



# Source Water Protection

2015 Annual Report



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This annual report is provided in accordance with s. 81 of the *Clean Water Act, 2006*. It outlines the activities undertaken by the City of Barrie in 2015 that were required by legislation (staff appointments and training), as well as a summary of progress to date in implementing the Source Protection Plan.

## 2. RISK MANAGEMENT OFFICIAL AND INSPECTORS

*\*Please only complete this section if the requested information has been updated since last year, or if you have new information to add that has not previously been submitted to the SPA.\**

- 1) Provide name (s) and contact information of appointed RMOs and RMIs.

\_\_\_\_\_ passed by-law # \_\_\_\_\_ to appoint a Risk Management Official, an alternate Risk Management Official and (\_\_\_\_) Risk Management Inspectors, see table below. Certificates of appointment were issued to each RMO and RMI by the Municipal Clerk.

<i>Staff Name</i>	<i>Title/ Role</i>	<i>Contact Email</i>
*Katie Thompson	Risk Management Official Risk Management Inspector	<a href="mailto:Katie.Thompson@barrie.ca">Katie.Thompson@barrie.ca</a>
Sherry Diemert	Alternate Risk Management Official/Inspector	<a href="mailto:Sherry.Diemert@barrie.ca">Sherry.Diemert@barrie.ca</a>

**\*Comment:** In the summer of 2015, the City began and successfully completed recruitment of a new Risk Management Official. In early 2016, the City passed a by-law 2016-004 to formally appoint the new staff member as a Risk Management Official. A copy of the by-law has been forwarded to the Source Protection Authorities.

## 3. ONTARIO REGULATION 287/07 REQUIRED TRAINING

*\*Please only complete this section if the requested information has been updated since last year, or if you have new information to add that has not previously been submitted to the SPA.\**

- 1) Provide name (s) of RMOs and RMIs who have completed the Part IV and S. 88 training courses.

The Risk Management Officials and Risk Management Inspectors have completed Director-approved training courses as per Ontario Regulation 287/07 under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*; as shown below:

<i>Staff Name</i>	<i>RMO/RMI Training Date Year/ month</i>	<i>Property Entry Training Date Year/ month</i>
Katie Thompson	June, 2012	May, 2012

#### **4. RISK MANAGEMENT OFFICE**

Given that the overwhelming majority of RMOs are just beginning to undertake the development of the Risk Management Plans with the person engaged in the threat activity, and as a result, the majority of the values presented in section 81 and 46 will be zero. Please provide a high level overview of the work the Risk Management Office undertook in 2015 by answering the following questions.

##### **1) Provide a summary of the RMO and program actions undertaken/ completed in 2015.**

In 2015, the risk management office undertook a number of activities to prepare for and implement the source protection plan. Highlights of the work accomplished in 2015 are noted below:

- Since the plan came into effect on July 1, 2015, the risk management office has been actively reviewing building and planning applications for Part IV policy compliance.
- The risk management office issued 23 notices to proceed related to building applications, and provided comments on 20 planning pre-consultation inquiries.
- Using the provisions of the s.59 policy, the risk management office provided direction to development services to include standard comments on the handling and storage of salt and DNAPLs on planning files under review in vulnerable areas. All planning application files in the WHPA-A are circulated to the risk management office for review. This has reduced the number of applications reviewed by the risk management official
- The City's risk management official continues to be chair for the local risk management official working group, and a member of the provincial risk management official working group.
- The City worked with the source protection authorities to develop the web based tool for municipalities to track the required data.
- The City collaborated with a number of other risk management officials to develop standard risk management measures screening forms, and risk management plan templates for the different threat categories that require a risk management plan. The city's risk management inspector led the development of risk management measures screening forms for the "ICI" threat category.
- Templates and forms for the Notices and Orders to achieve a consistent approach to Source Protection Plan implementation were developed. The templates and forms were enhanced through collaboration with other Risk Management Officials.
- The City started development of a comprehensive communications strategy for the Source Water Program. Complete Implementation of the strategy was put on hold due to a staffing change mid-year, and the pending development of an education and outreach policy implementation strategy from the Source Protection Authorities.
- A Source Water Protection webpage was created to educate the residents and business owners on the program, and to answer frequently asked questions. Staff received compliments from other municipalities on the website content. The website can be accessed by following the link below: <http://www.barrie.ca/Living/Environment/Pages/SourceWaterProtection.aspx>
- Two "This Week in Barrie" articles were published with a source water protection message.
- Training was provided to frontline staff on the Source Protection Program. A guidance document and online mapping tool were created to support front line staff and overall customer service.
- An annual liaison meeting was held with the local Ministry of Environment and Climate Change district office.

