

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
	LUP-11	LUP	MC	Mun	A	Municipalities shall only permit new development or site alteration in a WHPA-Q1/Q2 where the activity would be a significant drinking water threat, where it can be demonstrated through the submission of a hydrogeological study, that the existing water balance will be maintained (i.e. there will be no net reduction in recharge).	171	MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	The corrections and edits noted below should also be reflected on the summary matrix on page 171. We note that there are a number of errors on the summary matrix chart including policies included in the wrong column (e.g. SEWG(c)-5), policy numbers that no longer exist (e.g. SEWG(d)-3) and policies that are new that are not included (e.g. LUP-11).	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
TIME-7	LUP	MC	Mun	F	Official Plans and Zoning By-Laws shall be updated to conform with the applicable significant drinking water threat policies in accordance with Section 26 of the Planning Act.			MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List A: Add TIME-7 and the transition provision, remove LUP-5 if policy deleted. Add LUP-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
LUP-5	LUP	MC	Mun	F	Municipalities are encouraged to include policies in their official plans that require the preparation of master environmental servicing plans for new developments.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List A: Add TIME-7 and the transition provision, remove LUP-5 if policy deleted. Add LUP-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
LUP-10	LUP	HR	Mun	F	Municipalities are encouraged to amend their planning documents to protect significant groundwater recharge areas from incompatible development or site alteration that may reduce the recharge of an aquifer within a WHPA-Q1/Q2.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List A: Add TIME-7 and the transition provision, remove LUP-5 if policy deleted. Add LUP-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
LUP-5	LUP	MC	Mun	F	Municipalities are encouraged to include policies in their official plans that require the preparation of master environmental servicing plans for new developments.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List B: Add LUP-5 should the revisions noted be included.	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
TIME-5	PI	MC	MOE, OMAFRA	E	All existing prescribed instruments shall be amended to conform with the applicable significant threat policy within 5 years after the source protection plan takes effect, or on a schedule determined by the Director based on a prioritized review of the instruments that govern significant drinking water threat activities.			MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List C: Add transition provision, TIME-5	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List D: No changes	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
SEWG(b)-5	Oth	MC	Mun	E	Municipalities shall consider the implementation of programs to remove connections of stormwater sources to sanitary sewers to reduce surges in volumes during wet weather and the establishment of upgrade priorities that focus on the most vulnerable areas.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List E: Add SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, TIME-8, transition provision (for building permits), consider adding LUP-9, LUP-10, LUP-11 (to assist the municipality with using a site alteration by-law to implement these policies).	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
FUEL-3	Oth: (SA)	NLB	SPA	E/F	The local SPA shall obtain from TSSA, the number, location and reporting information for fuel storage where the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat. The location and reporting information would be shared with the risk management official to aid in the implementation of the Part IV power policies.	MON-5		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List E: Add SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, TIME-8, transition provision (for building permits), consider adding LUP-9, LUP-10, LUP-11 (to assist the municipality with using a site alteration by-law to implement these policies).	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
TIME-8	EO	MC	SPA, MOE	E	The education and outreach program is to be developed and initiated within 3 years from the date the source protection plan takes effect.			MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List E: Add SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, TIME-8, transition provision (for building permits), consider adding LUP-9, LUP-10, LUP-11 (to assist the municipality with using a site alteration by-law to implement these policies).	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
LUP-9	LUP	MC	Mun	F	Where the future taking of water from an aquifer without returning it to the same aquifer would be a significant drinking water threat, municipalities shall only permit new development or site alteration where it can be demonstrated that any increase in water demand can be accommodated on a sustainable basis.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List E: Add SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, TIME-8, transition provision (for building permits), consider adding LUP-9, LUP-10, LUP-11 (to assist the municipality with using a site alteration by-law to implement these policies).	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
