

Comments Received During Pre-Consultation on the March 11, 2014 Revised Version of the Source Protection Plan						
Comment From	Date Received	SPP or ED	Policy/Section Ref	Comment	SPC Response	SPAs Response
Innisfil	8-Apr-14	SPP	Sec 16	Verbiage at the beginning of Section 16 "The Policies" indicates that Innisfil has passed a resolution to discontinue the use of the Goldcrest well system. There is concern that information on threats within the Golf Haven WHPA's remains in the Assessment Report, however, it is not mentioned here that the Town has discontinued use of these wells.	As the Town has discontinued use of the Golf Haven Water supply the system and associated mapping has been removed from the assessment report. Text was included in the plan regarding the Goldcrest system as the decommissioning process has not yet been fully completed. Source Protection Authority staff have been directed to follow-up with Town staff to explain how the decommissioning and partial decommissioning of systems has been treated within the assessment report and source protection plan.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Innisfil	8-Apr-14	SPP	SEWG(b)-5	The changes identified here result in the policy being unclear. Recommended wording would be: "...stormwater sources to sanitary sewers to reduce surges in volumes during wet weather, the removal of combined sewer overflow outlets to surface water and the establishment of upgrade priorities that focus on vulnerable areas where the activity..." to meet the intent described in the explanatory document.	The policy wording has been updated as suggested. The term "wet weather" has been swapped for inflow/outflow to provide a level of consistency between other stormwater management documents.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Innisfil	8-Apr-14	SPP	Glossary	Within the Glossary of Terms, the alteration to the Future Threat, Activity & Uses definition, section (c), results in this section of the definition being identical to Section (c) of the definition of an Existing Threat, Activity and Uses. Recommend wording as follows: "(c) an activity that is not presently occurring and has not occurred within the last ten years from the date of approval of the Source Protection Plan"	Part C of the definition of a future threat activity contained a copy and paste error. Part C of the definition has been updated as follows: "an activity that is not presently occurring and has not occurred within the last ten years from the date of approval of the source protection plan."	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Innisfil	8-Apr-14	SPP	Glossary	Within the Glossary of Terms, explanation of Restricted Land Use (policies), typos exist in the second sentence. Specifically, "of" should be replaced by "or" and "issues" with "issued".	The typographical errors have been corrected as suggested.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Penetanguishene	8-Apr-14	SPP/ED	General	The Public Works Director and Chief Water Operator for the Town of Penetanguishene have no comments on the revised explanatory and revised Source Protection Plan.	The SPC is appreciative of the time the Town has taken to review the changes to the Source Protection Plan. This comment has been received for information.	The Source Protection Authorities are appreciative of the time the Town has taken to review the changes to the source protection plan. This comment has been received for information.
Orillia	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 43	1st paragraph last line should read as Table 4 instead of Table 3	The broken hyper-link has been fixed. The text now references the correct table.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Orillia	8-Apr-14	SPP	Transition Provisions	On Page 57 of 197- 14 Transition Provisions- 1st paragraph, 2nd line should be approval-in-principle instead of approval-in-principal	The spelling error has been corrected as noted.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.

