



**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

**AGENDA**

Source Protection Committee Meeting No. SPC-03/2015  
 Meeting No. 3  
 Monte Carlo Inn Barrie Suites, 81 Hart Dr., Barrie, ON  
 Wednesday April 20, 2016  
 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

**MEMBERS:**

Lynn Dollin, Chair

**Municipal**

Herb Proudley  
 John Boucher  
 Rick Newlove  
 Stan Wells  
 Clayton Cameron

**Economic/Development**

Colin Elliott  
 David Ketcheson  
 David Ritchie  
 John Hemsted  
 Colin Nisbet

**Public Sector**

Bob Duncanson  
 Fred Ruf  
 Larry Slomka  
 Tom Kurtz  
 Stephanie Hobbs  
 Dianne Corrigan

**First Nations**

Dan Schilling

**Liaisons**

Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit – Karen Kivilahti for Brenda Armstrong  
 Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority – Mike Walters  
 Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change – Elizabeth Forrest

**Staff**

Ben Longstaff	Keith Sherman
Bill Thompson	Susan Jagminas
Ryan Post	Jessica Burns, minutes

**Guests**

Don Goodyear, York Region – on behalf of Wendy Kemp  
 Katie Thompson, City of Barrie – on behalf of Richard Forward  
 Stacey McCarthy, Senior Account Manager, Letter M Marketing  
 Pat Kinch, Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change

**Regrets**

Wendy Kemp – proxy to Stan Wells  
 Richard Forward – proxy to Rick Newlove

***I. WELCOME & OPENING REMARKS***

***II. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST***

***III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA***

***(Pages 1-4)***

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the agenda for the APRIL, 2016, meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as presented.**

**IV. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**(Pages 5-12)**

(a) Source Protection Committee

Included is a copy of the draft minutes from the November 26, 2015 meeting of the Source Protection Committee (SPC).

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the minutes of the November 26, 2015 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as printed and circulated.**

**V. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(a) Activities of the Chair & Committee

Welcome Bill Thompson, Manager IWM Division, LSRCA

(b) Agricultural Sector Update to the SPC

Crop Advisor and Nutrient Management Advisor Workshop March 29, 2016

(c) MOECC Update

A brief update from TBD, MOECC

**VI. DELEGATIONS**

**VII. PRESENTATIONS**

a) Education & Outreach Strategy

Susan Jagminas and Stacey McCarthy, a Letter M Marketing representative will provide a brief review of the status of the E & O Outreach Strategy.

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the information provided by Susan Jagminas and the Stacey McCarthy on the status of the E & O Outreach Strategy be received for information.**

b) General Program Updates

SPA staff will provide general updates on the progress of implementation and other activities being undertaken.

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the updates provided on the above topics be received for information.**

c) Source Protection Committee

Ben Longstaff will present information on updating SGBLS SPC membership.

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the information presented by Ben Longstaff on the Source Protection Committee be received for information.**

d) Annual Reporting

Bill Thompson will provide an update on the status and progress of the official Annual Report and Annual Reporting framework.

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the information provided by Bill Thompson on the official Annual Report and Annual Reporting framework be received for information.  
AND FURTHER THAT staff be directed to make any changes as required and circulate to RMOs within the SGBLS watershed to complete the 2015 Annual Report.**

(e) Issues Contributing Area (ICA) Study Update

Keith Sherman will provide an update on the status of the Lafontaine ICA study.

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the information provided by Keith Sherman on the status of the Lafontaine ICA study be received for information.**

***VIII. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION***

***IX. ADOPTION OF ITEMS NOT REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION***

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the recommendations respecting items not requiring separate discussion be approved, and staff be authorized to take all necessary actions to effect those recommendations.**

***X. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION***

***XI. OTHER BUSINESS***

***XII. CLOSED SESSION***

***XIII. ADJOURNMENT***

## CORRESPONDENCE LIST

1. **Correspondence** ***(Pages 13-48)***
  - a) Correspondence from the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) entitled “Source Protection Municipal Fund (2015-16 Launch) FAQs, dated January 28, 2016
  - b) Correspondence from the MOECC entitled “Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change responses to Source Protection Plan Authority Reporting Policies” dated March 2016
  - c) Advertisement for Public and Economic Source Protection Committee members, to be published in local watershed newspapers on April 26, 2016 entitled “Interested in Getting Involved in Protecting Our Drinking Water?”

**RECOMMENDED: THAT the correspondence listed in the April 20, 2016 agenda as Items 1a – c be received for information.**



**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

**MINUTES**

Source Protection Committee Meeting No. SPC-02/2015  
 Meeting No. 2  
 Suiteworks, 92 Caplan Ave., Barrie, ON  
 November 26, 2015  
 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

**MEMBERS:**

Lynn Dollin, Chair

**Municipal**

Herb Proudley  
 John Boucher  
 Rick Newlove  
 Stan Wells  
 Richard Forward  
 Clayton Cameron

**Economic/Development**

Colin Elliott  
 David Ritchie  
 John Hemsted  
 Colin Nisbet  
 Gerry Brouwer

**Public Sector**

Bob Duncanson  
 Fred Ruf  
 Larry Slomka  
 Tom Kurtz  
 Stephanie Hobbs  
 Dianne Corrigan

**First Nations**

**Liaisons**

Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit – Karen Kivilahti for Brenda Armstrong  
 Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority – Gayle Wood  
 Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change – Teresa McLellan

**Guests**

Chitra Gowda, Source Water Protection Lead, Conservation Ontario  
 Katie Thompson, RMO, Barrie  
 Scott Drewette, RMI, Barrie  
 David Barber, Rama First Nations – on behalf of Dan Schilling  
 Don Goodyear, York Region – on behalf of Wendy Kemp

**Staff**

Ben Longstaff	Ryan Post
Shelly Cuddy	Keith Sherman
Susan Jagminas	Jessica Burns, minutes

**Regrets**

David Ketcheson	Alex Millar	Dan Schilling
Chris Galway	Wendy Kemp	

***I. WELCOME & OPENING REMARKS***

All were welcomed to the meeting. A roundtable was done to introduce new faces.



**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

**II. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

No pecuniary interests were declared.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

The agenda was approved as printed and circulated.

Moved by: Bob Duncanson                      Seconded by: Richard Forward

RESOLVED:            THAT the agenda for the November 26, 2015 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as presented.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS

**IV. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

Moved by: John Hemsted                      Seconded by: Rick Newlove

RESOLVED:            THAT the minutes of the April 21, 2015 meeting of the Source Protection Committee, be approved as printed and circulated.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS

**V. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(a) Activities of the Chair & Committee

Recent staff changes at the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, Katie Thompson is now with the City of Barrie as the Risk Management Official and Irena Kontrec is now with the Town of Orangeville as the Risk Management Inspector.

(b) Agricultural Sector Update to the SPC

The SPC Agricultural Representatives (Ag Reps) recently participated in the Young Farmers of Ontario workshop on November 22 and 23, 2015 in Toronto. They displayed a new Source Water and Farming banner; they received a lot of positive feedback, they engaged well with the public and facilitated some effective networking.

The Severn Sound SPA added Source Water Protection as a new award category in their annual award program. The 2015 award was presented to Pierre Paul Maurice in recognition of his achievements in promoting the protection of Source Water in the agricultural lands of the Lafontaine Issue Contributing Area in the



**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

Severn Sound Source Protection area. Pierre Paul has been a Source Water ambassador to the farming community of the Lafontaine area, explaining the importance of source water protection to area landowners.

**VI. DELEGATIONS**

None.

**VII. PRESENTATIONS**

(a) General Updates

Shelly provided a brief presentation on general Source Water Protection program updates.

Concern regarding consistent communication from the staff level to the SPC regarding current happenings in the field of Source Water was expressed i.e. the topic of Source Water road signs. It was agreed that improved method and frequency of communication from staff to SPC members is needed and will be adopted.

Some clarification around the challenge of the Source Water road signs joint announcement was provided by Teresa, MOECC i.e. Pan Am Games. Specs for the road signs were only just approved at the end of October 2015 and Mary Wood, Ministry of Transportation, is now working with the MOECC to contact all Project Managers regarding SW road sign installation. Some additional history around the team that put together the specs for the SW road signs was provided; those regions involved at the onset may have installed SW road signs earlier (June 2015). It was further noted that requests for amendments to the Source Protection Municipal Implementation Funding agreement to include funding for SW road signs are intended to be dealt with as quickly as possible.

Action Item 1	Clarification is to be provided regarding eligible costs for Source Water road signs.
Responsibility	Teresa McLellan

Lastly it was noted that the amended Simcoe County Official Plan (OP) is approaching approval. Once complete this will allow lower tier municipalities to complete their OP amendments.

Moved by: Richard Forward                      Seconded by: Larry Slomka

RESOLVED:            THAT the updates provided on the above topics be received for information.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS

**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

(b) Conservation Ontario Update

Chitra provided a Conservation Ontario (CO) update on the Source Water Protection program.