- The City's risk management inspector provided threat verification services for the Township of Wasaga Beach.
- In the first half of 2015, the Township of Springwater made a decision to have the City of Barrie provide Part IV implementation services for the Township. In July, a one year agreement was signed. Activities completed under this agreement included:
  - Conducting windshield surveys, and site visits for the purpose of verifying existing significant drinking water threats.
  - Providing a training session for Township departments on the implementation process
  - Established and implemented a process to have planning and building applications reviewed for Part IV compliance.

**2) Provide a summary of the number of inspections/field visits completed in 2015.**

The City of Barrie Risk Management Inspector has conducted site visits at 236 facilities to-date for the purpose of verifying existing significant drinking water threats. The maximum total number of threats verified subject to Part IV policies is 215.

**3) Provide an update on the threat verification process, and highlight the number of parcels that require a risk management plan to be negotiated.**

The maximum number of parcels subject to a risk management plan is 215. Some of the threats counted may turn out to be false/not require a risk management plan pending forthcoming guidance from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change. Threats related to paints or sealants are considered to be potential significant threats due to uncertainty about the chemical properties or contaminants of concern in products handled and stored at facilities.

**4) Provide a summary of the work planned for 2016.**

The 2016 work plan includes the following activities to continue with Source Protection Plan implementation:

- On-going review of planning and building applications for s.59 and Part IV compliance.
- Finalize Risk Management Plan templates for the applicable significant drinking water threats (Salt, Snow, DNAPLs, Fuel and Waste).
- Develop the business processes for Part IV compliance inspections and enforcement protocols.
- Commence the necessary updates to the Official Plan and Zoning to comply with the Source Protection Plan.
- Begin Risk Management Plan negotiations starting with City owned facilities, and then moving on towards privately owned facilities.
- Develop a Source Water Protection by-law.
- Installation of road signs noting drinking water protection zones.
- Develop an education and outreach communications strategy.
- Source Water Protection training sessions will be provided to by-law, environmental services, fire, field coordinators and operations staff.

## **5. S.81- LEGISLATED ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

Under S.65 (1) of O.Reg 287/07, all RMOs must provide the following information annually under S.81 of the Clean Water Act. This content is mandatory.

- 1) How many Risk Management Plans have been agreed to under s. 58 (5) of the CWA?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each RMP that has been agreed to provide:

The location of the property to which the Risk Management Plan relates

The WHPA or IPZ in which the property is located

The threat activity to which the RMP relates

- 2) How many Risk Management Plans have been established by Order under s.58 (10) of the CWA?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each RMP established by Order provide:

The location of the property to which the Risk Management Plan relates

The WHPA or IPZ in which the property is located

The threat activity to which the RMP relates

- 3) How many Risk management Plans has the RMO established by Order under s.58(12) of the CWA, as a result of an application for a Risk Management Plan made by a person engaged under s. 58(11) of the CWA?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each RMP established under s. 58(12) Order provide:

The location of the property to which the Risk Management Plan relates

The WHPA or IPZ in which the property is located

The threat activity to which the RMP relates

- 4) How many Risk Management Plans has the RMO refused to agree to or establish under ss. 58(16) or 58(15) of the CWA?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each RMP that has been refused under ss 58(16) list:

A brief description of the reasons for refusal

Location of the property to which the refusal relates

WHPA or IPZ where the property is located

Activity to which the RMP relates

- 5) How many Orders has the RMO issued under Part IV of the CWA?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each Order that has been issued provide:

A brief description of the circumstances related to the Order  
The location of the property to which the Order relates  
The WHPA or IPZ where the property is located  
The activity to which the Order relates

- 6) How many notices have been received from a person engaged in an activity, notifying the RMO of their possession/intent to obtain a prescribed instrument under ss.61 (2) & (7) of the CWA.