Comments Received During Pre-Consultation on the March 11, 2014 Revised Version of the Source Protection Plan						
Comment From	Date Received	SPP or ED	Policy/ Section Ref	Comment	SPC Response	SPAs Response
Orillia	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 63	1st paragraph line 6 should read as Environmental Compliance Approvals instead of certificates of approval.	The outdated terminology has been updated as suggested.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Orillia	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 69	Paragraph 2 appears to be slightly misleading. The circumstances determining whether an activity is a significant drinking water threat relate specifically to the drainage area (hectares) associated with the stormwater management facility discharge (discharge is defined as including addition, deposition, emission or leakage). This is because the stormwater could be untreated, discharging to source water.	The circumstances surrounding stormwater specifically use the term "stormwater management facility". The introductory text on page 67 reflects the Table of Circumstances terminology.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Orillia	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 95	1st line spelling of phosphorous	The typographical error has been corrected.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Orillia	8-Apr-14	ED	15	2nd paragraph line 5 should be approval-in-principle instead of approval-in-principal. 3rd paragraph line 2 should be approval-in-principle instead of approval in principal. 2nd paragraph, line 4 should be recognize instead of recognized	The typographical errors have been corrected as suggested.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Orillia	8-Apr-14	ED	Pg 53	3rd paragraph line 2, non-agricultural instead of non-agriculture. 3rd paragraph line 6, non-agricultural instead of non-agriculture.	The typographical errors have been corrected as suggested.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Orillia	8-Apr-14	ED	Pg 55/59	spelling for phosphorus	The typographical errors have been corrected as suggested.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Orillia	8-Apr-14	ED	95	Please check numbering.	The numbers referenced in the policy text correspond to the 21 drinking water threat numbers. This was done to ensure the threats were being referenced by consistent numbering throughout the various Source Protection Documents produced by the Source Protection Committee.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.

Comments Received During Pre-Consultation on the March 11, 2014 Revised Version of the Source Protection Plan						
Comment From	Date Received	SPP or ED	Policy/Section Ref	Comment	SPC Response	SPAs Response
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	General	Region of Peel staff have reviewed the SGBLS SPP dated March 11, 2014. Generally, we support the revisions and do not have substantial comments.	The SPC is appreciative of the time the Region has taken to review the changes to the Source Protection Plan.	The Source Protection Authorities are appreciative of the time the Region has taken to review the changes to the Source Protection Plan. This comment has been received for information.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	WAST(b)-1	Staff recommend checking the language "the existing establishment, operation or maintenance" this could be duplicated in WAST(b)-2 which is a prohibition policy.	There was a typographical error in policy WAST(b)-2 the words "existing or the " have been deleted. Policy WAST(b)-1 is intended to capture existing threat activities while policy WAST(b)-2 is intended to capture future threat activities.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	RCHG-2	Although this policy does not apply to the Region of Peel but in general staff support the policy revisions which will help the municipalities to consider the water quantity constraints when approving settlement area expansions in areas where recharge reduction is a potential issue (in WHPA-Q2). The province is requesting this examination be done when a planning approval authority is determining whether to permit an expansion of a settlement boundary. The policy encourages municipalities to consider water servicing and the impact on aquifers when approving area settlement area expansions. This requirement is likely already considered by public works and the conservation authorities as part of a municipal comprehensive review. But, the legal effect of this policy is Not Legally Binding/Must Conform with. It is unclear as to how two legal effects will be applied.	The SPP incorrectly identified policy RCHG-2 as a SA policy, which resulted in the assignment of two legal effects to capture both the municipal and provincial planning approval authorities. The policy has been moved to the land use planning section and assigned a legal effect of MC for both municipal and provincial planning approval authorities.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	RLU-1	Staff support the proposed modification as it provides for appropriate direction to be given to planning authorities and Building Officials.	The SPC is appreciative of this comment. It has been received for information.	The Source Protection Authorities are appreciative of this comment. It has been received for information.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	LUP-1	The policy amendment removed noted specific types of waste storage from the list of prohibited uses. Therefore, the area municipalities are being permitted to allow more storage of specified excluded wastes as defined under the Environmental Protection Act.	The SPC reconsidered the policy approach taken to address small amounts of wastes described in clauses p,q,r,s,t,u of the definition of hazardous waste O.Reg 347, based on new information provided by the MOE about what exactly is captured in the Table of Circumstances. As a result of this new information it was decided that small amounts of wastes p,q,r,s,t,u would be best addressed through education and outreach. Existing PCB waste management systems, and hazardous liquid industrial waste will be addressed through RMP, and are to be prohibited in the future. Please refer to the explanatory document for additional information.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 144-146	Municipalities have been added to the position of "policy implementer"; it needs to be clearly defined who is taking the lead and who is supporting or both are equally responsible for the implementation of the E&O programs.	The policy text directs the local SPA to collaborate with municipalities on the delivery of the education and outreach policies. The implementer column of the policy table has been updated to include the word 'lead' beside SPA.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.

