Affected property owner	No	Staff looking into this comment
3	<b>LiquidFuel-1 and 4</b> Changes to current codes are undertaken approximately every five years. TSSA engages stakeholders to consider proposed changes. These proposals then require MCS support to amend the current regulation or <i>Technical Standards and Safety Act, 2000</i>	TSSA	Yes	The recommendation in LiquidFuel-1 will be forwarded to the TSSA for consideration during their next code change.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
4	<b>LiquidFuel-1 and 4</b> TSSA does not meet the definition of a “public body” under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> so they cannot be named as the implementer of a monitoring policy.	MOE	Yes	The following monitoring policy was removed: <i>TSSA shall provide a response to the Source Protection Authority regarding their consideration of this policy</i> . Through correspondence they will be encouraged to implement this policy and progress will be noted in the annual progress report.

## DNAPLs AND ORGANIC SOLVENTS

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>DNAPL/OS-1</b> Concerned about how Risk Management Officials will be able to locate threat activities, especially in a non-commercial use.	Town of Mississippi Mills	No	Administering Risk Management Plans for DNAPLs and organic solvents will be very challenging. Some municipalities have suggested there are information sources (e.g., high risk lists for fire departments) that could help identify operations that involve DNAPLs or organic solvents. This challenge will be discussed at our February 16 municipal working group meeting.
2	<b>DNAPL/OS-2</b> Environment Canada does not meet the definition of a “public body” under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> so they cannot be named as an implementer of a monitoring policy.	MOE	Yes	The following monitoring policy was removed: <i>“Environment Canada shall provide a response to the Source Protection Authority regarding their consideration of this policy”</i> . Through correspondence they will be encouraged to implement this policy and progress will be noted in the annual progress report.
3	<b>DNAPL/OS-3</b> Policy wording should reference sewer use by-laws	Town of Smiths Falls	Yes	Policy wording has been revised to include sewer use by-law as an example.
4	<b>DNAPL/OS-4</b> Concerned about the difficulty of enforcement because of ongoing changing commercial activities	Town of Smiths Falls	No	Prohibiting the future storage and handling of DNAPLs and organic solvents will be very challenging. This challenge will be discussed at our February 16 municipal working group meeting.

## AIRCRAFT DE-ICING

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	It is unclear why the Town of Mississippi Mills is listed as an implementer of the policy since there are no airports.	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	A policy is required to address future airports in areas where runoff containing de-icing materials would be a significant threat. While it is unlikely that a future airport could be established in these areas, a policy was required.

## TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<p><b>Transp-3</b> MOE should instigate the education and outreach program and municipalities could make the information available.</p> <p>Concerned about policies suggesting a municipal role toward E&amp;O for safe handling of substances to prevent spills (bullet #2).</p>	<p>Township of Drummond/North Elmsley</p> <p>Town of Mississippi Mills</p>	Yes	<p>Policy wording was revised so the education and outreach program only entails the dissemination of information about where vulnerable areas are located and encouraging best practices in these areas to prevent and respond to spills (bullet #2 removed). The program is intended to build on existing resources including material available from the MOE.</p> <p>Municipalities can also approach other agencies (e.g. other municipalities, conservation authorities) about administering education programs on their behalf. This will be discussed at our Feb 16 municipal working group meeting.</p>

## EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<p><b>E&amp;O-1</b> Suggest the MOE or conservation authority take the lead in developing and distributing education and outreach materials. Municipalities could play a supporting role.</p>	Mississippi Mills Smiths Falls North Grenville Drummond/North Elmsley	Yes	This will be discussed at the Feb 16 municipal working group meeting.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
2	<b>E&amp;O-1</b> Do not like the “clean water zone” working title.	SPC Members Multiple municipalities	Yes	The working title has been revised to “drinking water zone”. The program’s official name can be determined prior to implementation by the implementer(s).
3	<b>E&amp;O-1</b> Will the program be a living document? Please clarify the form of the program.	Smiths Falls	Yes	The form of the program will be decided by the implementer. It may entail printed materials that are mailed to residents and businesses or some other form.
4	<b>E&amp;O-1</b> The storage and application of pesticides should be included as part of the education and outreach certification and training under the Ontario Pesticide Education Program	OMAFRA	Pending	This comment will be clarified with OMAFRA.
5	<b>E&amp;O-1</b> Perhaps this policy should include large farms, small intensive farms and other operations.	OMAFRA	No	All farms should receive or have access to information through the “Living and Working in the Drinking Water Zone” program.
6	<b>E&amp;O-2</b> This program requires additional implementation and promotional material. Should include the need to properly decommission abandoned wells.	County of Lanark	Yes	The region wide education and outreach program can address any and all topics related to protecting regional groundwater. Properly decommissioning wells will also be addressed by some transport pathways policies.

