

Name of Municipality: Township of Oro-Medonte

Name of SPA(s) submitted to: Severn Sound SPA

Staff Contact: Keith Sherman, Risk Management Official

Submitted by: Township of Oro-Medonte

Date Submitted: February 8, 2016

Note: This template is being provided to satisfy the Annual Reporting Requirements of the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan that came into effect on July 1, 2015. For those in multiple Source Protection Regions, it is recommended that you check in with them for additional reporting requirements.

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 Township of Oro-Medonte 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.

Township of Oro-Medonte passed by-law # 2015-113 to appoint a Risk Management Official and 2 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>
1 Keith Sherman	SSEA Exec. Dir – RMO/RMI	ksherman@midland.ca
2 Melissa Carruthers	Data Mgmt Tech/RMI - RMI	mcarruthers@midland.ca
3		
4		

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/ day</i>	<i>Property Entry Training Date Year/ month/ day</i>
1 Melissa Carruthers	2014/12/19	2014/12/16
2		
3		
4		

4. RISK MANAGEMENT OFFICE

Given that the overwhelming majority of RMOs are just beginning to undertake the development of the RMPs 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.

Part IV

The Township of Oro-Medonte appointed the Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA) staff Keith Sherman to act as the Township's Risk Management Official/ Risk Management Inspector and Melissa Carruthers as a Risk Management Inspector. Other RMO/RMI activities included: setting up the filing system and threats verification database for existing SDWTs; Assembling other pertinent information provided by municipal staff and from the renter or owner concerning the property to assist in confirming and verifying the existing SDWTs on the property and for use in future discussions concerning risk management with the landowners and/or renters; contacting landowners and/or renters through site visits, follow-up calls, windshield surveys and mailed surveys and letters; determining the status of threat activities on the ground wherever possible; updating the threat enumeration for each WHPA within the Township; populating a threats verification database for existing SDWTs. The information on each threat property was included in a threat table (excel spreadsheet).

Education & Outreach

Working with seven other municipalities (District of Muskoka, Townships of Tay, Tiny, Severn, and Georgian Bay as well as the Towns of Midland and Penetanguishene) to develop a unified approach to education and outreach. This unified approach has included the preliminary design of educational brochures and road signage that is consistent with the Ministry standard to make the public aware of the WHPA and IPZ areas within each of the municipalities.

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

Three field visits of existing SDWT properties have been completed to date, two of which were completed in 2015. The purpose of the visits was for threat verification. These numbers do not include any phone interviews, surveys, meetings or other methods of threat verification.

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 table below highlights the current status of existing SDWT verification within the Township of Oro-Medonte. The AR numbers of existing SDWTs from the Approved Assessment Reports (2011 and 2015) and the LSRCA database (DB) are shown below. Pending number of threats is calculated by subtracting the removed and confirmed threat numbers from the DB # and the total number of threats is calculated by adding together the added, confirmed and pending threats columns.

Total Existing Significant Drinking Water Threats in the Township of Oro-Medonte									
Threat #	Threat Category	2011 AR #	2015 AR #	DB #	Added	Removed	Confirmed	Pending	Total
1b	Waste Disposal Sites	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2a	Stormwater	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2b	Sewage Treatment Facil.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2c	Septics	138	126	147	12	33	113	1	126
3	Application of ASM	4	0	4	0	4	0	0	0
4	Storage of ASM.	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
6	Application of NASM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	Handle/Store of NASM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Applic'n of Com. Fert.	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
9	Handle/ Store Com. Fert.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	Application of Pesticide	5	3	5	0	2	0	3	3
11	Handle/Store Pesticide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	Handle/Store Fuel	11	11	12	0	1	0	0	0
15	Handle/Store Fuel - WHPA wide	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
16	Handle/Store DNAPL	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0
17	Handle/Store Organic Solv.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	Livestock Grazing Area	2	1	2	0	1	1	0	1
	Total	164	144	174	12	44	115	15	142

There are 15 threats remaining to be verified in the Township of Oro-Medonte. Those threats include 1 septic, 3 application of pesticide, and 11 WHPA wide residential handling and storage of fuel threats.

Of 136 parcels subject to Source Protection Plan policies, 3 parcels may require a risk management plan to be negotiated

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

RMO work planned for 2016 is to complete verification of the pending threats, start on the risk management plans required within the Township, and address any new threats through section 59 notices and risk management plans, where appropriate.

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 formal inspections but threat verification site visits have been completed

Indicate the threat activity (ies) for which the inspection pertains to

- 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 0

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 formal inspections but threat verification site visits have been completed

Indicate the threat activity: _____

- 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?

List number of contraventions with s.57: 0 formal inspections but threat verification site visits have been completed

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: <1 month, 1-3months, 3-6months, >6 months. If greater than 6 months, please note the reasons why.

Not encountered as yet.

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: <1 month, 1-3months, 3-6months, >6 months. If greater than 6 months, please note the reasons why.