Comments Received During Pre-Consultation on the March 11, 2014 Revised Version of the Source Protection Plan						
Comment From	Date Received	SPP or ED	Policy/Section Ref	Comment	SPC Response	SPAs Response
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 167-168	Acronyms list- we noted some administrative inconsistency; upper case, lower case etc. Example of this is MUN vs. Mun	The inconsistency of upper vs. lower case in acronyms has been resolved in the updated Source Protection Plan.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 151	MON-4 inconsistency is noted between Planning Approval Authorities under the Implementer column vs. Provincial Planning Approval Authorities under Policy Text. This is the only area listing Planning Approval Authorities at a provincial level.	The typographical error has been resolved to reference to correct implementing bodies in policy MON-4.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 173	Future Threat Activity and Uses- A future threat, activity and/or use are defined as: (c) an activity that is presently occurring or has occurred within the last ten years from the date of approval of the source protection plan. An activity that has not occurred within the last ten years from the date of the approval of the Source Protection Plan (MOE's definition). Staff would like clarification regarding, if the activity is currently occurring, how the activity can be a future activity.	Part C of the definition of a future threat activity contained a copy and paste error. Part C of the definition has been updated as follows: "an activity that is not presently occurring and has not occurred within the last ten years from the date of approval"	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	Pg 173	A typing error was noted in the following sentence: (e) an expansion, alteration or replacement of a use, activity, building or structure that does not reduce the risk of contaminating drinking ?? Is considered a future activity and subject to the future policy.	The term water is missing from the referenced sentence. The missing term has been added as recommended.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Peel	8-Apr-14	SPP	pg 180	RMO (Glossary of Terms)- the definition of RMO should also reference to powers and duties prescribed as per Part IV of the CWA. RMI- a typing error is noted for your consideration "... appointed as "an" risk management inspector.....	The definitions of Risk Management Official and Risk Management Inspector have been updated as suggested to specifically reference Part IV powers.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Midland	8-Apr-14	SPP	General	Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the changes to the Source Protection Plan, specifically Threats 19 & 20: Water Quantity Policies. At this time, staff have no comments to any of the proposed changes and support the new policies as presented.	The SPC is appreciative of the time the Town has taken to review the changes to the Source Protection Plan. This comment has been received for information.	The Source Protection Authorities are appreciative of the time the Town has taken to review the changes to the Source Protection Plan. This comment has been received for information.
Barrie	8-Apr-14	SPP	SALT(ICA)-1	The City understands that the policy has been altered to include only the WHPA-A portion of the ICA and is in support of the area that the policy applies. The City remains concerned with the enforcement of application rates on private property. Suggest Improvement: Providing courses such as Smart About Salt and requiring this type of certification maybe more beneficial than enforcing application rates through a RMP.	This comment has been received for information, and the recommendation to host a smart about salt course in the City of Barrie will be passed along to the local Conservation Authorities.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.