## ROAD AND WATERWAY SIGNS

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Signs 1 &amp; 2</b> Consider changing the policy to: “MTO in collaboration with other members of the MTO/MOE/SPC Working Group will design a standardized source water protection road sign, and will be responsible for the manufacture and installation of any signs to be placed on provincial highways. Municipalities will be responsible for manufacturing to the design standard and installing on their roadways”	MTO	Yes	The MTO/MOE/SPC working group is currently working on revised policy wording. The policies will be revised to incorporate their suggestions.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
2	<b>Signs-3</b> If a sign is to be placed on, or above federal lands or waters, then an application will need to be made to the Rideau Canal office in Smiths Falls for approval of the Superintendent.	Parks Canada	Yes	Policy wording may be revised to make conservation authorities responsible for researching potential IPZ sign locations and coordinating appropriate approvals and municipalities responsible for producing and installing the signs.

## TRANSPORT PATHWAYS

No specific comments were received about transport pathway draft policies.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
1	<b>Provincial Funding</b> All program costs should be funded by the province.  The Province should fund the first round of Risk Management Plans for existing activities.	South Frontenac Leeds and Grenville  Carleton Place	Yes	All 19 SPCs across Ontario have been pressuring the MOE to provide provincial funding for implementation. They will continue to push for provincial funding.
2	<b>Funding For Property Owners</b> The Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program should be provincially funded beyond 2012 to assist with policy implementation.	Tay Valley	Yes	All 19 SPCs across Ontario have been pressuring the MOE to provincially fund this stewardship program beyond 2012 to help property owners implement policies. They will continue to push for extended funding.
3	<b>Rural Clean Water Program</b> The conservation authority, in partnership with the MOE, municipalities and local stakeholder groups should establish an incentive program for replacing underground storage tanks; replacing and repairing sewage systems; and properly decommissioning unused wells and upgrading substandard wells.	South Frontenac	Yes	The Rideau Valley Conservation Authority has a funding program to address septic systems, wells and fuel storage on farms. It does not currently address underground storage tanks. This comment will be provided to the project manager of the Rideau Valley Rural Clean Water Program.
4	<b>Restricted Land Use Tool</b> Support the addition of Section 59 restricted land use policies (an administrative policy tool).	Carleton Place Lanark North Grenville Smiths Falls Westport	Yes	Restricted land use policies have been added to act as a screening tool for applications that may be subject to Section 57 prohibition or Section 58 risk management plans under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> .

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
5	<b>Reviewers Guide</b> Excellent document, however would like to see all policy documents formatted in a matter that could be incorporated into a standard letter (if possible).	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	The Source Protection Plan will be formatted like a traditional policy document.
6	<b>RMO Training</b> Training for RMOs should be held locally or on-line to minimize costs to municipalities.  Province should cover the cost of RMO training.	Tay Valley Township  Township of Montague	No	MOE has indicated they will not hold regional training sessions or cover costs associated with the training (the course itself is free). This concern will be pursued if municipalities choose to send their staff for RMO training.
7	<b>RMO Jurisdiction</b> Which RMO is responsible for addressing the four Carleton Place threats in Almonte?	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	The RMO for Carleton Place.
8	<b>RMO Selection</b> Municipalities should appoint a RMO for their IPZ or WHPA.	Town of Smiths Falls Drummond/North Elmsley	Yes	Deciding who will be the RMO and the area they will cover will be decided by the municipalities.
9	<b>RMO Information</b> More information is needed regarding the RMO (a factsheet could be created).	Town of Smiths Falls	Yes	Guidance material about Risk Management Officials and Inspectors has been developed for municipalities by the MOE. We are awaiting its release.
10	<b>OMAFRA As The RMO</b> OMAFRA does not have the authority to administer Risk Management Plans under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> .	OMAFRA	No	Conversations are ongoing at the provincial level about what role OMAFRA could play in establishing Risk Management Plans for agricultural operations.
11	<b>RMP Compliance Date</b> The municipal working group agreed that a compliance date of 3 years to establish risk management plans for existing threats was reasonable. This will be consistent with the compliance date for reviewing existing prescribed instruments.	Municipal Working Group	Yes	A compliance date of three years will be added to the policies throughout the Plan.
12	<b>Threat Count</b> Would like to see a correlation between each threat count and the respective property in each category.	Town of Mississippi Mills	Yes	This information can be provided to municipalities under MFIPPA.
13	<b>Certificate of Approvals</b> Certificates of Approval are moving towards using the term "Environmental Compliance Approval"	MOE	Yes	Policy wording was revised to reflect the change in terminology.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
14	<b>Compliance Date for Existing Instruments</b> Strongly recommend existing prescribed instruments comply with policies “within 3 years from the date the plan takes effect, or such other date as the Director determines based on a prioritized review of Environmental Compliance Approvals that govern significant drinking water threat activities”.	MOE	No	The policies will state a compliance date of 3 years for existing prescribed instruments. It is believed that only one existing instrument will have to be examined in the Mississippi-Rideau so it does not seem necessary to give discretion beyond 3 years. This will also be consistent with the compliance date for establishing Risk Management Plans for existing threats.
15	<b>Moderate/Low Threat Policies</b> At this time the MOE is focusing their policy review on significant threat policies.	MOE	n/a	We will await a response. In the meantime policies will remain unchanged.
16	<b>Specify Action Policies</b> At this time the Ministry is cataloguing all of the strategic action policies into specific ministry program areas. Once all the pre-consultation policies are received, we can determine the scope and variation of strategic policies proposed.	MOE	n/a	We will await a response. In the meantime policies will remain unchanged.
17	<b>Monitoring Policies</b> The MOE will consider how to implement reporting that would meet the requirements for the monitoring policies of all of the Plans in Ontario and streamline implementation requirements.	MOE	n/a	We will await a response. In the meantime policies will remain unchanged.
18	<b>Municipal Policy Tools</b> May consider providing more direction to support municipalities (especially those with limited resources) in the implementation of policies that use existing municipal tools like official plans and zoning bylaws.	MMAH	Yes	This will be considered during policy implementation.
19	<b>Compliance Timing</b> Any policy requiring change to municipal planning documents for implementation can be time-consuming.	MMAH	Yes	Compliance dates for amending planning documents will be established by municipalities.
20	<b>Park Land</b> Municipalities may wish to include direction in their official plan that will consider the acquisition of 5% parkland when considering development in WHPAs and IPZs as opposed to cash-in-lieu in order to increase greenspace in these vulnerable areas.	MMAH	Yes	This comment will be discussed with municipalities.