LUP-10	LUP	HR	Mun	F	Municipalities are encouraged to amend their planning documents to protect significant groundwater recharge areas from incompatible development or site alteration that may reduce the recharge of an aquifer within a WHPA-Q1/Q2.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List E: Add SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, TIME-8, transition provision (for building permits), consider adding LUP-9, LUP-10, LUP-11 (to assist the municipality with using a site alteration by-law to implement these policies).	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
LUP-11	LUP	MC	Mun	F	Municipalities shall only permit new development or site alteration in a WHPA-Q1/Q2 where the activity would be a significant drinking water threat, where it can be demonstrated through the submission of a hydrogeological study, that the existing water balance will be maintained (i.e. there will be no net reduction in recharge).	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List E: Add SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, TIME-8, transition provision (for building permits), consider adding LUP-9, LUP-10, LUP-11 (to assist the municipality with using a site alteration by-law to implement these policies).	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List F: No changes	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
TIME-3	Pro	MC	RMO	E	For the purpose of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, Section 57 does not apply to a person engaged in the designated activity in the area where the threat could be significant until 365 days after the day the source protection plan takes effect.			MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List G: Add TIME-3	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
TIME-1	RMP	MC	RMO	E	For existing activities designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act, a risk management plan must be established no later than 5 years from the date the source protection plan takes effect.			MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List H: Add TIME-1	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
EDU-10	EO	NLB	Mun	E/F	In accordance with Section 22 (7) of the Clean Water Act, the Ministry of Transportation, in collaboration with the Ministry of the Environment as well as in consultation with source protection authorities (SPAs), should design a sign to the appropriate provincial standards, to identify the locations of wellhead protection areas and intake protection zones. The Ministry of Transportation should manufacture, install and maintain the signs along provincial highways within the wellhead protection areas with a vulnerability score of 10, and/or within an intake protection zone or wellhead protection area E with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher. Municipalities will be responsible for the purchase, installation and maintenance of appropriate signs designed by the province in collaboration with the SPAs. These signs should be placed, at a minimum, where municipal arterial roads are located within a wellhead protection areas with a vulnerability score of 10, and/or an intake protection zone or wellhead protection area E with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher. The above policies will be implemented as part of an overall education and outreach plan within each Source Protection Area. These policies, in conjunction with additional education and outreach policies, should be implemented within 2 years after the effective date of the plan.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List J: Add EDU-10, SEWG(a)-2, SEWG(b)-5, DNAPL-3, SOLV-3 if amended to be in scope.	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
SEWG(a)-2	Oth (Re)	NLB	MOE	E	The MOE is encouraged to consider conducting research to identify risks from infiltration ponds to aquifers used as a drinking water source and to review contemporary technology for the design and operation of stormwater management facilities that can protect municipal drinking water systems. The research outcome should update stormwater management planning and design guidelines, and the Tables of Circumstances.	MON-2		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List J: Add EDU-10, SEWG(a)-2, SEWG(b)-5, DNAPL-3, SOLV-3 if amended to be in scope.	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
SEWG(b)-5	Oth	MC	Mun	E	Municipalities shall consider the implementation of programs to remove connections of stormwater sources to sanitary sewers to reduce surges in volumes during wet weather and the establishment of upgrade priorities that focus on the most vulnerable areas.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List J: Add EDU-10, SEWG(a)-2, SEWG(b)-5, DNAPL-3, SOLV-3 if amended to be in scope.	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
DNAPL-3	Oth (Re)	NLB	MOE	E	The MOE is encouraged to consider undertaking research into DNAPL alternatives and phase out their use in Ontario.	MON-2		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List J: Add EDU-10, SEWG(a)-2, SEWG(b)-5, DNAPL-3, SOLV-3 if amended to be in scope.	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
SOLV-3	Oth (SA)	NLB	MOE	E	The MOE is encouraged to consider undertaking research into organic solvent alternatives and phase out their use in Ontario.	MON-2		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List J: Add EDU-10, SEWG(a)-2, SEWG(b)-5, DNAPL-3, SOLV-3 if amended to be in scope.	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	Please correct the title and opening statement of List J by replacing the word "specify" with "strategic".	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
WAST(a)-3	Oth: RE	NLB	MOE	F	The MOE should undertake research around hauled sewage treatment options and the opportunity to create environmentally friendly usable by-products (e.g. compost) to negate the need of spreading hauled sewage within vulnerable areas where the activity is or would be a significant, moderate or low drinking water threat.	MON-2		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List K: Add WAST(a)-3, PEST(App)-2, if addressing areas where significant, Salt(App-2), DEMD-6, EDU-11 Remove: SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, EDU-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
