

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Related Policies	Monitoring Policy
GEN-1 No change	Municipality	A	<p>s.59 Restricted Land Uses</p> <p>All land uses except solely residential uses, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i> in all areas where the following activities are, or would be, a significant drinking water threat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site (within the meaning of Part V of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i>) that does not require approval under the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> or the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> • The application or storage of agricultural source material • The application or storage of non-agricultural source material (Category 1) • The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard • The application, handling or storage of commercial fertilizer • The handling and storage of pesticide at a manufacturing, processing or wholesaling facility, retail outlet or custom applicator’s storage yard • The application, handling and storage of road salt • The storage of snow (snow dumps) • The handling and storage of fuel that requires s.57 Prohibition or s.58 Risk Management Plan • The handling and storage of DNAPLs and organic solvents • The management of runoff that contains chemicals used in the de-icing of aircraft • An activity that reduces recharge of an aquifer 	Immediately (T-9)	<p>WST-2 PES-2 WST-6 SAL-1 ASM-2 SAL-2 ASM-4 SAL-7 NASM-1 SNO-1 NASM-2 FUEL-3 LIV-1 DNAP-1 LIV-3 OS-1 FER-2 DI-1 FER-3 REC-2 PES-1</p> <p>See Explanatory Notes</p>	MON-1

COMMENTS POLICY GEN-1		
	Comments	Response
Halton Region and lower tier municipalities	8. This policy designates all land uses except residential uses for the purposes of Section 59 Restricted Land uses under the Clean Water Act, 2006. However, policy SAL-1 requires the use of Part IV Risk Management Plans for future application, handling and storage of road salt where it would be a significant threat including residential land uses, but excluding single family dwellings. It is suggested to use a parking lot size metric in SAL-1 instead of specifying ‘single family dwelling’. The metric used in SAL-3 would be appropriate. See comments on SAL-1 for rationale in using the parking lot size metric. If this metric is not used in SAL-1, policy GEN-1 needs to be revised to include multi-residential land uses only for SAL-1 (to enable to use of Section 59 for policy SAL-1), while retaining the exclusion of all residential land uses for all other S. 59 activities listed under GEN-1.	SPC to consider option for SAL-1 and appropriate revisions will be made to GEN-1 if necessary.
Wellington County municipalities	1. The exemption established in this policy for solely residential uses will aid greatly in implementation of the Amended Proposed Plan as it focuses staff resources on the land uses (i.e. industrial, commercial, mixed use) that have the greatest potential to impact municipal drinking water. The addition of an activity that reduces recharge of an aquifer to this list is also helpful for implementation as it assists in providing some definition around an activity that has the potential for a wide range of interpretations.	Comment noted.

Red text and strikethrough = revisions that went out for public consultation
 Highlighted text = revisions made after public consultation

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Related Policies	Monitoring Policy
GEN-2 No change	MOECC	K	<p>Incentive</p> <p>The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change should maintain and expand the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program and/or fund other relevant programs to enable local delivery to implement risk management measures for the following activities where they are a significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>a) Septic systems governed under the <i>Building Code Act</i>; b) Application and storage of ASM; c) Application, handling and storage of NASM; d) Use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or farm-animal yard. O. Reg. 385/08, s. 3; e) Application, handling and storage of fertilizer; and f) Application, handling and storage of pesticide.</p>	Existing: Consider within 2 years (T-15)	SWG ASM NASM LIV FER PES See Explanatory Notes	MON-4

COMMENTS POLICY GEN-2		
	Comments	Response
CVC	<p>CVC Staff encourages the CTC and MOE to include the following items to be eligible project within the incentives program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. handling and storage of fuel and water conservation measures on farm properties (such as irrigation equipment upgrades) b. soil testing for ASM application rates as per ASM-1 c. fencing to restrict livestock as per LIV-1 d. cost to install a covered fertilizer storage as per FER-2 	<p>These suggestions will be included in the Explanatory Document as they are too detailed to include in the policy and may limit other projects from being considered.</p>

Red text and strikethrough = revisions that went out for public consultation
 Highlighted text = revisions made after public consultation