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each notice received provide:

The location of the property to which the notice relates

The WHPA or IPZ where the property is located

The activity to which the notice relates

The type of prescribed instrument if any, referred to in the notice and any information needed to identify the prescribed instrument

- 7) How many notices has the RMO issued under s. 61(6) & (8) of the CWA, notifying a person engaged in a threat activity of the **termination of an exemption** provided under s.61 (1).

**Answer:** State total number: 0

The location of the property to which the notice relates

The WHPA or IPZ where the property is located

The activity to which the notice relates

The type of prescribed instrument if any, referred to in the notice and reason for termination (e.g. timeline passed, not eligible for PI etc.,)

- 8) How many times was a s.61 (1) exemption granted?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

The location of the property to which the notice relates

The WHPA or IPZ where the property is located

The activity to which the notice relates

The type of prescribed instrument for which the s. 61(1) exemption was granted

- 9) What is the total number of inspections that were carried out for activities that require a Risk Management Plan under s.58 of the CWA?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

**Note: Risk Management Plans have not yet been implemented. The City of Barrie RMI has conducted inspections/site visits at 236 facilities to-date for the purpose of verifying existing significant drinking water threats.**

- 10) Of the inspections carried out for activities requiring a RMP, how many were found to be in non-compliance with the specific contents of the RMP?

**Answer:** State total number: Not applicable

Indicate the threat activity to which each s.58 non-compliance pertains to

11) What is the total number of inspections carried out for activities that were prohibited?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

Indicate the threat activity: \_\_\_\_\_

No, confirmed significant drinking water threats within the Township are subject to an existing prohibition policy. Therefore, no formal inspections were required to confirm the activity has ceased.

12) Of the number of inspections undertaken in respect to an activity to which s.57 of the Act applied, in how many cases was the person engaged in contravention with s. 57 of the Act?

**Answer:** List number of contraventions with s.57: 0

Provide a description of the circumstances surrounding the contravention: \_\_\_\_\_

13) How many Risk Assessments have been **submitted, accepted, and not accepted** under s.60 of the CWA.

**Answer:** State total number for each category (submitted/accepted/not accepted): 0

For each Risk Assessment that has been submitted provide:

The location of the property to which the Risk Assessment relates

The WHPA or IPZ where the property is located

The activity to which the Risk Assessment relates

14) How many times has the RMO caused a thing to be done under s. 64 of the CWA?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each instance that the RMO caused a thing to be done provide:

The location of the property to which the notice under s.64 relates

The WHPA and IPZ where the property is located

The activity to which the notice under s. 64 of the CWA relates

15) How many prosecutions have been made under s. 106 of CWA?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each prosecution, please provide a brief description of the related offence.

16) How many prosecutions made under s.106 of the CWA have resulted in a conviction?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each conviction provide a brief description of the related offence: \_\_\_\_\_

## **6. SECTION 46 ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

The following questions are being asked by the SPC in support of the Section 46 Annual Reporting Requirements. Please note some of the questions below have been requested by the MOECC. If you have not been recording this information as of yet, please make a note below, and provide us with feedback as to whether or not you will be able to track this information going forward.

1) During inspections, where the RMI found a **significant non-compliance** with the contents of a RMP, indicate the length of time it took to bring the activity back into compliance with the terms of the RMP. An approximation is acceptable.

**Answer:** Not applicable

2) During inspections, where the RMI found a major non-compliance with a **section 57 prohibition**, indicate the length of time it took to bring the activity back into compliance with the SPP.

**Answer:** Not applicable

3) During inspections, how many times did the RMI come across **new** significant threat activities on site that were previously not addressed through the implementation process? For each newly identified threat, list the threat activity and provide a brief explanation outlining why the new threat had been established (e.g. expanded operations, change in circumstances surrounding threat – now more being stored etc...). Did you take action to respond to the threat, if yes, please provide a brief explanation of the actions that you took.

**Answer:** Not applicable

4) For persons without existing PIs, applying for an exemption under s.61 (1), how much time overall (from notice of RMP requirement to receipt of statement of conformity) did it take to obtain a confirmation of exemption? Please circle your answer.

**Answer:** Not applicable

5) For each RMP that has been agreed to or established, was the person engaged undertaking any risk management measures to address the threat activity **prior** to receiving the notice of RMP requirement? Please circle your response.

**Answer:** Not applicable

6) How many times was the RMO unable to issue a s.59 Notice to Proceed? Generally, in those situations where a s. 59 Notice to Proceed could not be issued, provide a brief explanation of the reasons why (i.e. nature of the operation did not allow application to be altered to meet requirements, applicant unwilling to alter etc..)