PEST(App)-2	Oth	NLB	OMAFRA, MOE	E	OMAFRA and MOE are encouraged to review and, where appropriate, amend pest management training courses to incorporate additional precautions and considerations to address pesticide application in vulnerable areas.	N/A		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List K: Add WAST(a)-3, PEST(App)-2, if addressing areas where significant, Salt(App-2), DEMD-6, EDU-11 Remove: SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, EDU-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
Salt(App)-2	Oth (Re)	HR	MTO, OGRA, AMO	F	The MTO, in collaboration with OGRA and AMO, is encouraged to undertake research into cost effective alternatives to salt application that do not compromise public safety in vulnerable areas.	N/A		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List K: Add WAST(a)-3, PEST(App)-2, if addressing areas where significant, Salt(App-2), DEMD-6, EDU-11 Remove: SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, EDU-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
DEMD-6	Oth (SA)	NLB	Province	E	Where municipalities share a water source within a WHPA Q1 identified as having significant drinking water threats, the MOE, in collaboration with MOI, MMAH and MNR, is encouraged to support municipal efforts that focus on finding collaborative and mutually beneficial solutions to address water servicing constraints.	MON-4		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List K: Add WAST(a)-3, PEST(App)-2, if addressing areas where significant, Salt(App-2), DEMD-6, EDU-11 Remove: SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, EDU-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
EDU-11	EO	NLB	MOE	E	The MOE is encouraged to develop education materials to aid in the implementation of education and outreach programs to address the following significant drinking water threats: 1b) waste disposal sites 2a) stormwater management facilities 2c) on-site sewage systems 3) application of agricultural source material to land 4) storage of agricultural source material 6) application of non-agricultural source material to land 7) handling and storage of non-agricultural source material 8) application of commercial fertilizer to land 9) handling and storage of commercial fertilizer 10) application of pesticides to land 11) handling and storage of pesticides 12) application of road salt 13) handling and storage of road salt 14) storage of snow 15) handling and storage of fuel 16) handling and storage of DNAPLs 17) handling and storage of organic solvents 20) an activity that reduces the recharge of an aquifer 21) use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing, an outdoor confinement area or farm-animal yard.	MON-2	136	MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List K: Add WAST(a)-3, PEST(App)-2, if addressing areas where significant, Salt(App-2), DEMD-6, EDU-11 Remove: SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, EDU-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
SEWG(b)-5	Oth	MC	Mun	E	Municipalities shall consider the implementation of programs to remove connections of stormwater sources to sanitary sewers to reduce surges in volumes during wet weather and the establishment of upgrade priorities that focus on the most vulnerable areas.	MON-1		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List K: Add WAST(a)-3, PEST(App)-2, if addressing areas where significant, Salt(App-2), DEMD-6, EDU-11 Remove: SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, EDU-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
FUEL-3	Oth: (SA)	NLB	SPA	E/F	The local SPA shall obtain from TSSA, the number, location and reporting information for fuel storage where the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat. The location and reporting information would be shared with the risk management official to aid in the implementation of the Part IV power policies.	MON-5		MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	List K: Add WAST(a)-3, PEST(App)-2, if addressing areas where significant, Salt(App-2), DEMD-6, EDU-11 Remove: SEWG(b)-5, FUEL-3, EDU-10	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	The title of List K could be: Significant threat policies with non-legally binding commitments, and the opening statement could be included as follows: "Significant threat policies that identify a body other than a municipality, local board or source protection authority as responsible for implementing the policy, which represents a non-legally binding commitment."	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
							171	MOE	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists	The policy matrix for prescribed instruments required as per the director's instructions issued August 23, 2011 contains a number of errors. Please review the policies included on Lists C and D and ensure this matrix is accurate. Please note that since prescribed instruments that are required under the Ontario Water Resources Act are now issued under the EPA. Please ensure that policies that address these PIs are listed in both OWRA column and the EPA column. There are also numerous errors that are on the optional policy summary matrix on page 171. Please also revise this table prior to submission.	Comments and corrections to the legal effect lists will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	There appears to be additional information and policy suggestions included in section 8 (beginning on page 100) of the explanatory document. This information and policy suggestions do not meet the content requirements and should not be included. If the committee would like to provide this information it can be provided under separate cover to the Minister.	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	We ask that you review the explanatory document and ensure that the required content of the document is up to date with the policies listed in the proposed plan. For example, on page 104, there is a statement that "no issues of water quantity currently exist" however this statement is not accurate as the tier 3 water budget has been completed and areas where threats 19 and 20 have been delineated in SGBLS.	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