Not encountered as yet.

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: State total number _____

List newly identified threat activity _____

Provide a brief explanation outlining why the new significant threat has been established: _____

Provide a brief explanation of how you responded to the newly identified threat activity: _____

Not encountered as yet.

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: <2months, 2-4months, 4-6 months, 6-8months, 8-10months, 10-12months, >1year. If greater than 1 year, please note the reasons why.

Not encountered as yet.

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: Yes /No

Not encountered as yet.

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: state total number: 0

Provide a brief explanation of the reasons why a s. 59 Notice to Proceed could not be issued: _____

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.

None proposed as yet.

- 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 encountered as yet.

- 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 encountered as yet.

- 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 encountered as yet.

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

Not encountered as yet.

- 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 encountered as yet.

- 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 encountered as yet.

- 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

- 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

- 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..)

Not encountered as yet.

- 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.

Process has been set up for those municipalities using SSEA as RM Services – working so far. Ongoing communication between counter staff, planning/works department staff and SSEA essential.

- 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?

Not as yet.

- 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.,).

Not as yet.

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.

s. 46 Tasks	Yes	In progress	No	N/A
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)		X		
Existing O.P and zoning by-laws have been reviewed and scoped for required changes		X		
Official Plan and Zoning By-law update discussions are underway		X		
Action Plan for O.P & zoning by-law updates has been developed (timing of rollout and key milestone identified)			X	
Template and/or draft O.P and Zoning by-laws have been drafted and circulated internally for comments			X	
Final draft of OP amendment complete			X	
All planners have been trained on SWP policies, and upcoming amendments			X	
OP amendment finalized and ready for inclusion upon next O.P update			X	

Comments: Township has initiated the RFP to complete the Review of the Township's Official Plan and Comprehensive Zoning By-law in 2016. This review will include the incorporation of SWP into both documents. A work plan and the timing for completion will be finalized once a consultant is retained by the Township by Spring 2016.

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, only for 100m to of a Municipal well head

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

Septic Maintenance Program Statistics

100m of a Municipal Well Head

Total Properties in program = 140

- Complete = 106
- Incomplete = 33 (not including no record files)
- No Record = 1

Completion required by January 16, 2017

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

Yes In progress No

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

Septic Re-inspection Program Lead	
Name	Sherri Moore
Title /Role	Deputy Chief Building Official
Email	smoore@oro-medonte.ca
Telephone	705-487-2171

3) Has the municipality developed an inspection protocol?

Yes In progress No

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

40 page procedure

4) Are septic inspections underway?

Yes No

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

139 properties have been inspected

33 properties have outstanding items – pump reports and / or tertiary maintenance agreements

Please place a checkmark beside the additional supporting documentation that has been developed as part of the septic inspection program :

- Inspection report templates
- Database to manage inspection information
- Notification materials for landowners subject to septic inspections
- By-laws requiring collection of fees for septic inspection

5) 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?

By the proposed date or Orders will be issued

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

If **yes**, describe:

- Type of system (surface or groundwater): groundwater
- Current planning status: Township is currently undergoing a Water, Waste Water, Transportation Master Plan which may determine changes to the drinking water systems the project has not yet identified if any changes will be required

Well 3 has been drilled as part of the Horseshoe Highlands water supply but is not operational as of yet.

- Location: Craighurst and Horseshoe Valley Settlement Areas
- Timing for bringing the system/intake/or well online: _____

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

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

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

Yes

No

If **yes**, please list

- Name of system : _____
- Location of system: _____
- Projected timeline for decommissioning: _____

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

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

The Horseshoe Craighurst Corridor (HCC) Landowners Group Inc. (the “Landowners”) and the Township of Oro-Medonte have started a Water, Wastewater and Transportation Master Plan to identify a long-term servicing plan for the future development of the Craighurst and Horseshoe Valley settlement areas and adjacent lands (see map).

The study will follow the Municipal Engineers Association (MEA) Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Master Planning process Approach #2. The Master Plan will carry out the requirements for Class EA Schedule A, A+ and B projects, and set the stage for future Schedule C projects. The study will define existing problems and opportunities, and consider and evaluate alternative solutions to ultimately identify the preferred water, wastewater and transportation servicing strategy.

For further information regarding this report, please contact:

Name: Michelle Jakobi
Position: Operations technologist
Email/Phone: mjakobi@oro-medonte.ca 705-487-2171 ext. 2148

Name: Andria Leigh
Position: Director, Development Services
Email/Phone: aleigh@oro-medonte.ca 705-487-2171 ext. 2123

Name: Bobbi Leppington
Position: Chief Building Official
Email/Phone: bleppington@oro-medonte.ca 705-487-2171 ext. 2115

Name: Melissa Carruthers
Position: Data Mgmt Tech/ Risk Management Inspector, SSEA
Email/Phone: mcarruthers@midland.ca 705-527-5166 ext. 205