#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
21	<b>Land Acquisition</b> Municipalities can be encouraged to develop a land acquisition strategy (authority under section 58 of the <i>Planning Act</i> ). Could acquire lands in the most vulnerable areas and manage them in a way that protects source water.	MMAH	Yes	This comment will be discussed with municipalities.
22	<b>Site Plan Control</b> Municipalities may consider the application of site plan control to regulate on-site storage. Official plans must have implementing policies to utilize site plan control.	MMAH	Yes	This comment will be discussed with municipalities.
23	<b>Legal Authority</b> Policies should identify what legal authority authorizes municipalities to carry out the actions and responsibilities outlined in the policy (e.g., section of the <i>Municipal Act</i> or other applicable legislation).	MMAH	Yes	Policy wording was revised where applicable to reference the <i>Municipal Act</i> , and where possible, the appropriate section. Other legal authorities may be identified where needed.
24	<b>Financial Costs</b> Need to consider the cumulative impact of the policies on the financial capacity and available resources of affected municipalities to prevent further strain on municipal finances.	MMAH	Yes	Municipalities have been heavily involved in developing source protection policies as they will be the primary policy implementer and have limited resources.
25	<b>Policy Summary</b> Want to see a specific list of policies with definite details of potentially restricted land uses.	Affected property owner	Yes	A summary table will be included in the appendix of the Plan that will summarize policies by their effect (e.g., prohibit or manage a land use)
26	<b>Pharmaceuticals</b> Concerned about pharmaceuticals in the water.	Open house participant	Yes	This concern will be forwarded to the MOE for consideration.
27	<b>Private Wells</b> Concerned about water quantity and related development.	Open house participant	Yes	This concern will be forwarded to the City of Ottawa for consideration.
28	<b>Public Participation</b> Need to include the public in all steps of the process.	Affected property owner	Yes	The source protection process contains multiple rounds of public consultation. Policies will go through three rounds of public consultation before being submitted to the province for possible approval.



#	Comment	Commenter	Addressed	Staff Recommendation
29	<b>Boating Info</b> Additional information is needed regarding boats at intakes.	Affected property owner	Yes	The sign policies recommend posting signage along recreational waterways to make boaters aware when they are near a municipal drinking intake.
30	<b>Transparency</b> Transparency is necessary, which companies/businesses or industries might garner business from the introduction of new policies?	Affected property owner	Yes	The type of businesses that could garner business from the introduction of source protection policies are those that are involved in best management practices or risk mitigation measures associated with the drinking water threat activities.
31	<b>Taxes</b> Would the policies mean an increase to property tax?	Affected property owner	Yes	It is unknown right now if policies will affect property taxes. Municipalities and SPCs are lobbying for provincial funding to cover implementation costs (not property taxes). SPCs also tried to develop policies that were cost-effective to implement.

## **5.0 Community Outreach**

**Date:** February 21, 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. *Municipal Working Group Meeting (all municipal staff invited)*
  - February 16, Perth (staff and some members attended)
2. *Mississippi Valley Source Protection Authority*
  - February 22, Almonte (Chair Stavinga and Sommer attended)
3. *Rideau Valley Source Protection Authority*
  - February 23, Manotick (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. *City of Ottawa Info Exchange Meeting*
  - March 6, Perth (Sommer participating)
2. *Rideau Lakes Open House*
  - March 29, North Crosby (Sommer attending)