**Answer:** Not applicable

7) How many existing prohibitions were confirmed on the landscape?

**Answer:** State total number: 0

For each instance a prohibited activity was confirmed provide:

The location of the property to which the prohibition relates

The WHPA or IPZ where the property is located

A brief description of how willing the person engaged was too ceasing the prohibited activity \_\_\_\_\_

## **7. OPTIONAL OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS TO AID IN A QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF POLICY EFFECTIVENESS**

These questions are being asked to support a qualitative assessment of policy effectiveness. Responses to these questions will be collected over a five year period, and incorporated into the five year



implementation review. Please respond where applicable to your implementation experiences. We acknowledge that many of the questions will be marked as not applicable for this year, as policy implementation has just begun.

This space has been provided for you to share any implementation successes, failures, frustrations, gaps, or other comments with the Source Protection Committee & Source Protection Authority (ies).

- 1) Generally, in circumstances where a prohibited activity was proposed, how readily available were alternatives to the prohibited activity? How willing was the applicant to alter their application to meet SW requirements.

Not applicable.

- 2) Does enforcing a prohibition require more or less work than anticipated? (I.e. would negotiating a RMP have been simpler/ achieved the same result in the end as prohibition?)

Not applicable.

- 3) How accepting were people with the requirement to cease a prohibited activity? Were applicants generally open to implementing alternatives or altering their application to satisfy prohibition policy requirements?

Not Applicable. No confirmed significant drinking water threats within the City are subject to a prohibition policy.

- 4) In circumstances where applicants were required to alter their application in order to get a s.59 Notice to Proceed, how many application submissions, on average, were required before a notice could be issued?

Not applicable.

- 5) Generally, how often were potential significant threat issues resolved through pre-consultation?

Not applicable, as most commonly no significant drinking water threat activities have been proposed to which a Part IV policy applies.

- 6) Generally, how many days on average did it take to negotiate and complete a Risk Management Plan for each of the following sectors: agricultural, industrial, commercial/institutional, municipal (include time spent in meetings, conversations with client, review/sign-off, etc.,) An approximation is acceptable. Suggested Answer format for each sector: <1day, 1-3 days, 3-6 day, 6-10days, >10days. If greater than 10 days, please note the reason why.

Not Applicable. The focus of 2015 was to complete the threat verification exercise and develop a work plan for risk management plan negotiations. Risk Management Plan negotiations will begin in 2016.

- 7) Generally, how much time overall (from the time you first approached the person engaged, to RMP agreement/establishment) did it take to complete the RMP process? Suggested Answer format: <2months, 2-4months, 4-6 months, 6-8months, 8-10months, 10-12months, >1year. If greater than 1 year, please note the reasons why.

Not Applicable.

- 8) In general, with the inclusion of conditions in a s. 59 Notice, were potential moderate or low threat activities created? (i.e. conditions in the notice prevented creation of significant threat activity, but allowed for potential moderate or low threat activity to continue.)

No comment.

- 9) In general, can you identify any loopholes or gaps (either in the tables of circumstances, source protection legislation, source protection plan, or other) that applicants are using to get around the requirements posed by the source protection plan policies?

No comment.

- 10) For s.59 applications where it was determined that neither s. 57 nor s.58 apply, indicate the most common reasons why ( i.e. just a moderate threat, conditions included in Notice to Proceed that prevent threat from becoming significant, activity moved to boundaries outside WHPA –A etc., etc..)

Most commonly, no significant threat activities have been proposed in relation to applications to which a Part IV policy applies.

- 11) Have there been any occasions where processes set up to flag catch the potential creation of a significant drinking water threat have failed? Explain the circumstances of the situation and what you did to correct it.

No.

- 12) Have there been any occasions where the Spills Action Centre had to be notified of a substance being discharged into the raw water supply of an existing municipal drinking water system considered in the Assessment Report under s.89(1) of the Clean Water Act? If yes, please provide a brief description of the circumstances surrounding the incident. Did the party responsible for the drinking water health hazard have a RMP in place? If a RMP was in place, was the party responsible for the drinking water health hazard in compliance with the terms of the agreed upon RMP?

No.