							69	MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	On page 69, the sentence "Airports are federally regulated and therefore the committee could only address this activity with a legally binding policy" is incorrect. The federal government cannot be bound by a <u>policy</u> in the SPP, however, Part IV can be used to address threat #18, and Part IV is binding on the municipality, and if the federal government agrees to a RMP, then they would be bound by the provisions of the RMP. Please delete this sentence entirely or and replace it with "Airports are federally regulated and a <u>policy</u> addressing the federal government is non-legally binding."	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
							23	MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	The description of the required content of the explanatory document on page 23 appears incomplete. For more details about what is required, please review the SPP Planning Bulletin on Explanatory Document requirements dated February 18, 2011, as well as section 40 of O. Reg. 287/07. The minimum requirements of the Explanatory Document are listed below along with comments indicating where the document did not meet these requirements.	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	*an explanation of the source protection committee's policy decisions o The rationale is often mixed with the committee's discussion however, it appears to be included.	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
							13	MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	the committee's reasons for using S 57 prohibition to address an existing activity o Page 13 of the explanatory document contains a discussion about the requirement, but the rationale for the committee's decision to prohibit existing threats doesn't clearly state why the committee is of the opinion that the activity must be prohibited to ensure that it ceases to be a SDWT (i.e. why the activity cannot be managed).	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	a statement indicating that the committee is of the opinion that education, outreach and incentives, and policies that rely on s. 26 p. 1 are sufficient to address significant threats, when used as a stand-alone policy tool	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
							89	MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	On page 89, the explanatory document states that "While the source protection committee believes that education and outreach is a viable tool to use for existing significant threats within vulnerable areas, it was also felt that education and outreach, in and of itself, would not be sufficient to address the threats". Incidental volumes of DNAPLs are addressed using only E and O; therefore, the committee must reconsider whether the explanatory document reflects their opinion, or whether the policy should be reconsidered in light of this statement.	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
								MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	a summary of comments received during pre-consultation and an explanation of how they affected policy development	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
							99	MOE	Comments on the explanatory document	On page 99, there is a brief summary of formal consultation; however the committee must include a summary of the comments received during <u>pre-consultation</u> and how these comments affected policy development.	Comments and corrections to the explanatory document will be completed prior to submission to the Ministry.
FERT(App)-1	RMP	MC	RMO	E/F	Existing and future application of commercial fertilizer to land is designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act, and therefore requires a risk management plan for those not phased in under the Nutrient Management Act, where the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat. The risk management plan will include appropriate terms and conditions to ensure that the application of commercial fertilizer ceases to be a significant drinking water threat. The risk management plan shall require fertilizers to be applied using best agronomic practices on the advice of a certified crop advisor, that soil tests (NPK) be carried out and that proper farm practices regarding crop rotation be applied, as appropriate.	MON-6		MOE	Fertilizer policies comments	FERT(App)-1 and FERT(App)-2 appear to apply in the same area as FERT(ICA)-1 and FERT(ICA)-2, and use the same wording. If the committee wishes to have policies to specifically address the ICA, then please state in the non-ICA policy that the policy does not apply to the ICA. Alternatively, one set of policies could be deleted since the same policy applies to both ICA and non-ICA SDWT areas, then the policy could address "an area where significant". If the latter is chosen, the policy will capture areas where the threats are significant as a result of an issue, regardless of the scoring. Similarly, FERT(H&S) -1 and FERT(ICA)-1 as well as FERT(ICA)-2 and FERT(H&S)-2 also overlap and ASM(App) and ASM(Store) policies overlap with ASM (ICA) policies.	The policies have been reworded to address the comment.