Discussion occurred around the role of the Joint Advisory Committee (JAC). It was clarified that this is neither a Source Water nor a Conservation Ontario Committee; it is funded directly through the Drinking Water Source Protection (DWSP) program. This is an effective and collaborative committee that advises Senior Management at the MOECC based on input provided by Conservation Authority Project Managers; they act as a collective voice from all the Source Protection Authorities (SPAs) to the Province.

Concern was expressed around the JAC commenting on funding to the Province, as on the ground staff should be involved for information and policy interpretation purposes.

It was clarified that the MOECC will be hosting a launch event in 2016 for their interactive mapping tool. The JAC will look into having the messaging of that event be communicated to Project Managers and Chairs for consistent and timely messaging. It was further noted CAs will be reviewing farm plans in February and March 2016 and having this interactive mapping tool would be beneficial. It was clarified that, although not yet interactive, the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) has access to this mapping information.

Discussion occurred around the representation of other implementing bodies on the JAC aside from the MOECC and Conservation Authorities (CAs), such as OMAFRA and Source Protection Authorities (SPAs) that are non-CA SPAs i.e. Sever Sound Environmental Association. Although the JAC receives input directly from municipalities and has links through CO to the Part IV Working Group, it may be a good time to consider this issue. It was agreed that efforts need to be made to ensure that the JAC is made up of thorough representation across the region.

Action Item 2	The JAC and the MOECC are to be informed of the issue of ensuring thorough municipal and implementing body representation on the JAC.
Responsibility	Chitra Gowda (inform JAC) and Teresa McLellan (inform MOECC)

Moved by: John Hemsted

Seconded by: Herb Proudley

RESOLVED: THAT the Conservation Ontario presentation provided by Chitra Gowda be received for information.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS





**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

(c) Provincial Implementation of SPP Policies

Teresa provided an updated on the Provincial implementation of the SPP policies. The full presentation will be posted to ourwatershed.ca following the meeting and any questions not addressed presently can be emailed to Teresa directly.

Discussion occurred around the Permit to Take Water (PTTW). According to Teresa, this is an ongoing project with an active working group looking at how to best integrate PTTW into the overall permitting program. Identification of the priority water takers is being addressed; water taking regulations are being looked where there are volume concerns.

Moved by: Larry Slomka

Seconded by: Richard Forward

RESOLVED: THAT the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change updates provided by Teresa McLellan be received for information.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS

(d) Source Protection Committee

Ben provided a brief presentation on the SPC.

Discussion occurred around maintaining the SPC size at 21 members. The interest of current members to remain on the Committee, the municipal representative appointment process and eligibility were all considered. The group agreed to maintain the size of the SPC at 21 members for the time being.

Further discussion occurred around staff Option 1 and Option 2 of approaches to adopt in the coming year(s) in terms of SPC membership.

**Option 1:** Immediately proceed to refresh current SPC membership (e.g. replace ineligible members & members stepping down only), then establish long-term plan for all member expire by December 31<sup>st</sup> 2019;

**Option 2:** Develop a long term expire/replacement plan before undertaking any SPC replacement process;

Municipal sector representation, eligibility and municipal process were considered. Discussion occurred around effected sectors i.e. aggregate and if more representation for a particular sector is needed given policy effects.

The SPC agreed on Option 1.



**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

Targeted representation for the economic sector was considered i.e. fuel storage and road construction.

Action Item 3	Ontario Regulation 288/07 of the CWA, 2006 O.Reg 310/15 is to be consulted for clarification on eligibility criteria for municipal sector representatives and report back to the SPC.
Responsibility	Ben Longstaff

It was further clarified that a CA board member is not eligible to be a member of a SPC according to the most recent amendment; however, a special request can be made.

Moved by: Fred Ruf

Seconded by: Dianne Corrigan

RESOLVED: THAT the information presented by Ben Longstaff on the Source Protection Committee be received for information  
AND FURTHER THAT staff be directed to implement the SGBLS SPC membership process as agreed upon.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS

(e) Updates to the Assessment Report (AR) and Source Protection Plan (SPP)

Ben presented a brief presentation on the AR and SPP.

The correction of a typographical error in the definition of major development was discussed. The current definition of major development is anything equal to 500m<sup>2</sup> (single detached residential properties exempt). It was proposed by staff to correct the definition by including the words “or greater”; it was additionally agreed by the SPC to include the word “including.”

The need to consider the magnitude and expense involved in completing these studies in order to satisfy requirements was expressed. Discussion occurred around definition of major development and it was confirmed that parking lot size is included in determining building size (i.e. whether exceeds the 500m<sup>2</sup> threshold).

It was noted that correction to condition threats concerning Barrie wells will be made.

Moved by: John Hemsted

Seconded by: Stephanie Hobbs

RESOLVED: THAT the information presented by Ben Longstaff on the updated AR and SPP be received for information  
AND FURTHER THAT staff be directed to make any necessary changes and post those changes online, pending SPA approval.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS



**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

(f) Update on Annual Reporting

It was agreed to differ the item of Annual Reporting to the next SPC meeting agenda.

Ben mentioned that the Annual Reporting Working Group has been working very well together to date. However, with the recent staffing changes this working group will be put on hold for a short period and will be re-addressed in the New Year.

Moved by: Rick Newlove

Seconded by: Richard Forward

RESOLVED: THAT the information provided by Ben Longstaff on Annual Reporting received for information.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS

**VIII. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION**

None.

**IX. ADOPTION OF ITEMS NOT REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION**

Moved by: Rick Newlove

Seconded: Richard Forward

RESOLVED: THAT the recommendations respecting items not requiring separate discussion be approved, and staff be authorized to take all necessary actions to effect those recommendations.

CARRIED BY CONSENSUS

**X. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION**

None.

**XI. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**XII. CLOSED SESSION**

None for the record of this meeting.



**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

***XIII. ADJOURNMENT***

Liaisons and guests were thanked for attending.

Katie Thompson was thanked for her time spent working with the SPC over the last few years. She was thanked for her dedication and expended efforts in support of the SGBLS SPC.

It was agreed that the next SPC meeting will take place in mid-March 2016.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was moved by Herb Proudley at 4:03 pm.

# Source Protection Municipal Implementation Fund (2015-16 Launch)

## Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

### 1. What is the fund about?

The Source Protection Municipal Implementation Fund provides one-time grants to small, rural municipalities to help offset some of the start-up costs they will incur as they implement their drinking water source protection plan policies.

The goals of the Source Protection Municipal Implementation Fund are to:

- build municipal capacity to implement source protection plans
- support sustainable, pragmatic, local delivery approaches.

### 2. Who is eligible for funding?

To be eligible, municipalities must meet the following criteria:

1. The municipality is located in a source protection area as defined by the *Clean Water Act, 2006*;
2. The municipality has vulnerable areas identified by the local source protection committee (and identified in approved assessment reports) where there could be significant drinking water threats;
3. 25% or more of the municipality's population is living in a rural area, according to the [Rural and Small Community Measure](#); or the municipality's population is under 100,000 and the municipality is required to implement policies pertaining to [Part IV, sections 57 and/or 58 of the Clean Water Act, 2006](#); and
4. An approved or an amended source protection plan that will be re-submitted for approval prior to its effective date, which specifies that the municipality is required to implement one or more of the following significant drinking water threat policies:
  - Policies for the purpose of Part IV of the *Clean Water Act, 2006*;
  - Policies that govern *Planning Act* decisions;
  - Policies that establish education and outreach programs; or
  - Policies that specify other types of actions the municipality is required to take.

### 3. How much funding is each municipality receiving?

Funding allocation for each eligible municipality is calculated using a formula that considers:

1. Each municipality's [weighted assessment per household](#);

2. The number of drinking water threats in each municipality;
3. The types of significant drinking water threat policies the municipality is required to implement; and
4. The number of municipalities with which a municipality collaborates (i.e., collaboration incentive).

Please see Question 10 for details on the funding formula used.

#### **4. What can a municipality use the funds for?**

Funding from the Source Protection Municipal Implementation Fund may only be used toward eligible costs related to eligible activities that your municipality undertakes to fulfill its requirements to implement significant drinking water threat policies specified in an approved or an amended source protection plan that has been resubmitted for approval.

Eligible activities are those undertaken by your municipality, or on your municipality's behalf, between February 1, 2016 and December 31, 2016 that are directly related to the following:

##### **Risk management**

- Establishing and enforcing risk management plans under Part IV of the Clean Water Act, 2006;
- Communication with landowners affected by policies pertaining to Part IV of the Clean Water Act, 2006;
- Refining the number of threats within your municipality pertaining to Part IV of the Clean Water Act, 2006;

##### **Land use policies**

- Implementing your municipality's municipal land-use planning policies related to activities that are identified as significant drinking water threats;

##### **Education and outreach**

- Implementing education and outreach policies to address significant drinking water threats, including:
  - Installation of municipal road signs indicating vulnerable areas where threats could be significant;

##### **Other activities**

- Working with the local source protection authority and local source protection committee to understand your municipality's requirements under the source protection plan;

- Developing and/or modifying your municipality’s business processes in order to implement significant drinking water threat policies ;
- Establishing processes for information sharing among municipalities and source protection authorities;
- Developing a reporting framework for your municipality that aligns with the collection of data under section 65 of Ontario Regulation 287/07, made under the Clean Water Act, 2006; and
- Other activities your municipality undertakes to fulfill its requirements to implement significant drinking water threat policies, including:
  - Establishing a mandatory septic re-inspection program for vulnerable areas delineated in approved assessment reports; and,
  - Installation of road signs indicating vulnerable areas where threats could be significant.