- 13) Were any emerging threat activities observed that could not be addressed through the source water protection program because the activity could not be designated as a significant drinking water threat (e.g. activity wasn't one of the 21 prescribed threats, activity could only be designated as a moderate threat per the table of circumstances etc.,).

We have identified a few activities that would seem to pose some level of potential risk but are not considered significant threats due to prescribed threats and circumstances.

- In WHPA-A, we have a business with a large (several m<sup>3</sup>) tank holding driveway sealant. The product does not appear to qualify as a DNAPL, Fuel, Organic Solvent, or Waste, but we assume that due to the quantity of this petroleum-based product that there is some risk.
- In WHPA-B, there is a business with large tanks (several m<sup>3</sup>) and drums of polyurethane resin and isocyanates for spray foam insulation. The resin component may be able to be interpreted as a DNAPL, but it is unclear based on the circumstances. The isocyanate component is not included under any threat category.
- There are several automotive scrap yards within the WHPA-B where waste fluids are drained from vehicles. Due to the vulnerability score, the storage of hazardous or liquid industrial waste is not considered a significant threat.

## **8. Official Plan Amendments**

The table below lists a number of tasks that will need to be completed in order to ensure compliance with **the land use planning policies** in the source protection plan and s. 40 and s.42 of the Clean Water Act. Place a checkmark beneath the statement that currently best describes the **development status** of the task listed in the far left column. Use the comment section to add any relevant comments and information.

<b>s. 46 Tasks</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>In progress</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
A Planning lead has been designated/hired as the key contact for the integration of SWP into the Official Plan (this may include hiring a consultant)	√			
Existing O.P and zoning by-laws have been reviewed and scoped for required changes		√		
Official Plan and Zoning By-law update discussions are underway		√		
Action Plan for O.P & zoning by-law updates has been developed (timing of rollout and key milestone identified)		√		
Template and/or draft O.P and Zoning by-laws have been drafted and circulated internally for comments			√	
Final draft of OP amendment complete			√	
All planners have been trained on SWP policies, and upcoming amendments		√		
OP amendment finalized and ready for inclusion upon next O.P update		√- See Comment		

**Comments:** Planning processes and application forms have been amended. Planners and frontline staff have received some training for screening application processes. An official plan amendment with assessment report mapping and some initial policies were put in place prior to Source Protection Plan approval in 2014. The next layer of work will entail more detailed policy, more emphasis will be on

zoning provisions, and developing design guidelines for salt management-mainly implemented through site plan control. At this time a determination has not been made as to whether this process will be a stand-alone official plan amendment or form part of a new/or updated Official Plan process.

## **9. Mandatory Septic Re-Inspection Program**

1) Has the municipality determined how many (if any) septic inspections will need to be performed in source protection vulnerable areas?

Yes (v)                      In progress                      No

If **yes**, list the number of septic systems that will need to be re-inspected under the Building Code Act.

Five active septic systems have been identified for inspection under the building code act.

2) Has a lead authority or contact been designated or hired to coordinate and carry out the septic inspection program in your municipality?

Yes (v)                      In progress                      No

If **yes**, please list their contact information below:

<b>Septic Re-inspection Program Lead</b>	
Name	Chris Glanville
Title /Role	Acting Manager of Building Services
Email	Chris.glanville@barrie.ca
Telephone	705-739-4220 Ext 4501

3) Has the municipality developed an inspection protocol?

Yes (v)                      In progress                      No

If **yes**, please briefly describe the inspection protocol below:

- Notices mailed to affected property owners
- Property owner pays inspection fee
- City of Barrie building inspectors complete a visual inspection of the septic system
- Final City of Barrie report provided to property owner
- Documentation is recorded and stored by the Building Services branch
- 5-yr re-inspection cycle commences

4) Are septic inspections underway?

Yes (v)                      No

If **yes**, what percentage of systems have been inspected to date?

100% of Clean Water Act triggered inspections have been completed to date. Lake Simcoe Protection Plan triggered inspections will continue in 2016.

- 5) Please place a checkmark beside the additional supporting documentation that has been developed as part of the septic inspection program :
- Inspection report templates (v)
  - Database to manage inspection information (v)
  - Notification materials for landowners subject to septic inspections (v)
  - By-laws requiring collection of fees for septic inspection (v)
- 6) Septic inspections triggered under the Building Code will need to be completed by **January 19, 2017**. When do you anticipate having the septic inspections completed?

