

**Existing Threat Activity (SPC to review)**

An existing threat activity shall mean the following, unless expressly stated in a policy:

- a) an existing use, activity, building or structure at a location in a vulnerable area that is in compliance with all applicable requirements, and that was being used or had been established for the purposes of undertaking the threat activity, at any time within ten years prior to the date of approval of the Source Protection Plan, or
- b) an expansion of an existing use or activity that reduces the risk of contaminating drinking water **nor depletes drinking water sources**, or
- c) an expansion, alteration or replacement of an existing building or structure that does not increase the risk of contaminating drinking water **nor depletes drinking water sources**.

For clarity, **the definition of** an existing threat activity includes a change in land ownership, the rotation of agricultural lands among crops or fallow conditions, **and allows for alternating between sources of nitrates (agricultural source material, commercial fertilizer, and Category 1 non-agricultural source material)**.

Future threat activities are anything not covered under existing.

COMMENTS POLICY on EXISTING THREAT ACTIVITY		
	Comments	Response
<b>Halton Region and lower tier munic.</b>	5. <b>Existing Threat Activity:</b> The inclusion of the clauses that “an existing threat activity includes an expansion, alteration or replacement of an existing building or structure that does not increase the risk of contaminating drinking water” and “an expansion of an existing use or activity that reduces the risk of contaminating drinking water” is not applicable for existing water <b>quantity</b> threats. Suggest to add wording to include water quantity threats, eg: that “an existing threat activity includes an expansion, alteration or replacement of an existing building or structure that does not increase the risk of contaminating drinking water <b>nor deplete drinking water sources</b> ” and “an expansion of an existing use or activity that reduces the risk of contaminating drinking water <b>nor deplete drinking water sources</b> ”	Staff agree and have added wording suggestion.

**Transition (Edited – no change to intent)**

“Existing Threat” policies apply to prescribed drinking water threat activities under the following circumstances:

- 1) A drinking water threat activity that is part of a development proposal where a Complete Application (as determined by the municipality **or Niagara Escarpment Commission**) was made under the *Planning Act*, ~~or Condominium Act~~ **or Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act (NEPDA)** prior to the day the Source Protection Plan comes into effect. The policy for "existing" drinking water threats also applies to any further applications required under the *Planning Act*, *Condominium Act*, ~~or Prescribed Instruments~~, **or a development permit under the NEPDA**, to implement the development proposal.
- 2) A drinking water threat activity that is part of an application accepted for a Building Permit, which has been submitted in compliance with Division C 1.3.1.3 (5) of the *Ontario Building Code* prior to the day the Source Protection Plan comes into effect.
- 3) A drinking water threat activity that is part of an application accepted for the issuance or amendment of a prescribed instrument prior to the day the source protection plan comes into effect.

COMMENTS on TRANSITION PROVISION		
	Comments	Response
<b>MHBC Planning</b>	<p>Lands subject to development control under the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act may not require an application under the Planning Act or Condominium Act. The proposed revision recognizes development permits under the NEPDA but only in the context of "<i>further applications ... to implement the development proposal</i>". The first half of the transition provision should connect the link to applications made under the NEPDA. We recommend the following revision:</p> <p><i>A drinking water threat activity that is part of a development proposal where a Complete Application (as determined by the municipality <b>or Niagara Escarpment Commission</b>) was made under the Planning Act, <del>or Condominium Act</del> or <b>Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act</b> prior to the day the Source Protection Plan comes into effect...</i></p> <p>The proposed revision would ensure that applications within and outside the area of NEC development control have the same transition provisions.</p>	<p>Staff agree and have added wording suggestion.</p>

**Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: Timelines for Policy Implementation (No change)**

Policy ID	Timelines for Policy Implementation
<b>Prescribed Instruments</b>	
T-1	Prescribed Instruments (existing) shall be reviewed (and amended, as necessary) within 3 years of the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect, or such other date as the Director determines.
T-2	Prescribed Instruments (existing), where prohibited, shall not be renewed when the current Prescribed Instrument expires, and the significant threat activity to which the Prescribed Instrument pertains, shall cease no later than 5 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.
T-3	The relevant Ministry shall comply with the Prescribed Instrument policy (future) immediately upon the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.
<b>Part IV Tools</b>	
T-4	Activities (existing) designated for the purpose of s.57 under the Clean Water Act as prohibited, shall be prohibited by the Risk Management Official within 180 days from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect as per s. 57(2) under the Clean Water Act, unless otherwise specified within the policy.
T-5	Activities (future) designated for the purpose of s.57 under the Clean Water Act are prohibited immediately upon the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.
T-6	Activities (existing) designated for the purpose of s.58 under the Clean Water Act, requiring risk management plans, shall be identified and confirmed within 1 year by the Risk Management Official. Risk management plans shall be established within 5 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.

<b>COMMENTS POLICY T-6</b>		
	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Wellington County municipalities</b>	13. This policy requires the RMO to confirm existing activities requiring RMPs within one year and establish RMPs within five years. It is possible that some existing activities may be missed during the initial confirmation. If this occurs and these activities are noted later, please confirm whether these activities would still be considered existing.	Yes, if the RMO is of the opinion they were existing threat activities and had been missed. It is up to the discretion of the RMO.

T-7	Activities (future) designated for the purpose of s.58 under the Clean Water Act, requiring risk management plans, are prohibited until such time as a risk management plan is approved by the Risk Management Official, immediately upon the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.
<b>Land Use Planning</b>	
T-8	Official plans and <del>zoning by-laws</del> shall be amended for conformity with the Source Protection Plan within 5 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect, or at the time of the next review in accordance with s.26 of the Planning Act, whichever occurs first. <b>Zoning by-laws shall be amended within 3 years after the approval of the official plan.</b>
T-9	Planning approval authorities shall <del>comply</del> <b>conform</b> with the policy immediately upon the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.

<b>COMMENTS POLICY T-9</b>		
	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Wellington County municipalities</b>	14. Suggest changing wording from Planning Authorities to Planning decisions. Also could you please clarify the legal effect of the change from comply to conform.	There is no change in legal effect of the policy, conform is the proper wording to use with reference to Land Use Planning as per MOE’s previous comments.

<b>Education and Outreach, Incentives, Research</b>	
T-10	Education and outreach (materials, programs, etc.) shall be developed and implemented within 2 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.

<b>COMMENTS POLICY T-10</b>		
	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Wellington County municipalities</b>	15. In Wellington County, there will be five source protection plans to implement. Where possible, consistency between the requirements and timing of the policies in the source protection plans will greatly aid the implementation efforts of the Wellington County municipalities. As such, consistency between the education timing policies within the Credit and the Grand SP Plans would be helpful.	The CTC SPC have made best efforts to coordinate policies with neighbouring SPAs. As the CTC SPP will be submitted before the Lake Erie SPP, Lake Erie staff are encouraged to review the CTC policies for consistency.

T-11	Incentives shall be considered within 2 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.
T-12	Research shall be initiated within 2 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect, contingent on funding.
<b>Specify Action</b>	
T-13	A prioritized maintenance inspection program shall be in effect no later than January 2017.
T-14	The policy shall be complied with within 180 days from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.
T-15	The policy shall be considered within 2 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.
T-16	The policy shall be initiated within 2 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.
<b>T-17</b>	<b>The policy shall be implemented within 2 years from the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.</b>
<del>T-17</del> <b>T-18</b>	The policy shall be implemented immediately upon the date the Source Protection Plan takes effect.

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Monitoring Policy	Related Policies
MON-1 <b>No change</b>	Municipality	F	The municipality or planning approval authority shall, by February 1 of each year, prepare and submit a report <b>equivalent to Section 65 of O. Reg. 287/07 under the Clean Water Act, 2006</b> to the Source Protection Authority on the actions taken in the previous calendar year to achieve the outcomes of the source protection policy. Where applicable, municipal planning authorities shall provide a copy of the notice of adoption of amendments to official plans and/or zoning by laws. <b>Reporting shall include information related to the effectiveness of the policies in ensuring a threat ceases to be, or does not become significant, and any actions required to respond to a drinking water threat during the reporting period.</b>	See Explanatory Notes