## **5. What type of expenses can a municipality use the funds for?**

There are four types of eligible expenses; staff salaries and benefits, fees for professional services, printing and distribution, and the purchase and/or production of municipal road signs.

- Municipal salaries and benefits, for example:
  - Hiring or re-assigning municipal staff to serve as Risk Management Officials and Risk Management Inspectors as specified under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*; or
  - Administrative support required to establish and/or maintain the Risk Management Office.
- Fees incurred for contracted professional services, for example:
  - Hiring a consultant to support the Risk Management Official in determining appropriate measures the municipality should include in a risk management plan.
- Printing and distribution costs related to education and outreach programs and activities necessary to implement a source protection plan.
- Purchase and/or production costs of municipal road signs indicating vulnerable areas where threats could be significant.

## **6. What if my municipality wants to undertake an activity or cost that is not specified in the agreement?**

Please contact us at [SourceProtectionFunding@Ontario.ca](mailto:SourceProtectionFunding@Ontario.ca) with the subject line “SPMIF-Municipality Name” if you have any questions about eligible activities or costs.

**7. Where can I find my municipality’s Source Protection Plan?**

Contact your Conservation Authority to get a copy of your Source Protection Plan.

**8. What is the Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM)?**

The RSCM represents the proportion of a municipality’s population residing in rural areas or small communities. For example, if a municipality has a RSCM greater than 25, more than 25 per cent of its population is living in rural or small communities.

The RSCM is based on Statistics Canada data from the Census and is calculated by dividing the population in rural or small communities by the total population.

**9. What does weighted assessment per household mean?**

A municipality’s weighted assessment per household is used as part of the formula to determine the maximum amount of the grant. This is a measure of the size of the municipality's tax base. It refers to the total assessment for a municipality weighted by the tax ratio for each class of property (including payments in lieu of property taxes retained by the municipality) divided by the total number of households in the municipality.

**10. How was the funding amount determined for each Municipality?**

The grant value for an eligible municipality is calculated using the following formula:  
Grant = [Base Allocation × (Index 1 + Index 2)] + Collaboration Incentive.

- All eligible municipalities were assigned a base allocation on a sliding scale, based on each municipality’s [weighted assessment per household](#) (municipalities with lower values receive a higher base allocation).
- The base allocation was then multiplied by the sum of two indices:
  - Index 1: Existing Threat Index (each municipality was assigned a value of 0 – 2 depending on the number of drinking water threats in the municipality specified in their approved assessment reports); and

Score	Index 1: Existing Threat Index
0	0 threats
1	1-200 threats



Score	Index 1: Existing Threat Index
1.5	201-500 threats
2	>500 threats

- Index 2: Policy Index (each municipality was assigned a value of 1 or 2 depending on the type of policies the municipality is required to implement to address significant drinking water threats as specified in an approved or proposed source protection plan that has been submitted for approval before its effective date)

Score	Index 2: Policy Index
1	Municipality is required to implement any type of significant drinking water threat policy <u>other than</u> policies pertaining to Part IV, sections 57 and/or 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i>
2	Municipality is required to implement significant drinking water threat policies pertaining to Part IV, sections 57 and/or 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i> ;  OR  Municipality is required to implement significant drinking water threat policies pertaining to Part IV, sections 57 and/or 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i> and any other type of significant drinking water threat policy.

- After the base allocation is multiplied by the index sum, an additional collaboration incentive is available. Each eligible municipality may be eligible for one of the following amounts: \$5,000 for collaborating with one to two other municipalities; or \$10,000 for collaborating with three other municipalities; or \$15,000 for collaborating with four or more other municipalities.

# Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change responses to Source Protection Plan Annual Monitoring Reporting Policies

This report represents a summary of the actions the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (ministry or MOECC) has taken to implement policies in the source protection plans. For most policies, the ministry is taking a provincial approach to implementation, and provincial actions to date are reported below. Where warranted, additional details on local implementation will be provided.

The ministry provides the following summary of actions it has taken to implement the source protection policies contained in the following 15 source protection plans that were in effect during 2015:

1. Ausable Bayfield-Maitland Valley
2. Cataraqui
3. Essex
4. Lake Erie - Catfish Creek
5. Lake Erie - Kettle Creek
6. Mattagami
7. Mississippi-Rideau
8. Niagara
9. North Bay- Mattawa
10. Quinte
11. Raisin South Nation
12. Sault Ste. Marie
13. South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe
14. Sudbury
15. Trent Conservation Coalition

Please contact your Source Protection Program's Branch liaison officer if you have any questions.

---

## Prescribed Instruments:

The *Clean Water Act* requires the ministry's prescribed instruments decisions to conform with the policies in the source protection plans that address significant drinking water threats and have regard to the prescribed instrument policies that address moderate and low drinking water threats.

The ministry reviewed all policies affecting prescribed instruments in the source protection plans.

Based on this review, the ministry developed Standard Operating Policies (SOPs) for the review and approval of:

- Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECAs) for waste disposal sites, sewage works and the application of untreated hauled sewage to land
- Pesticides Permits for the application of pesticides to land
- Permits to Take Water (PTTW)

The SOPs define how the ministry is addressing drinking water threat activities that are regulated by ministry approvals and permits consistently across the province to protect drinking water sources and meet the requirements of the local source protection plan prescribed instrument policies.

The ministry put the source protection SOPs into practice in the Lakehead, Niagara Region, and Mattagami Source Protection Areas as of October 1, 2014, and province-wide as of January 1, 2015.

In order to notify stakeholders of this approach, the ministry posted an information notice on the Environmental Registry (EBR #012-2968) on April 1, 2015. The SOPs are attached in Appendix A.

The ministry has implemented new procedures for screening applications for approvals and permits that are prescribed instruments under the *Clean Water Act*, to ensure that applications proposing a significant threat activity are identified and subject to the applicable program area SOPs. Since January 2015, every application for a new or amended prescribed instrument goes through a 'primary screening' to determine if the activity associated with the application is located in one of the following:

- A wellhead protection area or intake protection zone with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher,
- An issues contributing area, or
- An event-based area for wastewater treatment plant / sanitary sewer failures.

If any of the above criteria apply, the prescribed instrument application is flagged for a more detailed 'secondary screening' to determine if the activity associated with the application is a significant drinking water threat. If yes, the appropriate SOP is applied. The number and location of applications that were identified as significant, moderate, or low threats after undergoing a secondary screening in 2015 for each source protection area is provided in Appendix B. 17 applications were determined to be related to a significant drinking water threat and the SOPs were applied.

The ministry is currently reviewing prescribed instruments previously issued before the plans were approved and took effect, to determine whether the SOPs can be applied. More detail about this exercise is provided below in the section titled *Existing Instruments*.

## **The following is a summary of actions for each approval/permit program area:**

### ***All MOECC Program Areas – Prohibition Policies:***

As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a prescribed instrument for implementation prohibits an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an instrument for the activity. Source protection policies may be just one of the reasons an application is denied.

### ***All MOECC Program Areas – Moderate/Low Threat Policies:***

As noted in the SOP, the ministry has reviewed moderate and low threat policies and determined that current processes for the review and approval of the majority of instruments meets the requirements of these policies. However, the SOP identified changes specific to the review and approval process for ECA applications for the land application of hauled sewage, summarized below.

### **Waste Disposal Sites - Land Application of Hauled Sewage:**

#### *Significant Drinking Water Threats*

For applications proposing to apply untreated hauled sewage (e.g. waste from portable toilets, septic tanks, etc) to land in areas where this activity would be a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is not issuing any ECAs, even if a source protection plan policy allows for managing the threat through the ECA.

#### *Moderate and Low Drinking Water Threats*

The MOECC SOP identifies new considerations for the review and approval of ECA applications for the land application of hauled sewage in areas where this activity would be a low or moderate drinking water threat. Please refer to the SOP for additional details on the changes to the review and approval process.

### **Waste Disposal Sites - Land Application of Biosolids (Processed Organic Waste - POW):**

Biosolids are a type of waste that has been processed and when applied to land, can provide soil conditioning benefits. When biosolids/processed organic waste are applied on agricultural land to grow crops, it is considered non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM). Provincial approvals for the land application of NASM on *agricultural* land are governed by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA).