FERT(App)-2	PI	MC	OMAFRA	E/F	Where the existing and future application of commercial fertilizer to land is in an area where this activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat, and the activity requires an approval under the Nutrient Management Act, OMAFRA shall ensure that the nutrient management plan or strategy that governs the application of commercial fertilizer to land includes appropriate terms and conditions to ensure that the activity ceases to be or become a significant drinking water threat.	MON-3		MOE	Fertilizer policies comments	FERT(App)-1 and FERT(App)-2 appear to apply in the same area as FERT(ICA)-1 and FERT(ICA)-2, and use the same wording. If the committee wishes to have policies to specifically address the ICA, then please state in the non-ICA policy that the policy does not apply to the ICA. Alternatively, one set of policies could be deleted since the same policy applies to both ICA and non-ICA SDWT areas, then the policy could address "an area where significant". If the latter is chosen, the policy will capture areas where the threats are significant as a result of an issue, regardless of the scoring. Similarly, FERT(H&S) -1 and FERT(ICA)-1 as well as FERT(ICA)-2 and FERT(H&S)-2 also overlap and ASM(App) and ASM(Store) policies overlap with ASM (ICA) policies.	The policies have been reworded to address the comment.

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
FERT(ICA)-1	RMP	MC	RMO	E/F	The existing and future application, handling and storage of commercial fertilizer to land is designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act, and therefore requires a risk management plan for those not phased in under the Nutrient Management Act, where the vulnerability score is less than 10. The risk management plan, at a minimum, will be based on contemporary standards and shall require: <u>Application</u> 1) all fertilizers to be applied using best agronomic practices based on the advice of a certified crop advisor; 2) that soil tests (NPK) be conducted; and 3) that proper farm practices regarding crop rotation be applied, as appropriate. <u>Handling and Storage</u> 1) liquid fertilizer to be stored in double-walled tanks or secondary containment facilities, with collision protection; 2) dry fertilizers to be stored under cover on impervious floor surfaces with no drainage outlets so that the application, handling and storage of commercial fertilizer ceases to be or does not become a significant drinking water threat.	MON-6		MOE	Fertilizer policies comments	FERT(App)-1 and FERT(App)-2 appear to apply in the same area as FERT(ICA)-1 and FERT(ICA)-2, and use the same wording. If the committee wishes to have policies to specifically address the ICA, then please state in the non-ICA policy that the policy does not apply to the ICA. Alternatively, one set of policies could be deleted since the same policy applies to both ICA and non-ICA SDWT areas, then the policy could address "an area where significant". If the latter is chosen, the policy will capture areas where the threats are significant as a result of an issue, regardless of the scoring. Similarly, FERT(H&S) -1 and FERT(ICA)-1 as well as FERT(ICA)-2 and FERT(H&S)-2 also overlap and ASM(App) and ASM(Store) policies overlap with ASM (ICA) policies.	The policies have been reworded to address the comment.
FERT(ICA)-2	Pro	MC	RMO	E/F	Where the Nutrient Management Act does not require an approval, the existing and future handling, storage and application of commercial fertilizer is designated for the purposes of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, and is therefore prohibited where the vulnerability score is 10, and the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-6		MOE	Fertilizer policies comments	FERT(App)-1 and FERT(App)-2 appear to apply in the same area as FERT(ICA)-1 and FERT(ICA)-2, and use the same wording. If the committee wishes to have policies to specifically address the ICA, then please state in the non-ICA policy that the policy does not apply to the ICA. Alternatively, one set of policies could be deleted since the same policy applies to both ICA and non-ICA SDWT areas, then the policy could address "an area where significant". If the latter is chosen, the policy will capture areas where the threats are significant as a result of an issue, regardless of the scoring. Similarly, FERT(H&S) -1 and FERT(ICA)-1 as well as FERT(ICA)-2 and FERT(H&S)-2 also overlap and ASM(App) and ASM(Store) policies overlap with ASM (ICA) policies.	The policies have been reworded to address the comment.