COMMENTS POLICY MON-1		
	Comments	Response
<b>Halton Region and lower tier municipalities</b>	<p>36. Municipalities will report on metrics according to Clean Water Act Section 65 as mandated for Part IV policies. With respect to reporting information related to the policy effectiveness for other (i.e. non-Part IV) policies, the monitoring policies do not establish outcome based metrics to demonstrate the effectiveness of the policies. In other words, municipalities can report on the effectiveness of non-Part IV policies to the degree which established outcome based metrics are available for use.</p> <p>It is suggested that studies be conducted to determine which metrics are best suited to determine policy effectiveness. It is recognised that such a study takes time and resources, so it could be an ongoing collaborative effort between various stakeholder organizations including SPAs, municipalities, etc.</p>	<p>Agree that there is value in having an ongoing collaboration in developing more information about what should be included in the monitoring report and this is a matter for the implementation phase.</p> <p>Monitoring reports that provide information useful to SPCs, SPAs, municipalities, etc. is a good idea to be carried forward.</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	Monitoring Policy	Related Policies
MON-2 No change	RMO	F	The risk management official shall, by February 1 of each year, undertake the reporting requirements specified in Section 65 of O. Reg. 287/07 under the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i> on the actions taken in the previous calendar year to achieve the outcomes of the source protection policy. <b>Reporting shall include information related to the effectiveness of the policies in ensuring a threat ceases to be, or does not become significant, and any actions required to respond to a drinking water threat during the reporting period.</b>	

COMMENTS POLICY MON-2		
	Comments	Response
Wellington County municipalities	3. It is recommended, in conjunction with comments under GEN-5 and MON-4 that the RMOs be requested to provide a list of the inspections completed including date of inspection, address, municipality and RMP or file reference number in the report provided under MON-2. This list could be provided as an appendix to the report to the lead SPA, allowing the lead SPA to forward this list to the provincial regulatory authorities for information. This information, provided in the winter of every year, would be useful to inform the provincial regulatory authorities on recent RMO inspections in their areas and assist in work planning for their inspections. It is noted that under Section 65 of O. Reg. 287/07 that location of inspections is not a required part of the report while locations for other aspects of the report (ie RMPs, orders etc.) is required. Please note that there may be Freedom of Information constraints in sharing this type of information but, if possible, the sharing of inspection locations between RMOs and provincial regulatory authorities would be useful in implementing the Source Protection Plans and should be considered as additions to policies MON-2 and MON-4.	Comment noted. We agree that the kind of information that has been identified would be useful and we will add material to explanatory document.

Policy ID	Implementing Body	Legal Effect	Monitoring Policy	Related Policies
MON-3 No change	SPA	F	The source protection authority shall include in the annual report pursuant to s.46 under the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i> , documentation on the risk reduction efforts they administered throughout the year. <b>Reporting shall include information related to the effectiveness of the policies in ensuring a threat ceases to be, or does not become significant, and any actions required to respond to a drinking water threat during the reporting period.</b>	
MON-4 No change	Provincial Ministry	F	The provincial ministry shall, by February 1 of each year, prepare and submit a report to the Source Protection Authority on the actions taken in the previous calendar year to achieve the outcomes of the source protection policy. <b>Reporting shall include information related to the effectiveness of the policies in ensuring a threat ceases to be, or does not become significant, and any actions required to respond to a drinking water threat during the reporting period.</b>	

COMMENTS POLICY MON-4		
	Comments	Response
Wellington County municipalities	2. Regulatory authority inspections for Prescribed Instruments (PIs) and Monitoring. 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 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).	Comment noted. In the report received for MON-4 policies we would like the information to be useful for the RMO as well. Will include details in Explanatory Notes.