MOECC is responsible for regulating the land application of biosolids on *non-agricultural* sites. At these sites, biosolids application is regulated with an ECA issued under the Environmental Protection Act. To be consistent with O. Reg. 267/03 under the Nutrient Management Act, applications seeking

to apply biosolids to land within 100m of a municipal well, the ministry is not issuing any approval for the land application of this material regardless of the policy in the local source protection plan. Outside this zone, where the policy outcome is to manage the threat, MOECC is taking a local approach to any approvals for the land application of processed organic waste. In 2015, no approvals were issued for significant threat activities. If issued, approvals will continue contain appropriate conditions of operation that require the land application to occur in a manner that meets acceptable standards that are protective of the environment, drinking water sources and human health.

### **Waste Disposal Sites - Landfilling:**

Where a source protection plan policy outcome is to manage a significant, moderate, or low threat through the prescribed instrument for waste disposal sites, the ministry will meet the policy's obligations by continuing to apply protective requirements under the *Environmental Protection Act*, the *Environmental Assessment Act*, and existing regulations, policies, and guidelines. New waste disposal ECAs include stringent terms and conditions that consider the protection of drinking water sources, such as requirements for:

- buffer lands, and appropriate setbacks from wellheads or intake zones,;
- financial assurance (for privately owned sites) to ensure that if a proponent is unable or unwilling to meet their responsibilities for the site or if the site is abandoned, the site is properly closed and maintained to ensure it does not pose a risk to the environment, including drinking water sources.

In addition to the SOP, we have provided detailed guidance to affected municipalities "Source Protection Information Bulletin: Environmental Compliance Approvals for Waste Disposal Sites (2015)". The ministry emailed this draft information bulletin to municipalities affected by source protection plans in early June, 2015.

### **Sewage Works:**

Where a source protection plan policy outcome is to manage a significant threat to drinking water sources through the prescribed instrument for sewage works, the ministry is meeting the policy's obligations by including design and operational measures in an ECA. To assist in the implementation of this approach, anyone subject to the policy is required to include in their application a description of the measures necessary to protect drinking water and submit a 'Source Protection Supplementary Report' to outline how the activity for the sewage works will be managed so that the activity will not become a significant drinking water threat. Since a precautionary and pollution prevention approach is fundamental to the design of all sewage works, additional measure may not be required. In addition to this, sewage works that pose a significant threat to drinking water are not eligible for the Transfer of Review Program (a program where designated municipal authorities review the ECA application and supporting documentation on behalf of the ministry for sewage works having low technical complexity and low potential for significant environmental or public health impact.) This means that all applications for sewage works where there is a significant threat activity must now be submitted directly to the ministry for review and processing.

In addition to the SOP, we have provided detailed guidance to affected municipalities “Source Protection Information Bulletin: Environmental Compliance Approvals for Sewage Works (2015)”. The ministry emailed this draft information bulletin to municipalities affected by source protection plans in early June, 2015.

### **Application of Pesticides to Land:**

When issuing pesticide permits for the application of pesticides on land in areas where this activity would be considered a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is including appropriate terms and conditions that address emergency response measures and spill contingency plans as well as considering other measures necessary to manage the activity (see details in the SOP, Appendix A).

### **Permits to Take Water:**

The ministry completed a review of the source protection water quantity policies to date, all of which direct the ministry to use the prescribed instrument, Permits to Take Water (PTTW), to manage existing and future water takings, where significant. The review determined that the existing guidance and terms and conditions for PTTWs provided the tools necessary to manage water takings so that they do not pose a threat to municipal drinking water sources. No additional terms and conditions are required.

The ministry is committed to using the best available science to assess the sustainability and potential impacts to municipal systems, other users, and the natural and built environments. To that end, the ministry is also reviewing the PTTW process to determine how to best integrate the information from the source protection water budgets. Pending the outcome of this review, the best available science, including information generated by source protection water budgets, is being considered by the ministry when reviewing and making decisions on PTTWs. The ministry is also working to develop guidance material for proponents and qualified persons about using the source protection water budget science (including the input data, model and results) in their preparation of applications and for the PTTW decision-making process, particularly those for higher risk groundwater takings.

### **Fuel Storage at Municipal Residential Drinking Water Systems:**

For all new or amended drinking water works permits and/or municipal drinking water works licenses, the ministry is ensuring that the instrument requires that fuel for back-up generators is stored in a manner that is protective of drinking water sources.

For existing drinking water works permits and/or municipal drinking water works licenses, the ministry has identified drinking water systems within source protection area boundaries where fuel storage

could be a significant or moderate drinking water threat. To ensure that a consistent approach is taken province-wide, in spring 2016 the ministry will require drinking water system owners to complete a self-assessment and submit it to the approving Director under Part V of the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002. The ministry will send a letter to identified owners providing direction on how to complete the assessment and the timeline in which to respond to the ministry.

The ministry will review all assessments to determine whether the storage of fuel for back up generators for the drinking water system would be a threat to drinking water, and if so, whether the drinking water works permit or municipal drinking water license needs to be updated to conform with the local source protection plan policies (i.e. include measures to ensure that the fuel is stored in a way that is protective of drinking water such as using double-walled tanks or concrete berms.) If additional measures are needed, the ministry will notify the drinking water system owners and require them to apply for an amendment within 90 days. The application for an amendment will be required to indicate how the risk posed by fuel storage at the facility will be managed. The ministry intends to complete this process within the timelines required by the source protection plan policies, which is generally 3 years from the time a plan takes effect.

---

### **Update on review of existing instruments:**

The ministry is currently identifying instruments that are in place in areas where these would be significant drinking water threats activities, so that they can be reviewed to determine if changes are needed to meet the intent of the source protection policies. The ministry has established a three-year timeline from the effective date of each source protection plan to complete this work.

Instruments with expiry dates (e.g. Pesticides Permits), will be reviewed at the time of renewal within the three-year review of existing instruments.

For existing instruments that do not expire, the ministry will determine whether the SOP can be applied, or whether other amendments would be needed to protect sources of drinking water. To date, the ministry has identified approximately 250 existing sewage and waste disposal ECAs (issued after 1999) that need to be reviewed to determine if the activity undertaken at the site is a significant drinking water threat. The ministry has developed a plan to review these approvals and to contact the ECA holders if an amendment to their instrument is required.

---

### **Non-Legally Binding Policies:**

The Clean Water Act enabled source protection committees to develop other types of policies to protect existing and future sources of drinking water, referred to as Non-Legally Binding (NLB) policies. There are approximately 240 NLB policies in the approved source protection plans. Many of

these follow common themes, including support for education & outreach, and improving spills response.

The ministry has implemented changes that address the following NLB policy themes:

- integrating source protection information into the ministry's spills response;
  - Every spill reported to the ministry will be geo-spatially assessed to determine if it's in a source protection vulnerable area.
  - Spill response and notification procedures have been updated to ensure that in the event of a spill in a vulnerable area, prompt action and communication occurs with the affected municipalities, agencies and authorities within relevant source protection area(s) so that drinking water system operators can take appropriate measures.
- prioritizing inspections for evaluating compliance with prescribed instruments issued under the Nutrient Management Act<sup>1</sup>, Pesticides Act, Environmental Protection Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and Ontario Water Resources Act in source protection vulnerable areas; and
  - The ministry has identified source water protection vulnerable areas as a priority area of focus for ministry inspections. Annual inspection work planning has been initiated.
- creating a catalogue of resource materials that can aid in addressing significant drinking water threat activities and to help improve public knowledge about source protection in general, (details in Appendix C).

For the remaining NLB policies, the ministry has established a working group to further analyze how to best achieve the policy objectives across all source protection plans. This project is ongoing throughout 2016.

---

<sup>1</sup> MOECC is responsible for on-farm inspections of activities governed under the Nutrient Management Act.



## **Attachments:**

### **Appendix A:**

Standard Operating Policies for the review and approval of:

- Environmental Compliance Approvals for waste disposal sites, sewage works and the application of untreated hauled sewage to land
- Pesticides Permits for the application of pesticides to land
- Permits to Take Water

### **Appendix B:**

Summary of MOECC Prescribed Instrument Application Screening

### **Appendix C:**

Summary of Ministry Implementation and Support of Education & Outreach Policies

# Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's Source Protection Standard Operating Policies

The EBR Registry Number 012-2968 provides information on the Standard Operating Policies (“**SOPs**”) developed by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (“**ministry**”) to support the ministry’s implementation of source protection prescribed instrument policies. The content of the SOPs for ensuring approvals for waste, sewage works, hauled sewage, water taking and land application of pesticides **conform with policies in source protection plans** are summarized below, **noting that where a prohibition policy applies, the ministry will refuse the application as is legally required**. The ministry will apply the SOPs on a province-wide basis, to ensure a consistent approach to implementing source water protection policies.

This document has two sections: the first section provides a summary of the ministry actions to be taken to conform with source protection prescribed instrument policies for significant threat activities (otherwise known in the **Clean Water Act, 2006** (“**CWA**”) as significant threat policies), and the second section provides a summary of the ministry’s actions to be taken to have regard to policies that govern moderate and low threat activities (otherwise known as moderate and low threat policies).