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Related Policies	Monitoring Policy
GEN-3 No change	MOECC	K	<p>Specify Action</p> <p>The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change is requested to continue its funding to municipalities and Source Protection Authorities under source protection programs to continue local research into issues (nitrogen, pathogen, sodium, chloride) to determine where the following activities are a contributing source of the contaminant in Issue Contributing Areas:</p> <p>a) Septic systems governed under the <i>Building Code Act</i> and the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i>; b) Discharge of untreated stormwater from a stormwater retention pond; c) Application and storage of ASM; d) Application, handling and storage of NASM; e) Use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or farm-animal yard. O. Reg. 385/08, s. 3; f) Application, handling and storage of fertilizer; and g) Application, handling and storage of road salt.</p>	Existing: Consider within 2 years (T-15)	SWG ASM NASM LIV FER SAL See Explanatory Notes	MON-4

COMMENTS POLICY GEN-3		
	Comments	Response
CVC	CVC Staff supports CTC SPA's request for funding sources which would support the Source Protection Authorities roll in Education and Outreach, Incentives and Research. In addition, significant resources were applied to the development of the Tier 3 water budget models. It is essential that funding be made available to maintain the models so they remain current and valid and are utilized to support future decisions such as Permits to Take Water and/or land use planning decisions.	Comment noted.

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Related Policies	Monitoring Policy
GEN-4 No change	Municipality	E	<p>Specify Action</p> <p>Where municipal groundwater monitoring shows increasing or decreasing trends and/or exceeds Ontario Drinking Water Standards, the municipality shall investigate and share the information with the RMO, MOE, OMAFRA (for nitrates or pathogens) and the Source Protection Authority.</p>	Existing & Future: 2 years (T-12)	All Nitrate and Pathogen ICA Threats See Explanatory Notes	MON-1

Red text and strikethrough = revisions that went out for public consultation
 Highlighted text = revisions made after public consultation

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Related Policies	Monitoring Policy
GEN-5 SPC to review	Provincial Ministry	K	Specify Action Where an activity that is, or would be, a significant drinking water threat requires approval using a Prescribed Instrument, the regulatory authority shall undertake compliance/verification inspection to confirm that any new or amended conditions of approval are, or have been, implemented by the facility owner within 3 years of the date of the new or amended approval to ensure that the activity ceases to be, or does not become, a significant drinking water threat. Ongoing inspections should be conducted at no less than 5 year intervals.	See Policy	WST-1 NASM-2 WST-4 LIV-2 SWG-8 LIV-4 SWG-11 FER-1 SWG-13 FER-4 SWG-15 FUEL-1 SWG-17 FUEL-2 ASM-1 LO-SEW-1 ASM-3 LO-SEW-2 ASM-5 DEM-1 NASM-1 See Explanatory Notes	MON-4
NEW GEN-8 SPC to consider	Municipality	E	Specify Action Where an activity requires a Risk Management Plan, the municipality shall ensure through their authority that the RMO and RMI responsible for enforcement will establish a priority for how inspections will be conducted to ensure that the activity ceases to be, or does not become, a significant drinking water threat. Ongoing inspections should be conducted at no less than 5 year intervals or on a basis deemed appropriate by the RMO and RMI.	T-6 T-7	WST-2 PES-2 WST-6 SAL-1 ASM-2 SAL-2 ASM-4 SAL-7 NASM-1 SNO-1 NASM-2 FUEL-3 LIV-1 DNAP-1 LIV-3 OS-1 FER-2 DI-1 FER-3 REC-2 PES-1	MON-1

COMMENTS POLICY GEN-5		
	Comments	Response
Halton Region and lower tier municipalities	9. With regard to “Ongoing inspection” conditions listed in prescribed instruments as a measure to address significant drinking water threat activities, Halton staff believe the <u>time frame for carrying out inspections should not be restricted to less than 5 years</u> . Rather, <u>the criteria for inspection should be based on the asset material type, age, condition and risk</u> (standard asset management business practice, i.e. PACP/ CSA PLUS 4012) <u>as opposed to a generic frequency of 5 years</u> . For example, there would be no appreciable benefit to require an inspection of sanitary sewer that was newly constructed five years ago, given that the expected service asset life would be 80 to 100 years. As well, inspection practices at this frequency would not constitute effective use of staff resources and public tax money.	SPC to review.
Wellington County municipalities	2. It is noted that the provincial regulatory authorities responsible for PIs are requested (have regard for) to confirm implementation of PI conditions within three years and conduct follow-up inspections within five years. GEN-5 is subject to monitoring policy MON-4, it would be useful if the provincial regulatory authority provided a list of the inspections completed including date of inspection, address, municipality and PI reference number in the report provided under MON-4 to the	Comment noted. In the report received for MON-4 policies we would like the