Comments Received During Pre-Consultation on the March 11, 2014 Revised Version of the Source Protection Plan						
Comment From	Date Received	SPP or ED	Policy/Section Ref	Comment	SPC Response	SPAs Response
Barrie	8-Apr-14	SPP	FUEL-1	Implementation of this policy requires considerable workload for a few significant fuel threats. The effort to validate documentation could be comparable to establishing a RMP. Suggested Improvement: Exempt low density residential properties without requiring documentation.	In consideration of recent fuel spill, this comment and the similar comment from York Region. The Source Protection Committee has reconsidered the approach taken to address home heating fuel. The policy has been revised to fully exempt existing home heating fuel from requiring a risk management plan, the education and outreach policy has been updated to target home heating fuel, and an additional policy has been added to target fuel tanks on abandoned properties.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Barrie	8-Apr-14	SPP	RLU-1	RMO does not have time to screen every building permit for the City. Issuing written direction specifying the circumstances under which a planning authority or building official may be permitted to make the determination that a site specific land use is not designated makes this policy confusing and difficult to implement. Suggested Improvement: Make this policy wording clear to state 'with the exception of residential uses'	The SPC considered this request. However, no change was made as the policy as proposed is worded to allow each individual RMO to decide which types of applications do not need to pass through the Risk Management Office. In the case of the City of Barrie, the written direction to the planning and building departments could be specific to residential uses.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Barrie	8-Apr-14	SPP	WAST(b)-1	The intention of the policy was to cover PCB storage expansions. Including small quantity of hazardous waste will make determination of whether a RMP is required difficult. Implementing a program to pick up these small quantities of hazardous waste may be more effective. Suggested Improvement: Address the threat through education and outreach	The SPC reconsidered the policy approach taken to address small amounts of wastes described in clauses pqrstu of the definition of hazardous waste O.Reg 347, based on new information provided by the MOE about what exactly is captured in the Table of Circumstances. As a result of this new information it was decided that small amounts of wastes p,q,r,s,t,u would be best addressed through education and outreach. Existing PCB waste management systems, and hazardous liquid industrial waste will be addressed through RMP, and are to be prohibited in the future. Please refer to the explanatory document for additional information.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Barrie	8-Apr-14	SPP	LUP-1	Policy will be difficult to implement. Suggested Improvement: Change policy to exclude storage of wastes described in clauses P, Q, R, S, T, U of the definition of hazardous waste.	The policy as proposed currently excludes the storage of wastes described in p,q,r,s,t u of the definition from being address through Land Use Planning, as the SPC noted that a considerable amount of challenges may be encountered when implementing the policy.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
Barrie	8-Apr-14	SPP	COND-2	This policy requires the City to notify the SPA of applications under the Planning Act affecting a site identified as a significant threat but it does not state the purpose or any requirements that may be imposed. Suggested Improvement: State a clear purpose and objective.	The purpose and objectives of policy COND-2 are outlined in the accompanying explanatory document. An excerpt of the explanatory document has been copied below for reference/ "..... It should be noted that Policy 3.2.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement directs that contaminated sites shall be remediated as necessary prior to any activities related to the pre-development proposal proceeding. This re-development proposal may ultimately resolve the condition and therefore no more monitoring of this condition would be necessary...."	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.

Comments Received During Pre-Consultation on the March 11, 2014 Revised Version of the Source Protection Plan						
Comment From	Date Received	SPP or ED	Policy/Section Ref	Comment	SPC Response	SPAs Response
MOE	9-Apr-14	SPP	WAST(b)-2	<p>Some examples of actual land uses that may be considered a threat under these sub-categories include: salvage yards; commercial industrial/manufacturing properties that process high end photography/photo finishing and laboratories, including those associated with institutions, welding works, etc.</p> <p>The policies that prohibit all waste as currently written, could affect certain existing waste generators and the impact could be more extensive than intended. We would like to have a discussion about the SPC's intention and scope these policies to assist you in assessing whether or not the policies capture what the SPC intended to capture.</p>	<p>The SPC reconsidered the policy approach taken to address small amounts of wastes described in clauses pqrstu of the definition of hazardous waste O.Reg 347, based on new information provided by the MOE about what exactly is captured in the Table of Circumstances. As a result of this new information it was decided that small amounts of wastes p,q,r,s,t,u would be best addressed through education and outreach. Existing PCB waste management systems, and hazardous liquid industrial waste will be addressed through RMP, and are to be prohibited in the future. Please refer to the explanatory document for additional information.</p>	<p>The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.</p>