The threat activities listed below are defined in the ministry’s [Table of Drinking Water Threats](#) (“**Table**”). This Table was prepared and released as part of the Director’s Technical Rules issued under section 107 of the CWA.

The [Risk Management Measures Catalogue](#) (“**RMMC**”) provides means to determine which management measure(s) and management targets is/are suitable to effectively manage a specific threat to the quality or quantity of source water, allowing the user to take local conditions into consideration.

## **Section 1: Summary of Ministry Actions to be taken to Conform with Source Protection Prescribed Instrument Policies for Future Significant Threat Activities**

### **Waste Disposal Site Prescribed Threat Activities**

#### *Threat activities:*

- Landfarming Petroleum Refining Waste, threat #1a
- Landfilling (Hazardous Waste and Liquid Industrial Waste), threat #1b
- Landfilling waste from municipal sources, threat #1c
- Landfilling Industrial and Commercial waste, threat #1d
- Liquid Industrial Waste Injection into a Deep Well Disposal Site, threat #1e
- Storage of Hazardous/Liquid Industrial Waste at Waste Disposal Sites, threat #1g

- Storage of wastes described in clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t) or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste or clause (d) of the definition of liquid industrial waste (under Regulation 347), threat #1h

*Prescribed Instrument:*

An Environmental Compliance Approval (“**ECA**”) under Part II.1 of the *Environmental Protection Act* (“**EPA**”) for activities under s.27 of the EPA.

*Standard Operating Policy:*

The ministry screens ECA applications for waste disposal sites to identify if the site is located in a vulnerable drinking water area and if the activity meets the circumstances to be considered a significant threat to drinking water.

A stringent site-specific technical review is conducted to ensure that waste disposal facilities are designed and operated in a manner that meet regulatory, guidelines and best management practices. The ministry’s assessment of the proposal is clearly documented which includes how the activity meets the ministry’s requirements and how the Statement of Environmental Values were considered. The technical review in conjunction with imposing conditions in an ECA related to design, environmental monitoring, reporting and trigger mechanisms and contingency plans, provide comprehensive controls that ensure regulated waste management activities do not become significant drinking water threats. Where proposals do not meet these requirements, the ECA application will be refused.

When a source protection policy requires risk management of a waste prescribed significant threat activity, the ministry will apply current program and regulatory standards when making a decision on the ECA.

*Details and Rationale:*

For significant drinking water threat activities, the *Environmental Assessment Act* (“**EAA**”) process (where it applies), the requirements for an ECA under the EPA and requirements under existing regulations and guidelines are comprehensive and adequately address the objectives of the source protection policies.

The EAA sets out a planning and decision-making process to evaluate the potential environmental effects of a proposed project before any decisions are made to proceed with the project. Since March 2007, certain private and public sector waste management projects are subject to the EAA through the Waste Management Projects Regulation (O. Reg. 101/07). The level of assessment required depends on the project’s expected environmental effects. Projects subject to an environmental assessment (EA) cannot obtain an ECA to engage in the waste management activities until the requirements of the EAA have been met. As part of the EA process, proponents are required to:

- anticipate environmental, social, economic and cultural consequences of a proposed project or activity (i.e. siting considerations, effects on surface and/ groundwater quality, quantities and flow, commitments to monitoring of discharges and emissions);
- assess plans to manage any potential environmental effects resulting from the proposed project or activity (i.e. development of mitigation measures); and,
- allow for the involvement of the public and government agencies in the review of the proposed project or activity.

The EPA, specifically section 27 (under Part V), requires proponents to obtain an ECA from the ministry prior to using, operating, establishing, altering, enlarging or extending a waste disposal site. The ECA includes stringent conditions that:

- identify the maximum volume and design requirements for the waste disposal site;
- approve a closure plan for the site or require a detailed closure be submitted based on the conceptual closure plan included in the site's Design and Operations Plan;
- approve plans such as Environmental Monitoring Plans, trigger mechanism plans, and contingency plans to ensure the long-term protection of the environment;
- require record keeping, inspections (daily, monthly and annual) and the submission of an annual report;
- state the ministry's requirements for buffer lands, and includes appropriate setbacks from wellheads or intake zones, as appropriate;
- require financial assurance (for privately owned sites) to ensure that if a proponent is unable or unwilling to meet their responsibilities for the site or whether the site is abandoned, the site is properly closed and maintained to ensure it does not pose a risk to the environment, including drinking water sources.

Existing program and regulatory requirements for the approval of waste disposal sites are consistent with the significant threat prescribed instrument policies. Therefore existing program requirements conform with source protection risk management policies.

The Risk Management Measures Catalogue (“**RMMC**”) provides a means for a user to determine which management measure(s) and management targets is/are suitable to effectively manage a specific threat to the quality or quantity of source water, allowing the user to take local conditions into consideration. The RMMs were reviewed to determine if they are consistent with waste disposal site designs typically approved by the ministry. Site specific design criteria are submitted to the ministry with an application for a prescribed instrument (i.e. an ECA), as prepared by a Qualified Person (e.g. Professional Engineer).

**Ministry Policy and Guideline Framework for each Waste Sub-threat Activity:**

Waste Sub-threat Activity	Ministry's Policies and Guidelines
Landfarming Petroleum Refining Waste, threat #1a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 27 of the EPA requires that an ECA be obtained from the ministry prior to using, operating, establishing, altering, enlarging or extending a waste disposal site.</li> <li>• To obtain an ECA for a new Landfarming Petroleum Refining Waste site, detailed technical assessments of the site must be carried out to identify any potential effects on the environment including groundwater, surface water, air and soil to show how these potential effects can be satisfactorily addressed (review completed by the ministry's regional technical support section and/or Environmental Approvals Branch review engineer(s)).</li> <li>• Regulation 347 (General Waste Management) made under the EPA, was amended in 2005 to establish a land disposal restrictions ("<b>LDR</b>") program in Ontario. Under these rules, hazardous wastes that are to be land disposed must be treated to meet prescribed treatment requirements prior to land disposal.</li> <li>• The ministry's LDR program prohibits the direct disposal of hazardous waste to land without meeting the treatment standards within Regulation 347.</li> <li>• The ministry receives very few ECA applications related to landfarms.</li> <li>• Hydrogeology and surface water studies would be a component of the application. During the technical review, site specific conditions may be included in the ECA to ensure that each specific site has adequate measures to protect drinking water sources including monitoring plans, inspection procedures, reporting requirements and contingency measures.</li> </ul>
Landfilling Hazardous Waste and Liquid Industrial Waste, threat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EAA provides for the analysis of impact assessment, conservation and wise management of Ontario's environment by establishing a responsible</li> </ul>

#1b

and accountable process for decision-making before a project is undertaken. Key components of an environmental assessment (“**EA**”) include the mitigation and management of potential environmental impacts. The EA process for a proposal such as a Hazardous and Liquid Industrial Waste Disposal Site includes consideration and evaluation of alternatives.

- Waste Management Projects are subject to O. Reg. 101/07 made under the EAA. This regulation describes the waste management projects that are designated by the regulation and subject to the EAA and EA requirements. Under the regulation, waste management projects may be required to undertake an Individual EA or an Environmental Screening Processes (“**ESP**”) to ensure that the intent of the EAA is met.
- New landfills or expanding landfills that are proposed to have waste disposal volumes of less than 40,000 m<sup>3</sup> are not designated under the EAA. These landfills are required to meet the requirements of the EPA Regulation 347 (General Waste Management).
- For landfills subject to the EAA requirements, numerous technical studies and impact assessments are required to be completed. This includes a hydrogeological assessment, surface water assessments and geotechnical assessments. Section 6 of the Landfill Standards and A Guideline on the Regulatory and Approval Requirements for New or Expanding Landfilling Sites (PIBS 3651E), outline the type of technical studies required.
- **Hazardous and Liquid Industrial Waste Disposal (Landfill) Sites** are subject to Part V of the EPA and applicable regulation made under the Act (i.e. Regulation 347 and O. Reg. 232/98). Section 27 of the EPA requires that an ECA be obtained from the ministry prior to using, operating, establishing, altering, enlarging or extending a waste disposal site. The EPA is the overarching legislation that provides the basic legislative framework for waste management in Ontario. These landfills may also have requirements under the *Ontario Water Resources Act* (“**OWRA**”).