FERT(H&S)-1	RMP	MC	RMO	E	The existing handling and storage of commercial fertilizer is designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act, and therefore requires a risk management plan for those not phased in under the Nutrient Management Act, where the activity is a significant drinking water threat. The risk management plan, at a minimum, will be based on contemporary standards and shall require: 1) liquid fertilizer to be stored in double-walled tanks or secondary containment facilities, with collision protection, 2) dry fertilizer to be stored undercover on impervious floor surfaces with non drainage outlets so that the handling and storage of commercial fertilizer ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-6		MOE	Fertilizer policies comments	FERT(App)-1 and FERT(App)-2 appear to apply in the same area as FERT(ICA)-1 and FERT(ICA)-2, and use the same wording. If the committee wishes to have policies to specifically address the ICA, then please state in the non-ICA policy that the policy does not apply to the ICA. Alternatively, one set of policies could be deleted since the same policy applies to both ICA and non-ICA SDWT areas, then the policy could address "an area where significant". If the latter is chosen, the policy will capture areas where the threats are significant as a result of an issue, regardless of the scoring. Similarly, FERT(H&S) -1 and FERT(ICA)-1 as well as FERT(ICA)-2 and FERT(H&S)-2 also overlap and ASM(App) and ASM(Store) policies overlap with ASM (ICA) policies.	The policies have been reworded to address the comment.
FERT(H&S)-2	Pro	MC	RMO	F	Future handling and storage of commercial fertilizer is designated for the purposes of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, and is therefore prohibited where the activity would be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-6		MOE	Fertilizer policies comments	FERT(App)-1 and FERT(App)-2 appear to apply in the same area as FERT(ICA)-1 and FERT(ICA)-2, and use the same wording. If the committee wishes to have policies to specifically address the ICA, then please state in the non-ICA policy that the policy does not apply to the ICA. Alternatively, one set of policies could be deleted since the same policy applies to both ICA and non-ICA SDWT areas, then the policy could address "an area where significant". If the latter is chosen, the policy will capture areas where the threats are significant as a result of an issue, regardless of the scoring. Similarly, FERT(H&S) -1 and FERT(ICA)-1 as well as FERT(ICA)-2 and FERT(H&S)-2 also overlap and ASM(App) and ASM(Store) policies overlap with ASM (ICA) policies.	The policies have been reworded to address the comment.
							24	MOE	General comments on non policy content	It would be helpful to the reader if you could provide a link to the background document described on page 24. Staff could not find the document on-line at the SGBLS website. Alternatively, a brief description of the contents of the background document could be included together with a location to access the document.	Due to uncertainty in publication of background document reference has been removed from the explanatory document.
								MOE	General comments on non policy content	On page 38 the statement "the Clean Water Act prescribes 21 potential threats for which source protection committees must write policies" is somewhat misleading. The act requires that policies must be written for every <u>area</u> where a threat could be significant. The statement should be revised for accuracy.	The statement has been revised as per the suggestion.
								MOE	General comments on non policy content	The statement "The Ministry of the Environment has ranked drinking water threats as being significant, moderate or low" on page 40 is not accurate. Please clarify that the Province prescribed 21 drinking water threats, and the SPC must address areas where these threats are significant.	The statement has been revised as per the suggestion.
								MOE	General comments on non policy content	On page 43 there is a lengthy discussion on defining transport pathways, yet there are no policies addressing transport pathways, nor any information about how (or whether) transport pathways affected the vulnerability of wellheads or intakes in South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe SPA. In addition, examples that are provided of features that may result in a transport pathway are limited to features that impact wellheads, however, there are features such as drainage swales, tile drainage, ditches, etc., that could impact surface water intakes. The final sentence of this discussion needs to be amended to include that transport pathways can impact IPZ-3 scoring as well as IPZ-2. If transport pathways impacted the vulnerability scores in SGBLS, this discussion would benefit from a summary of those impacts.	The last sentence of the discussion has been updated to say that transport pathways can impact IPZ-3 scoring as well.