GENERAL COMMENTS		
	Comments	Response
MOECC	<p>6. We note that the July 2014 draft of the policies included an expanded rationale for each policy. However, the updated rationales are not robust enough for policies where there has been extensive discussion and review by the committee, extensive discussion with the municipalities, or where there is the potential for impacts to existing activities, etc.</p> <p>The Technical Bulletin on the Explanatory Document dated February 18, 2011 outlines what is required in the Explanatory Document. A summary from the bulletin is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An explanation of the source protection committee’s policy decisions.</li> <li>• The reasons that s.57 prohibition is used to address the risk of an existing activity.</li> <li>• A statement indicating that the committee is of the opinion that non-regulatory measures are sufficient to address significant threats, when used as a standalone policy tool.</li> <li>• A summary of comments received and an explanation of how they affected policy development.</li> <li>• A summary of how financial implications may have affected policy decisions.</li> <li>• An explanation of how climate change considerations may have impacted policies.</li> </ul>	Additional information will be provided in the Explanatory Document.
MOECC	<p>7. Halton Region has expressed concern regarding the policy approaches in the plan that addresses activities that contribute to nitrate issues, including policies that prohibit future activities in ICAs. The Ministry recognizes the efforts the SPA and committee have undertaken to address Halton’s concerns, but cannot consider these concerns to have been resolved until we have reviewed Halton Region’s comments on the draft July 2014 policies provided during the current consultation period. We continue to expect the committee to thoroughly consider Halton’s concerns. Where the committee does not update a policy to reflect Halton’s concerns, the committee must provide a summary of the analysis of the concern, the potential impacts of the policies and the rationale for addressing Halton’s concerns and amending policies in the policy rationales in the Explanatory Document.</p>	Comment noted.
Township of Amaranth	<p>1. Council question the mapping of the wells and the various “cones of influence” for ongoing development and land use, including agriculture. It was also noted that the Township has not yet received the final Pilot Study with respect to the recent Tier 3 study, which would address the Brown Well (in Amaranth) and climate change, and could change the dynamics of the entire source protection area.</p> <p>2. Council are concerned with the “threat circles” extending so far, even into different watershed, and question how that will impact development going forward. Will development located in the CTC area, but receiving water from the Lake Erie Source Protection Area (GRCA) be expected to return water back to the Grand? It is a fact that the surface and groundwater boundaries differ, so whose regulations will apply? Again/still there is concern about the inconsistencies of policies in the various Source Protection Plan areas, and the effective administration and implementation of the policies.</p> <p>3. Council questions the role of the County, who are directed through the proposed plan to have policies, but who have not to date been a part of the source protection plan process.</p> <p>4. Council also feels that agriculture is the “big loser” in this process, and that the identification of agriculture as a threat, and the extension of the “circles” will have a negative impact, especially for those operations that will be impacted by more than one source protection plan.</p> <p>In summary, the Township of Amaranth continues to be concerned about the inconsistency of policies between watersheds/source protection areas;</p>	<p>1. The final report was provided to all of the area municipalities in August of 2014.</p> <p>2. The policies that apply depend on which SPA the land is in. The matter of WHPAs extending across SPA boundaries and multiple SPAs within a municipality has been previously noted. Staff will provide support to municipalities to identify which policies apply where.</p> <p>3. The County of Dufferin is currently developing its first official plan. As a result, Dufferin County has a role in source protection planning and have recently begun to attend meetings and participate. The County has also received SMPPIF funding from the province to help them get ready for their</p>