	<p>An application to obtain an ECA for a new or expanding landfill site must include reports that address the detailed technical assessments of the site carried out to identify any potential effects on the environment including groundwater, surface water, air and soil to show how these potential effects can be satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p><b>Applicability of Regulation 232/98, under the EPA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• O. Reg. 232/98, Landfilling Sites contains comprehensive landfill standards that include requirements for site design, operation, closure, post-closure care and financial assurance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Applicability of Regulation 347, under the EPA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulation 347 is the general waste management regulation that provides an overview of waste management in the Province.</li> </ul> <p><b>Guidelines</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guideline B-7: Incorporation of the Reasonable Use Concept into MOEE Groundwater Management Activities establishes the basis for determining the "reasonable use" of groundwater on property adjacent to sources of contaminants and for determining the levels of contaminant discharges considered acceptable by the ministry.</li> </ul> <p>The Guideline applies to matters which fall under the authority of the EPA and OWRA.</p>
<p>Landfilling waste from municipal sources, threat #1c and Landfilling Industrial and Commercial waste, threat #1d</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source protection policies were reviewed and it was determined that the ministry's current regulatory framework for municipal/industrial/commercial landfills meets the policy requirements. The current framework for waste threats #1c and #1d is the same as waste threat #1b described above.</li> </ul>
<p>Liquid Industrial Waste Injection into a Deep Well Disposal Site, threat #1e</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A waste disposal site ECA for activities under section 27 of Part V of the EPA is required for deep well injection of waste, except for oil field brine disposal which is regulated by the Ministry of Natural Resources</li> </ul>

	<p>and Forestry (MNRF) through the <i>Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Act</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ministry regulates deep well injection of waste through the Deep Well Disposal Regulation (Regulation 341) and Regulation 347 under the EPA.</li> <li>• Under Regulation 341 of the EPA, operators of a waste well disposal must provide the ministry's local district office Director with monthly reports showing the source, volume and chemical composition of the wastes received at the site, and the volume of wastes discharged into the well.</li> <li>• Regulation 347 was amended in 2005 to establish a Land Disposal Restriction (LDR) program in Ontario. Under these rules, hazardous wastes that are to be land disposed must be treated to meet prescribed treatment requirements prior to land disposal.</li> <li>• The ministry's LDR program prohibits the direct disposal of hazardous waste into deep wells without meeting the treatment standards within Regulation 347. This will not affect the disposal of non-hazardous fluids such as brine.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Act</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MNRF regulates disposal of brine through the <i>Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Act</i> (the disposal of brine is exempt from the EPA, and only regulated by MNRF if re-injected in wells).</li> <li>• Currently, there are no ministry approved deep well disposal sites operating in Ontario. The last two (2) ministry-approved deep well disposal sites were plugged in 2013.</li> </ul>
<p>Storage of Hazardous/Liquid Industrial Waste at Waste Disposal Sites, threat #1g</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste management projects are subject to O. Reg. 101/07 made under the EAA. This regulation describes the waste management projects that are designated by the regulation and subject to the EAA and EA requirements. Under the regulation, waste management projects for the storage of waste at transfer/processing sites may be required to undertake</li> </ul>



the Environmental Screening Process to ensure that the purpose of the EAA is met.

- The EPA is the overarching legislation that provides the basic legislative framework for waste management in Ontario. Hazardous Waste and/or Liquid Industrial Waste Transfer and Processing Sites, Municipal Hazardous and Special Waste Depots (MHSW Depots) and hazardous waste thermal treatment facilities (all sites where storage of hazardous and liquid industrial occurs) are subject to Part V of the EPA and the regulations made under the EPA.
- Section 27 of the EPA requires that an ECA be obtained from the ministry prior to using, operating, establishing, altering, enlarging or extending a waste disposal site.
- Storage of hazardous waste and liquid industrial waste by a generator for more than 24 months requires an ECA (per section 17.2 of Regulation 347).
- To obtain approval for a new Hazardous Waste Transfer and Processing site, MHSW Depot and /or Hazardous Waste thermal treatment facility, a technical assessment of the site must be carried out to identify any potential effects on the environment including groundwater, surface water, air and soil to show how these potential effects can be satisfactorily addressed.

### **Regulations and Guidelines**

Regulations and guidelines for storage of hazardous waste and/or liquid industrial waste at transfer/processing sites include:

- [Regulation 347](#) limits the mixing, blending, bulking, etc. of hazardous waste.
- Household Hazardous Waste Collection and Facility Guidelines, 1993.
- Ministry's Guidelines of "Environmental Protection Measures at Chemical and Waste Storage Facilities", 2007.

	<p><b>Technical Review Approval Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ministry’s review engineers/evaluators with knowledge of hazardous waste and liquid industrial waste storage activities are assigned to review ECA applications for these proposed activities. Applicants of proposed hazardous waste and liquid industrial waste storage sites are required to submit supporting documentation, including storm water management plans, secondary storage containment plans, emergency spill procedures and contingency measures.</li> <li>• Review engineers will impose site specific terms and conditions in the ECA to ensure that each specific site has adequate measures to protect drinking water sources.</li> </ul>
<p>Storage of wastes described in clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t) or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste or clause (d) of the definition of liquid industrial waste (under Regulation 347)*, threat #1h</p>	<p>The source protection policies were reviewed and it was determined that the ministry’s current regulatory framework for storage of wastes described in clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t) or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste or clause (d) of the definition of liquid industrial waste (under Regulation 347)* meets the policy requirements. The current framework for waste storage threats #1h is same as it is for hazardous waste storage threat #1g.</p>

\* For reader clarity, the sub-threat 1h, “Storage of wastes described in clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t) or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste or clause (d) of the definition of liquid industrial waste” is storage of non-hazardous waste at transfer/processing sites.

Clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t) or (u) of the definition of “hazardous waste” or clause (d) of the definition of “liquid industrial waste” (“Small Quantity Wastes”) are time-accumulating and amount thresholds that determine how a waste is classified in Regulation 347. Generally, these clauses state that small amounts and/or accumulation of inherently hazardous waste can be managed as non-hazardous waste for the purposes of waste management. For the purposes of Source Protection, these materials can be a threat to drinking water.

## **Sewage Prescribed Threat Activities**

### *Threat activities:*

- Combined Sewer discharge from stormwater outlet to surface water, threat #2a
- Discharge of stormwater from a stormwater facility, threat #2b
- Industrial sewage effluent discharge, threat #2c
- Sanitary sewers and related pipes, threat #2d
- Septic system, threat #2e
- Sewage Holding tank, threat #2f
- Sewage Treatment Plant bypass, threat #2g
- Sewage Treatment Plant effluent discharge (includes lagoons), threat #2h
- Storage of Sewage, threat #2i
- Sewage – Mine tailings, storage, treatment and discharge, threat #1j

### *Prescribed Instrument:*

ECA under Part II.1 of the EPA for activities under s.53 of the OWRA

### *Standard Operating Policy:*

For sewage works governed by ECAs where the sewage works are located in areas where they are significant drinking water threats, the ministry will conform with source protection policies by applying design and operational measures (identified in the table below) to an ECA to manage the threat. The ministry has also introduced a new requirement for ECA applicants to submit a Source Protection Supplementary Report to outline how the activity for the sewage works is being managed and mitigated so that the activity will not become a significant drinking water threat. These requirements follow a precautionary and pollution prevention approach and will be applied on a consistent province-wide basis to protect drinking water sources. Some of the requirements identified below are currently implemented by the ministry on a site-specific basis. However, the ministry will now apply these requirements whenever the proposal would be considered a significant drinking water threat activity. The “General” section of the table is applicable to all sub-threat activities identified in the Table.

Sewage works that are significant threats to drinking water are not eligible for processing under the Transfer of Review Program. Only applications for approval of sewage works that have low technical complexity and low potential for significant environmental or public health impact and that are proposed to be located within certain designated municipalities are eligible to be processed under this program. An ECA application for sewage works that is excluded from the Transfer of Review Program must be submitted directly to the Environmental Approvals Access and Service Integration Branch of the ministry for review and processing. For additional information on the Transfer of Review Program, please refer the ministry’s [“Guide to Applying for an Environmental Compliance Approval, 2012”](#).

Ministry staff are currently screening ECA proposals for sewage works to identify if the site is located in a vulnerable drinking water area and if the activity meets the circumstances as a significant threat to drinking water. Guidance documents will be developed and/or updated to outline the ministry's ECA requirements for source protection.