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
								MOE	General comments on non policy content	On page 45 the statement "The Clean Water Act introduces brand new powers to municipalities and other implementing bodies. These are known as Part IV powers..." should be revised for accuracy. Part IV is only available to municipalities with the authority to pass by-laws for water production, treatment and storage of water or a single tier municipality, and not "other implementing bodies". The authority to enforce Part IV may be delegated or assigned or a partnership may be entered into with another body such as a neighbouring municipality or a conservation authority by agreement. Please revise for accuracy. It would also be helpful in the tools section to include the coding used in the policies charts in the description of tools, for example, section "10.1 Prohibition" should be revised to read "s.57 Prohibition (Pro)". The description of "Restricted Land Use" should be corrected to read "Restricted Land Uses" and in addition the section would benefit from a link to the Clean Water Act i.e. "S. 59 Restricted Land Uses". Alternatively, a footnote could be added to indicate that "Restricted land uses are not the same meaning as in the Planning Act."	Section 10 has been updated as per the suggestions.
								MOE	General comments on non policy content	On page 47, a separate tool is included in section 10.9 called "Research". We note that in the list of tools provided in section 10.8 (Other), that research is appropriately included, and that the "other" tools listed in section 10.8 match the s. 26 p. 1 tool in the general regulation. "Research" is not available as a separate tool outside of the provisions of s. 26 p.1 of the general regulation as the Plan seems to indicate, and we request that you delete section 10.9 in its entirety to avoid this miscommunication. Please note that there are several policies that suggest research be undertaken to address a threat, however to be in scope with the regulation all policies that use authorities under s. 26 p.1 must also be clearly linked to a vulnerable area, and must also show how the outcome of that research could help that threat either cease to be significant, or adequately managed, if in an area where the vulnerability is moderate or low.	Section 10.9 has been removed from the Plan and policies revised to ensure only relate to areas where a threat can be significant. The explanatory document has been revised to clearly explain how the research could help adequately managed low and moderate threats.
								MOE	General comments on non policy content	On page 51 it is unclear why there are two definitions of "development" in the SPP: One is from the Conservation Authorities Act (CAA) and the other definition of "development" is from the PPS. No direction has been provided as to when each definition would apply in the SPP and why two different definitions are needed. We note that the definition of development under the CAA includes reference to site alteration, yet site alteration is separately defined. We note that	The definition of development from the Conservation Authorities Act has been removed from the Source Protection Plan.
								MOE	General comments on non policy content	On page 52, it is unclear why there are a number of components to the definition of existing, and it is simpler language can avoid challenges with implementation including situations being missed. Section (a) of the definition of existing appears to use planning nomenclature, and does not appear to be necessary in the SPP as it relates to buildings, structures and uses that are regulated under mechanisms under the Planning Act. In addition, the term "lawful" is inappropriate as there are a number of activities that are not regulated and the term "lawful" requires compliance with a law. For example, DNAPLs are not regulated, therefore, cannot be "lawful". Based on a review of your plan, it would appear that it would be appropriate to include section (c) as the definition of existing, plus an allowance to include expansions as this appears to be the preference of the committee. Therefore, you may wish to consider the following wording: o An existing activity is an activity that is presently occurring or has occurred within the last ten years prior to the day the SPP takes effect. Expansions, replacements, or alterations of an existing activity are considered existing for the purpose of the policies in this Plan provided that the expansion, alteration or replacement of the activity results in greater	The SGBLS definitions were drafted with more detail to be less ambiguous, as was requested by municipal legal departments. Please note that the term lawful has been removed from the definition.
							52	MOE	General comments on non policy content	On page 52 there are also a number of components to the definition of "future" that have been provided. It is also unclear why this definition also includes planning nomenclature. The definition provided by MOE for consideration, which is found in section (c) appears to satisfy the requirements of the plan.	The SGBLS definitions were drafted with more detail to be less ambiguous, as was requested by municipal legal departments. Please note that the term lawful has been removed from the definition.