	<p>the timing of conformity and the resulting financial and staff resource impacts; the impacts on agriculture and the treatment of agriculture within the plans; the inclusion of the County of Dufferin with respect to source protection policies , yet no involvement to date; administration and implementation of the plans especially since the Township has three source protection areas to address; and the imposition of unmanageable and onerous restrictions on both municipalities and the residents.</p> <p>There seems to be an assumption that municipalities have not managed their planning and land development appropriately, and therefore need these prescriptive policies and procedures in place in order to ensure that they are responsible stewards of the land and resources. This is most definitely not the case. The Township of Amaranth has always been a responsible steward of the land and resources, through their Official Plan, and normal planning practices.</p>	<p>implementation role.</p> <p>4. Within the CTC portion of Amaranth most of the land where significant threat policies apply are in fact designated industrial although they may be under current agricultural activity.</p>
<p><b>Township of East Garafraxa</b></p>	<p>Further to the distribution of the Notification of Consultation on Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan and comments due by today, I wish to advise that the Township of East Garafraxa continue to be concerned with the apparent inconsistency of policies between the various Source Protection Regions, not only in presentation but also the anticipated difficulty with the implementation of such policies in the Township Official Plan. As previously noted in our comments, we are concerned that the development and application of different policies in the Official Plan for different Source Protection Areas/Regions will become an administrative nightmare, and that the potential for error and for unfair imposition of restrictions on the public will increase.</p> <p>We also are still concerned regarding the treatment of agriculture, and the assumption that agriculture is a threat, when most farm operations are already governed by nutrient management plans and best practices, and already have in place many plans and programmes that are being included as policies under the Source Protections Plans.</p> <p>There are also instances wherein the County of Dufferin is being directed to have source protection policies, but to date the County has not been party to source water protection, and still do not have a County Official Plan. We therefore question what their role is with respect to the Source Protection Plans.</p> <p>The Township continues to be concerned regarding implementation and enforcement of Source Protection Plan policies, and the undue burden on municipalities and residents, especially financial, that may result. The timing for bringing Official Plans and other planning documents into conformity needs to be considered carefully, as for many smaller municipalities, like East Garafraxa, staff resources as well as funds are not readily available to administer and implement these policies. Having said that, the Township has always been a responsible steward of the land, and many of the proposed policies already exist and are being implemented, through normal planning practices, without the need for them to be prescribed.</p>	<p>See responses above regarding Township of Amaranth comments.</p>
<p><b>Durham Region</b></p>	<p>The Region has been an active participant in the development of the CTC SPP and has provided comments at each consultation window. We have made numerous suggestions to the Province which we feel would improve the consistency and streamline implementation of the SPP being developed by SPCs province-wide. These include recommendations to the Province such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extending the <i>Nutrient Management Act, 2002</i> to cover all farms in significant threat areas and include NASM;</li> <li>• Requesting OMAFRA and MOECC to establish and enforce an integrated farm risk management plan to manage all agricultural threats;</li> <li>• Exempting from appeal all amendments to Official Plans made to achieve compliance with a SPP;</li> <li>• Continuing grants and incentives under the ODWSP; and</li> <li>• Providing provincial funding to assist all municipalities who have been downloaded the risk management function with significant start-up expenses and implementation costs.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p>