Sewage Sub-Threat Activity	Requirements for ECA Applications
<p><b>General (applicable to all sewage works included within this table)</b></p>	<p>In order to prevent potential risks from becoming a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is implementing the following requirements for the establishment of sewage works where the works have been identified as a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design must include a Source Protection Supplementary Report that demonstrates that the proposed design recognized the significant drinking water threat and has implemented mitigation measures to protect drinking water sources. The report should identify drinking water sources, how the sewage works has met the requirements of the CWA and the ministry's design and operational requirements and how the works considered the <u>Risk Management Measures Catalogue</u> (e.g., monitoring, reporting requirements), as amended, to address the risks</li> <li>• Designs must be accompanied with a monitoring and reporting plan.</li> <li>• Designs must be accompanied with a Spill Prevention and Contingency Plan, covering information requirements as per O.Reg. 224/07 to prevent, eliminate or ameliorate any adverse drinking water effects that result or may result from spills of pollutants. This includes steps taken in the event drinking water sources are contaminated for example, notifying members of the public who may be directly affected by a spill.</li> </ul> <p><b>Operational Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Spill Prevention and Contingency Plans must be kept up-to-date.</li> <li>• Regular and annual reports to include maintenance, inspections, and monitoring details.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All reports are required to be kept onsite (where the reports can be kept on-site) and at the operating authority’s office.</li> <li>• All reports are required to be made readily available upon request by ministry staff, Source Protection Authority or any other parties identified in Source Protection Plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stormwater management works</b></p>	<p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design must be based on providing Enhanced Level water <b>quality</b> control as per the ministry’s Stormwater Management and Planning Manual, 2003.</li> <li>• Design must include an additional 20% water <b>quantity</b> control in addition to the requirements of the ministry’s Stormwater Management and Planning Manual.</li> <li>• Design must be accompanied with erosion and sediment control measures to cover all phases of construction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Operational Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The erosion and sediment control measures plan must be kept up-to-date with records of inspections and maintenance made available for inspection by the ministry.</li> <li>• The monitoring and reporting plan must be kept up-to-date and on-site or at the operating authority’s office.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Combined sewers</b></p>	<p>New combined sewers are currently prohibited per the ministry’s Design Guidelines for Sewage Works, 2008 and Procedure F-5-5. Treatment Requirements for Municipal and Private Combined and Partially Separated Sewer Systems are outlined in Procedure F-5-5. Combined sewer outflows are to be reported to the Spills Action Centre as per the obligations under Part X of the EPA.</p> <p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as “General” section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Operational Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational procedures established to include closed-circuit television (CCTV) inspections every 5 years with records made available for inspection by the ministry.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Sanitary sewers and related pipes</b></p>	<p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New and replacement sewers are to be constructed of materials and with joints that are equivalent to watermain standards of construction and are to be pressure tested in accordance with Division 441 (formerly 701) of the Ontario Provincial Standards Specification (OPSS).</li> </ul> <p><b>Operational Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational procedures established to include CCTV inspections every 5 years with records made available for inspection by the ministry.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sewage treatment plant discharge via bypass</b></p>	<p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate sizing to reduce bypasses-in adherence to the ministry’s Sewage Works Design Guideline (2008) and provisions of Procedure F-5-5 and F-5-1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Operational Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response plan for unplanned bypasses.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sewage treatment plant – storage/holding tanks</b></p>	<p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as “General” section.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sewage treatment plant effluent (including lagoons)</b></p>	<p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate sizing to reduce bypasses-in adherence to the ministry’s Sewage Works Design Guideline, 2008 and provisions of Procedure F-5-5 and F-5-1.</li> <li>• Design must include an inspection/maintenance frequency and strategy to prevent unplanned bypasses.</li> <li>• Response plan for pre-mature effluent discharge (i.e. in the event of seasonal lagoons).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Industrial effluent discharge</b></p>	<p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designs must include an industrial sewage discharge flood protection and risk assessment report, considering the 1:200</li> </ul>

	<p>year storm event, or an additional 0.5 metres freeboard elevation on any lagoon or wastewater containment area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decommissioning plan for every component of the sewage system.</li> <li>• Design must include a contingency plan for responding to effluent quality not complying with effluent criteria.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Industrial effluent discharge – mine tailings</b></p>	<p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designs must include an industrial sewage discharge flood protection and risk assessment report, considering the 1:200 year storm event, or an additional 0.5 metres freeboard elevation on any lagoon or wastewater containment area.</li> <li>• Design must include a contingency plan for responding to effluent quality not complying with effluent criteria.</li> <li>• Response plan for pre-mature effluent discharge (i.e. in the event of seasonal discharge from tailing ponds).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Onsite sewage systems</b></p>	<p>In order to prevent potential groundwater and shallow groundwater contamination and risks from becoming a significant drinking water threat, the establishment of all new onsite sewage systems must adhere to the following criteria.</p> <p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design must comply with site specific effluent requirements (objectives, limits, triggers, monitoring, reporting, contingencies, etc.) as established at early stage during pre-application consultation with ministry District/Regional Offices.</li> </ul> <p><b>Operational Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance inspections by a qualified person.</li> <li>• Operational plan, which at a minimum shall include, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pump out and inspection of sewage underground tanks (including septic, balancing tanks, etc.) of each sewage system identified as moderate and high risk in the Sewage System Assessment Report.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hydraulic test to assess for any leakage at the time of the pump out.</li> <li>○ Removal of any trees, where they or their roots, are growing in the leaching beds.</li> <li>○ Preparing public information brochure for distribution (in cases of larger sites with more than one resident on site) regarding taking care of septic systems.</li> <li>○ Prohibit the construction of any structures such as decks, patios, or sheds over the disposal fields, as well as there should be no parking or driving vehicles over the surface of disposal fields and over any other components of the onsite sewage system.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Holding tanks</b></p>	<p>The ministry will not issue approvals for new underground holding tanks as current design and operational measures are not sufficient to ensure the activity will never become a significant drinking water threat. The proponent may only consider installation of above-ground tanks in compliance with the current requirements for holding tanks (Ministry Guideline F-9 and Ontario Building Code -OBC), subject to a site-specific review.</p> <p><b>Design Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as “General” section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Operational Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspections of holding tanks every five (5) years for assessment of holding tanks structural integrity including a hydraulic septic test to assess for any possible leakage, and complete with a written assessment and recommendations.</li> </ul>



## **Hauled Sewage Prescribed Threat Activities**

### *Threat activity:*

- Application of hauled sewage to land (waste subthreat #1i)

### *Prescribed Instrument:*

An ECA under Part II.1 of the EPA for activities under s.27 of the EPA.

### *Standard Operating Policy:*

The application of hauled sewage to land in locations where it would be a significant drinking water threat cannot be adequately managed with an ECA, such that the activity would never become a significant drinking water threat. To conform with significant threat prescribed instrument policies, the ministry will not approve the land application of untreated hauled sewage in areas where it has been identified as a significant drinking water threat.

### *Details and Rationale:*

Ministry experts determined that ECA terms and conditions could not adequately manage the land application of hauled sewage activity to ensure the activity never becomes a significant drinking water threat. This approach will address all of the parameters of concern associated with untreated hauled sewage as identified under the CWA (pathogens, nitrates and phosphorus).

## **Pesticides Prescribed Threat Activities**

### *Threat activity:*

- Application of Pesticides to Land, threat #10

### *Prescribed Instrument:*

Pesticide permits for land exterminations issued under section 7 of the Pesticides Act are identified as Prescribed Instruments under the CWA.

### *Standard Operating Policy:*

For activities that are identified as significant drinking water threats, the ministry will:

- ensure the permit includes appropriate terms and conditions that address emergency response measures and spill contingency plans for any pesticide

mixing, loading, and handling related to the proposed pesticide treatment which are protective of drinking water sources.

- ensure the permit includes applicable terms and conditions related to site specific setbacks to watercourses, timing restrictions (including consideration of weather events) and spills/runoff management or other measures necessary to manage the significant threat activity in order to protect sources of drinking water.

The additional terms and conditions will be included on all permits where the land application of pesticides is considered a 'significant' drinking water threat.

#### *Details and Rationale:*

The ministry will manage significant drinking water threat activities by including appropriate terms and conditions in all permits where the land application of pesticides is a significant drinking water threat.

These conditions will address emergency response measures and spill contingency plans as well as consideration for other measures necessary to manage the significant threat activity. Including these additional terms and conditions will help ensure broader environmental protection from the handling and use of pesticides and ensure a consistent approach to protecting source water across the province.

### **Permit to Take Water**

#### *Threat activity:*

- An activity that takes water from an aquifer or a surface water body without returning the water taken to the same aquifer or surface water body, threat #19

#### *Prescribed Instrument:*

Section 34 of the Ontario Water Resources Act, with respect to the permits to take water" is defined as a prescribed instrument by s.1.0.1, O. Reg. 287/07 (General) under the CWA.

#### *Standard Operating Policy:*

No instrument changes are required at this time to address source protection prescribed instrument policy requirements. However, the ministry is engaged in a broader review of how information generated through the source water protection planning process can enhance a proponent's development of, and subsequent ministry review and evaluation of, water taking proposals that are subject to regulation by a permit. Pending the outcome of this review, best available science would be considered by proponents and

qualified person experts when preparing applications as well as by the ministry in the permit decision-making process, particularly those for higher risk groundwater takings.

*Details and Rationale:*

A Permit to Take Water (PTTW) Director, when considering an application for a PTTW, is required under section 4, O. Reg. 387/04 (Water Taking), under the OWRA, to consider issues, including those relating to water availability, such as may concern municipal residential drinking water systems and any planned municipal use of water that has been approved. A PTTW Director is provided statutory discretion to impose terms and conditions deemed proper to safeguard Ontario waters. The current administration of the PTTW program implements requirements prescribed by prevailing statute, regulation and program policy, and in doing so ensures future proposed and existing water takings which are subject to PTTW are not significant drinking water threats.