Red text and strikethrough = revisions that went out for public consultation
 Highlighted text = revisions made after public consultation

	lead SPA. This list could be provided as an appendix to the report, allowing the lead SPA to forward this list to the RMOs for information. This information, provided in the winter of every year, would be useful to inform RMOs on recent inspections in their municipalities and assist in work planning for RMP inspections. Similarly, a list of municipal inspections could be provided through the lead SPA to the provincial regulatory authorities (see comment under MON-2).	information to be useful for the RMO as well. Will include details in Explanatory Document.
--	---	---

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Related Policies	Monitoring Policy
GEN-6 No change	Municipality	J	Specify Action Where education and outreach materials are prepared and delivered to significant drinking water threats areas, the municipality is encouraged to deliver those materials to affected properties and businesses in moderate and low threat areas.	Existing & Future: Consider within 2 years (T-15)	SWG-2 FUEL-4 SWG-7 DNAP-2 NASM-5 OS-2 FER-6 DEM-5 PES-3 REC-3 SAL-8 See Explanatory Notes	MON-1

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Related Policies	Monitoring Policy
NEW GEN-7 SPC to consider	Municipality	E	Incentive Where an activity is a significant drinking water threat, the municipality shall consider providing incentive programs to encourage actions to reduce the risks to source water.	Existing: Consider within 2 years (T-15)	All threats	MON-1

COMMENTS POLICY NEW GEN-7 (from PES-4 comments)		
	Comments	Response
CVC	CVC Staff encourages the SPC to include an incentive policy similar to PES-4 within the ASM, NASM, LIV, FER, SWG and FUEL.	SPC to discuss NEW GEN-7 and potential removal of PES-4.

Red text and strikethrough = revisions that went out for public consultation
 Highlighted text = revisions made after public consultation

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Policy	When Policy Applies	Related Policies	Monitoring Policy
OTHER-1 No change	Niagara Escarpment Commission	K	<p>Specify Action</p> <p>The Niagara Escarpment Commission is requested to initiate amendments to the Niagara Escarpment Plan, no later than in their next scheduled plan review cycle, to incorporate from the Source Protection Plans the relevant policies, restrictions and conditions into appropriate sections of the NEP, in order to protect existing and future drinking water sources in Source Protection Areas by ensuring activities cease to be or do not become significant drinking water threats.</p>	Existing & Future: Initiate within 2 years (T-16)	WST-5 SWG-18 SWG-4 SAL-3 SWG-9 SAL-10 SWG-12 DEM-2 SWG-14 REC-1 SWG-16 N/A	MON-4 MON-1

COMMENTS POLICY OTHER-1		
	Comments	Response
NEC	<p>6. The effect of this policy is non-legally binding (List K policy). It is our understanding that the NEC is not legally bound to implement SPP policies, as Development Permits under the <i>NEPDA</i> have not been identified as prescribed instruments under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> and the NEC is not considered a “planning approval authority” under Section 39 (1) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>. However, we recognize that there is a gap in SPP policy implementation in the NEP Area, where the NEC is the planning authority for areas under Niagara Escarpment Development Control and where municipal zoning does not apply. The NEC strongly supports source protection and the <i>NEPDA</i> does require the protection of water resources. As such, we believe that the NEC can accommodate and implement SPP policies as a matter of common provincial interest.</p> <p>7. Staff foresees that a “catchall policy” could be added to the NEP to cover all policies identified as relevant to the NEC, rather than a number of specific policies.</p>	Comment noted.

Red text and strikethrough = revisions that went out for public consultation
 Highlighted text = revisions made after public consultation