MOE	9-Apr-14	SPP	DEMD-5	<p>MOI is not a provincial planning approval authority. Recommend rewording this to read "MOI and MMAH" in the policy text.</p>	<p>The policy has been reworded to read "MOI and MMAH..." as recommended.</p>	<p>The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.</p>
MOE	9-Apr-14	SPP	RCHG-1	<p>Planning approval authorities include municipalities and the OMB. This term should be reserved for policies on list A.</p>	<p>The policy has been moved to the LUP policy section and added to list A as suggested.</p>	<p>The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.</p>
MOE	9-Apr-14	SPP	RCHG-2	<p>Is RCHG-2 meant to be implemented under the land use planning system? IF yes, then the policy tool should be identified as LUP and the policy should be on List A.</p>	<p>The policy has been moved to the LUP policy section and added to list A as suggested.</p>	<p>The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.</p>
MOE	9-Apr-14	SPP	RLU-1	<p>Using the term circumstances here could be confusing as we use circumstances to describe threats. Consider using another term.</p>	<p>The term circumstances has been changed to situations to reduce confusion with the Table of Circumstances.</p>	<p>The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.</p>

Comments Received During Pre-Consultation on the March 11, 2014 Revised Version of the Source Protection Plan						
Comment From	Date Received	SPP or ED	Policy/Section Ref	Comment	SPC Response	SPAs Response
MOE	9-Apr-14	SPP	LUP-9	It is unclear how this policy would be implemented. Is MOE to comment on the appropriateness of a development application? This is generally a municipal role. It may be more appropriate to end the policy after "on a sustainable basis". Consider changing the highlighted word "demonstrated" to "maintained". These comments apply to LUP-10.	The intent of this policy was not have MOE review and comment on the appropriateness of a development application. Rather, that the appropriate planning approval authority make sure a PTTW or approval-in-principle to issue a PTTW has been obtained prior to approving new developments or site alterations. The implementation of this policy could result in some changes to the order in which planning approvals have traditionally been issued. Additional information has been added to the explanatory document.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
MOE	9-Apr-14	SPP	LUP-12	Consider defining the word "major" in LUP-12. It appears that this policy will apply to all new development other than single detached residential (and accessory uses/structures?). In defining "major" it should be clear that "non-major" in LUP-13 is anything other than "major".	The proposed definition of major development was intended to be included in the Pre-Consultation version of the Source Protection Plan. The definition the SPC is proposing to follow is similar to both the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. The proposed definitions of major and non-major development have been added to the Source Protection Plan. "Major development means the construction of a building or building on a lot with the ground floor area cumulatively equal to 500 m ² (5382 sqft), and any other impervious surface. Note single detached residential properties are exempt from the definition. Non-major development is considered to be anything not captured in the definition of major.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.
MOI	11-Apr-14	SPP	General	We at the Ontario Growth Secretariat at the Ministry of Infrastructure have reviewed the proposed plan and note that new policies to protect water quantity have been added under Threats 19 and 20, as a result of water budget and risk assessment studies in Midland, Penetanguishene, York Region, and Bradford. We have reviewed these policies and have no concerns or comments.	The SPC is appreciative of the time the Ministry has taken to review the changes to the Source Protection Plan. This comment has been received for information.	The Source Protection Authorities are appreciative of the time the Ministry has taken to review the changes to the Source Protection Plan. This comment has been received for information.
York	March, 2014	SPP	FUEL-1	Implementation of this policy requires considerable workload for a few significant fuel threats. The effort to validate documentation could be comparable to establishing a RMP. Suggested Improvement: Exempt low density residential properties without requiring documentation.	In consideration of recent fuel spill, this comment and the similar comment from the City of Barrie. The Source Protection Committee has reconsidered the approach taken to address home heating fuel. The policy has been revised to fully exempt existing home heating fuel from requiring a risk management plan, the education and outreach policy has been updated to target home heating fuel, and an additional policy has been added to target fuel tanks on abandoned properties.	The source protection authorities support the approach the source protection committee took to address this comment.