As specific examples of this, a signing Director considering an application for a PTTW is required by regulation to consider matters that include but are not limited to those relevant to source protection policies such as:

- the need to sustain ecological and hydrological integrity of key hydrologic features, functions and aquatic systems,
- the need for implementation of water conservation and efficient use measures, and
- the need to protect existing and approved future municipal water supply (i.e., ensure municipal water supply requirements are not interfered with by other permitted water takings).

Therefore, no changes to the terms and conditions already included in PTTWs instrument are recommended to further control water taking in geographic areas identified as significant drinking water quantity threats recognizing that the broader review of how source protection water quantity information can be factored into the PTTW application and decision-making processes is underway.

**Section 2: Summary of Ministry Actions to be Taken to Have Regard To Source Protection Prescribed Instrument Policies for Moderate and Low Threat Activities**

It has been determined that the ministry's review and approval processes for instruments that manage moderate and low drinking water threats for waste, sewage, water taking and application of pesticides drinking water threat activities, are adequate to meet the requirements of source protection prescribed instrument policies. For activities that are identified as moderate or low drinking water threats, no additional measures beyond the existing approval requirements are required.

However, for moderate and low drinking water threats for the application of hauled sewage to land threat activities, the ministry's SOP does identify review and approval process changes.

### **Hauled Sewage Moderate and Low Threat Activities SOP**

If the ministry issues an ECA authorizing the land application of hauled sewage in locations where the activity would be a moderate or low threat, it will include terms and conditions that require the site to be designed, constructed and operated in a manner that meets acceptable standards that are protective of the environment and drinking water sources. The ministry is strengthening application and review requirements in these locations.

Updated requirements for surface application will include:

- a supplemental application checklist
- the ECA will:
  - be issued for less than 2 years duration
  - include terms and conditions that address spill prevention procedures
  - restrict land application activities to sites meeting specified standards relating to: maximum permitted slope, soil permeability requirements, minimum setbacks, storage requirements, prohibition on winter spreading and record keeping requirements.

Updated requirements for dewatering trenches will include:

- a supplemental application checklist
- the requirements of the ministry's "Draft Guide to Disposal of Septage in Dewatering Trenches, Ministry of the Environment, September 2008"
- the ECA will:
  - include terms and conditions that require the facility to be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with specific standards including maximum permitted slope, soil permeability requirements, minimum setbacks to surface water and to wells, storage and maximum application rate requirements,
  - include terms and conditions that require the facility to be closed as per the site specific closure plan.

## Appendix B

### Summary of MOECC Prescribed Instrument Application Screening - Jan 1, 2015 - Dec 31, 2015

- 17 proposed activities were determined to be a Significant Drinking Water Threat (SDWT) and the Standard Operating Policies were applied

Source Protection Areas/Regions	MOECC program						
	Waste - hauled sewage sites		Waste - biosolids (POW) sites		Waste - landfilling	Sewage works	Pesticides Permits
	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT	# proposed activity determined to be a Mod/Low threat	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT	# proposed activity determined to be a Mod/Low threat	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT
Ausable Bayfield Maitland Valley		4					
Cataraqui						1	
CTC ( <i>plan not in effect during 2015</i> )		1				3	
Essex							
Halton-Hamilton							
Lake Erie Region - Catfish SPA							
Lake Erie Region - Kettle SPA							
Lake Erie Region - Grand River SPA ( <i>plan not in effect during 2015</i> )		4			1	8	
Lake Erie Region - Long Point SPA ( <i>plan not in effect during 2015</i> )						1	
Lakehead ( <i>n/a - no prescribed instrument policies affecting any MOECC program area</i> )							
Mattagami		1					
Mississippi-Rideau		10				1	

Source Protection Areas/Regions	MOECC program						
	Waste - hauled sewage sites		Waste - biosolids (POW) sites		Waste - landfilling	Sewage works	Pesticides Permits
	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT	# proposed activity determined to be a Mod/Low threat	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT	# proposed activity determined to be a Mod/Low threat	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT	# proposed activity determined to be a SDWT
Niagara Peninsula							
Sudbury				2			
North Bay-Mattawa							
Quinte Conservation		2				1	
Raisin-South Nation		4					
Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula <i>(plan not in effect during 2015)</i>		10					
Sault Ste. Marie Region							
South Georgian Bay-Lake Simcoe	1 (prohibited)	9					
Thames-Sydenham and Region <i>(plan not in effect during 2015)</i>		1		1			
Trent Conservation Coalition		18					
Outside of a SPA/Region							
<b>Total across all source protection plan areas -regions:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>

## **Appendix C:**

### **Ministry Implementation and Support of Education & Outreach Policies**

MOECC undertook a comprehensive review of all education and outreach policies included in source protection plans, regardless of implementing body, to determine how best to support policy implementation province-wide. To reduce costs and duplication, MOECC created a resource material catalogue that could be used by the province, municipalities and conservation authorities to fulfill their policy obligations. Beginning in 2014, MOECC released 8 sections of the resource material catalogue, available through Conservation Ontario's website, to aid in the implementation of education and outreach policies. The sections include: (1) General Messages; (2) On-site Sewage (Septic) Systems; (3) Agriculture, Nutrients and Pesticides; (4) Road Salt and Snow; (5) Handling and Storage of Liquid Fuel; (6) Handling and Storage of Heating Fuel; (7) Hazardous Liquids (Dense Non-aqueous Phase Liquids and Organic Solvents) and (8) Well Abandonment and Testing. Two further catalogue sections on water conservation and drinking water protection zone signs are currently under development and will soon be available through Conservation Ontario's website. The catalogue provides content that can be inserted into locally-produced outreach materials, and existing materials that can be distributed as-is. The resource material catalogue has over 50 pages of content.

In 2015 and early 2016, MOECC updated and distributed over 22,000 English and French copies of its brochure for private onsite (septic) sewage systems, "Your Septic System: Protecting Your Investment and the Environment." It also launched a 60-page "Campaign in a Box" toolkit for municipalities and conservation authorities that provides guidance, tools, templates and infographics for implementing an education and outreach campaign. Both the brochure and toolkit are housed alongside the catalogue pages on Conservation Ontario's website.

In addition, MOECC provided support through its Education and Outreach Community of Practice (E&O COP). The E&O COP has over 130 members representing all source protection regions. The E&O COP includes an online forum where members share materials for distribution.

Members of the E&O COP are invited to peer-led webinars on best practices for education and outreach. To date, four webinars have been held with more than 325 attendees. Presentation topics include: Innovative Strategies for Education and Outreach; Successes, Challenges and Lessons Learned; City of London's "City Green" Initiative; Municipal Partnership Approaches/Targeting Audiences in a Large Area; Campaign to Target Intake Protection Zones; Communicating with Businesses; "Campaign in a Box" toolkit; Going Forward Post Approval; and Dealing with Property Owners.

MOECC also responded to individual requests from 10 source protection regions for education and outreach support.

## Interested in Getting Involved in Protecting Our Drinking Water?

### Invitation to Apply for Membership on the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe (SGBLS) Source Protection Committee

*Under Ontario Regulation 288/07, Clean Water Act, 2006*

The South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe (SGBLS) Source Protection Region, in accordance with the provisions of Ontario Regulation 288/07, is currently seeking two economic sector members and one public sector member to serve on the SGBLS Source Protection Committee.

Originally established in 2008, the committee has successfully developed and launched the Source Protection Plan. The plan provides policies to mitigate potential threats to the source of municipal drinking water. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change approved the Source Protection Plan on January 26th, 2015 at which stage the function of the committee transitioned primarily to evaluating the implementation of the Source Protection Plan policies and conducting periodic updates to ensure the plan is leading to the desired protection of sources of municipal drinking water.

### Summary of Committee Member Obligations and Requirements

- Make a five year commitment to participate;
- Attend committee meetings (two to three meetings per year);
- Attend training and orientation sessions as required;
- Must reside, own property, rent property, be employed in or operate a business within the boundaries of the SGBLS Source Protection Region;
- Cannot be a current Source Protection Authority Board or staff member;
- Respect confidential information and abide by the process in place to safeguard confidential information;
- Comply with the committee's code of conduct;
- Act as liaison by bringing forward common concerns from knowledge and experience of respective sector to the committee;
- Provide input and make decisions at the committee table;
- Understand source protection science concepts and technical reports; Review reports/documents as required.

More information about the Source Protection program and obligations of committee members is available on our website at: <http://www.ourwatershed.ca>

### How to Apply for Appointment to the Committee

Download an application from our website: [www.ourwatershed.ca](http://www.ourwatershed.ca).  
Applications and supporting materials can be submitted to the address below.

**Deadline is May 31, 2016**

A selection committee will review all applications and make recommendations to the lead Source Protection Authority to endorse the preferred applicants. The selection committee may require applicants to participate in an interview.

### Questions or Comments?

Contact: Bill Thompson, Manager, Integrated Watershed Management  
120 Bayview Parkway, Newmarket, Ontario, L3Y 3W3  
Tel: 905-895-1281 ext. 271  
E-mail: [b.thompson@lsrca.on.ca](mailto:b.thompson@lsrca.on.ca)