All septic inspections triggered by the Clean Water Act have been completed.

### **10. New, Altered, or Decommissioned Drinking water Systems**

- 1) Are there any new planned or potential drinking water systems (wells or intakes) within the next five years?

Yes            No            Other (v)

If **yes**, describe:

- Type of system (surface or groundwater): A new well was drilled in 2010 to replace existing well 4. The new well is commonly named Well 4a.
- Current planning status: The new well is currently online.
- Location: Perry Street Well 4a is located 8 metres away from well 4, and is screened in the same aquifer.
- Timing for bringing the system/intake/or well online: Well 4a is currently online and is supplying water for the City. Well 4 is no longer in use.

- 2) Has the necessary technical work for the new well/intake/system been completed (e.g. delineation of wellhead protection areas/ intake protection zones and identification of significant drinking water threats?

Yes            No (v)

If **no**, what is the expected completion date of technical work?

The completion of technical work has been deemed not required for the replacement well. The new well is located 8 metres south from existing well 4. The new well is permitted to pump at the exact same rate as the old well. Both wells are screened in the top of what is interpreted to be the A3 aquifer. The only

notable difference between the two wells is the location of the screens. For existing well 4 the screen is set at 44-53.3 mbgl, and for new well 4a the screen is located between 50-56.1 mbgl.

3) Is the municipality planning to decommission an existing well, intake, or system?

Yes          No          Other (v)

If **yes**, please list

- Name of system : Well 4- Central Wellfield
- Location of system: Perry Street
- Projected timeline for decommissioning:

Well 4 was decommissioned in 2014. A copy of the decommissioning record will be forwarded to the Source Protection Committee, along with the other required documentation to initiate the assessment report update.

4) Please describe any changes to existing levels of any contaminant in the raw water since approval of Assessment Report.

#### Existing Conditions

The number of sites considered to be an existing condition significant drinking water threat has been reduced from six to one, as a result of correcting a technical error in the assessment report.

The City continues to implement a Voluntary Municipal Groundwater Monitoring Program to determine the potential for impact to the municipal water supply from groundwater impacted by volatile organic compounds, trichlorethylene (TCE) and vinyl chloride. This monitoring program has been on-going since 2003. The 2014 report indicates that concentration of TCE and its breakdown products are relatively stable or declining in the vicinity of Well 3A, 5, 12 and 15. Based on the results from the 2014 report, it is concluded that low concentrations of VOC are present in the municipal supply aquifer, but have continued to remain fairly stable and well below the Ontario Drinking Water Standard. It should be noted that TCE was not observed at any of the municipal wells. The South and North Plumes are observed to be continuously migrating slowly to the east toward the Wastewater Treatment Facility. Observations made in 2014 indicate that the core of the South Plume is located west of Anne Street, in the vicinity of Tiffin street and the ACDC railway. The report goes on to state that the extent of the plume is fairly stable and concentrations appear to be declining overall.

Based on 2013 and 2014 data, the peak concentration of TCE within the North Plume is currently observed adjacent to the Wastewater Treatment Facility at Bradford Street. The report also references that concentrations within the Wastewater Treatment Facility property are expected to increase in the future; however, it is noted that TCE is not detected in monitoring wells located on the eastern property boundary of the Wastewater Treatment Facility to date.

Recommendations made in the report for 2015 were to continue with the existing monitoring program. This includes the following:

- a) Semi-annual sampling of the sentinel monitoring wells;
- b) Monthly monitoring for volatile organic compounds at the municipal supply wells;
- c) Annual sampling for the remainder of the monitoring wells.

#### Issues Contributing Area

Based on the review of the data as part of the Assessment Report preparation, drinking water issues were identified for the City of Barrie. Well 3A, 11, 12 and 14 for increasing trends for chloride concentrations and well 11 and 12 increasing trends of sodium. The City continues to monitor sodium and chloride concentrations in the raw water at all municipal supply wells, and the surface treatment plant.

- 5) Describe the status of any revisions to the Municipal Water Servicing Master Plans and/ or Class EAs to establish new municipal water supplies

At this time, the City does not plan to establish new municipal water supplies that were not included in the assessment report.

For further information regarding this report, please contact:

Name: Katie Thompson, P.Ge  
Position: Risk Management Official  
Email/Phone: 705-739-4220 ext. 4796