<p><b>Durham Region</b></p>	<p>The Region faces significant start-up expenses and downloaded costs for implementing SPPs. The Province should provide funding to municipalities to support the associated implementation costs.</p> <p>Property owners located in significant threat areas may also be faced with the costs to comply with SPP policies. Owners should have access to grants and incentives under the ODWSP and other programs to address significant drinking water threats.</p>	<p>In addition to the Region who has to implement policies, the Town of Uxbridge has receives SPMIF funding.</p>
<p><b>Durham Region</b></p>	<p>Municipalities should not be left with the expense of defending source protection policies at Provincial tribunals. The Province should consider exempting OMB appeals, and/or the ERT, amendments made to municipal Official Plans that would bring these documents into compliance with the SPPs.</p>	<p>CTC SPC has written to the MMAH supporting these exemptions.</p>
<p><b>City of Oshawa</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Financial support should be provided to municipalities for the additional work/resources needed to implement the SPP.</li> <li>2. Future Official Plan policies adopted by municipalities to implement SPPs should be exempt from appeal to the OMB.</li> <li>3. The City remains concerned regarding the Region of Durham’s ability to delegate Section 58 powers to the City.</li> <li>4. Upper and lower tier municipal responsibilities, in certain instances, should be clearly identified in the SPP.</li> </ol>	<p>City of Oshawa is not required to implement any significant drinking water threat policies proposed in the CTC Plan.</p>
<p><b>Halton Region and lower tier municipalities</b></p>	<p>Municipalities have repeatedly advocated to the Source Protection Committees and the Province that a consistent policy approach to address all drinking water threats should be followed across watersheds and especially within municipal boundaries; regardless of the governing watershed source protection plans. The current lack of policy consistency in several key aspects of multiple source water protection plans will lead to confusion amongst affected landowners and significant municipal challenges to policy implementation. Policy consistency amongst the multiple source protection plans within a given municipal jurisdiction remains a fundamental outstanding issue which must be addressed within the CTC SPP policies.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><b>Halton Region and lower tier municipalities</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Impacts to the Landowners:</b> The implementation of the policies will impact, and in some cases will cause undue hardship, to landowners, business owners, and homeowners. It is strongly felt that the Committee should consider this during the policy writing stage itself, in order to factor in the impacts to landowners.</p>	<p>The SPC has considered this. In a number of cases the SPC has recommended only Education and Outreach policies for significant threats where activities are being conducted by a landowner (e.g., fuel).</p>
<p><b>Halton Region and lower tier municipalities</b></p>	<p>2. <b>Program Funding for Implementing Bodies-</b> Provincial funding support for plan implementation is paramount to the success of the Source Protection Program. This has been raised repeatedly in discussions within the CTC SPC, with municipalities, the public, and the Ministry of the Environment. If funding is curtailed, the cost implications for municipalities, would be significant. In Report No. PW-58-11, Halton Region Council requested that “the Ministry of the Environment fully fund all implementation and operational costs of the Source Protection Plans” given the potential financial impact to the Region (as policy implementer) and socio-economic impact to its residents, businesses and farming communities.</p> <p>3. <b>Program funding for stakeholders-</b> The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) should continue with and increase the funding of the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program in order to assist affected landowners with policy implementation. This program would be instrumental in building support for the Source Protection Program and must be continued to ensure successful policy implementation and continued protection of our drinking water sources.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This is addressed through GEN-2.</p>
<p><b>Halton Region and lower tier municipalities</b></p>	<p>4. <b>Disputes and Challenges-</b> Once source protection plans are approved municipalities may be placed in the vulnerable position of defending costly OMB challenges on official plan amendments and zoning by-law amendments to meet SPP conformity requirements. We are aware that a right to dispute the Minister of the Environment’s approval of SPPs to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) is not enabled within the CWA. However, the legislation does not exempt any SPP conformity amendments for official plans and zoning by-laws from appeal to the OMB.</p>	<p>CTC SPC has written to the MMAH supporting these exemptions</p>

	This exemption is financially punitive to municipalities and such appeal costs should not be borne by the municipalities. As such, staff recommends that the Province amend the CWA and the Planning Act to remove the right of a third party appeal for any SPP conformity amendments to an official plan or zoning by-law. The Town of Halton Hills recently passed a resolution (Resolution No. 2012-0092) requesting that the Province exempt municipal conformity exercise resulting from SPPs from appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board.	
<b>Halton Region and lower tier municipalities</b>	6. Education and Outreach tools to address significant drinking water threats should be developed and standardized by the Province and provided to policy implementers in a timely manner in order for consistent use and application.	Comment noted. The CTC SPC has identified that the province should provide Education and Outreach to reduce the burden on local municipalities.
<b>Halton Region and lower tier municipalities</b>	<p>7. Staff supports the use of prescribed instruments (existing provincial regulations such as the <i>Aggregate Resources Act</i>, the <i>Nutrient Management Act</i>, <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> etc.) as the primary vehicle to regulate / manage drinking water threat activities.</p> <p>After reviewing the Proposed Source Protection Plan, staff noted that in many cases a “layering” of approaches and tools (i.e. application of prescribed instrument plus Part IV plus Land Use Planning and Education &amp; Outreach tools) are used for prohibiting or managing a threat (e.g. SWG-10, SWG-14, FER-5, LIV-5, ASM-6).</p> <p>This “layering” requires other bodies (Region, Town, CVC, etc.) to take action in regards to an activity which is already subject to regulation by existing legislation. We do not generally support this approach and note the duplication is redundant, confusing, difficult to implement, and costly. Staff maintains that the implementing body which has the jurisdiction to regulate an activity under existing legislation should be left to do so.</p>	The SPC has considered the optimal mix of tools to use to ensure an activity ceases to be or does not become significant. The SCP is of the opinion that land use planning tools are an essential part of the tool box.