								MOE	General comments on non policy content	Transition provisions allow for applications in planning process to proceed. We note that a transition provision has been included as contextual information on page 55. To have legal effect, the transition provision must be included as a policy in the plan, and placed on the appropriate legal effect lists in Appendix A. In addition, it is unclear why the recommended wording provided has been amended, for example, why reference to "Division C 1.3.1.3 (5) c of the Ontario Building Code Act" was included. Please note that this section does not exist in the act, although there is a provision in the Building Code. Please ensure that the transition provision is included as a policy and ensure that the provision is included on the applicable Lists in Appendix A. Because the transition provision affects applications under the Planning and Condominium Act, prescribed instruments, building permits, it should therefore be included on Lists A, C, and E.	Transition provision have now been included as policies. Whether to include reference to OBC Act is pending a response from MOE legal.
								MOE	General Comments on policies	This comment applies to a number of policies in the plan, which are listed below, and relate to legislative compliance of the plan policies. The Clean Water Act requires that a policy address every area where a threat could be significant. The only exceptions to this requirement are policies that rely on education and outreach initiatives or provide incentives (s. 22(7) of the act), or policies that direct climate change data to be collected (s. 26 p.5 of the regulation). These policies do not have to be tied to a specific area, and can apply broadly across the community. We noted that there are a number of policies where the area that the policy applies is not clear and revisions to the approach are suggested to ensure that the policy is compliant. For example, in some cases the area was not stated, and in other cases, the vulnerable area is unclear, such as the policy states "in vulnerable areas" without specifying whether the policy applies to all vulnerable areas, or only to areas where significant, or only to areas where the threat is moderate or low. Additionally, policies are required to achieve the objective of ensuring that the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat. Where policies do not meet one or both of these legislative requirements the policies discussed below appear to be out-of-scope. Many policies noted below rely on authorities under s. 26 p.1 of O. Reg. 287/07, also known as "specify action"	The policies have been corrected as appropriate.
SEWG(a)-2	Oth (Re)	NLB	MOE	E	The MOE is encouraged to consider conducting research to identify risks from infiltration ponds to aquifers used as a drinking water source and to review contemporary technology for the design and operation of stormwater management facilities that can protect municipal drinking water systems. The research outcome should update stormwater management planning and design guidelines, and the Tables of Circumstances.	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	SEWG(a)-2: In order to be in scope, this policy must be written to be linked to the threat and an area. For example, the policy could suggest that MOE is encouraged to consider conducting research to better understand the mechanism by which storm water ponds impact groundwater resources and how to mitigate impacts in areas where the threat is significant, moderate or low.	The policy has been revised to be in scope as per the suggestion.

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
SEWG(b)-5	Oth	MC	Mun	E	Municipalities shall consider the implementation of programs to remove connections of stormwater sources to sanitary sewers to reduce surges in volumes during wet weather and the establishment of upgrade priorities that focus on the most vulnerable areas.	MON-1		MOE	Policy wording	SEWG(b)-5: "the most vulnerable areas" should be amended to state "area where significant" or "all vulnerable areas." The vulnerable are needs to be clarified and the policy then placed on the appropriate list(s).	The policy has been revised to specify the intended vulnerable area (where significant) and has been placed on the appropriate list.
Salt(App)-2	Oth (Re)	HR	MTO, OGRA, AMO	F	The MTO, in collaboration with OGRA and AMO, is encouraged to undertake research into cost effective alternatives to salt application that do not compromise public safety in vulnerable areas.	N/A		MOE	Policy wording	Salt(App)-2: Please clarify which types of vulnerable areas and ensure that the policy is placed on the appropriate List.	The policy has been revised to specify the intended vulnerable area (where significant) and has been placed on the appropriate list.
DNAPL-3	Oth (Re)	NLB	MOE	E	The MOE is encouraged to consider undertaking research into DNAPL alternatives and phase out their use in Ontario.	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	DNAPL-3 and SOLV-3: These policies are unrelated to vulnerable areas, and are therefore, out of scope as currently worded. In addition, the SPP prohibits these chemicals in vulnerable areas in volumes that make the chemicals significant (policies DNAPL-2 and SOLV-2), so it is questionable why a policy is needed to research alternatives to phase out their use. We suggest that policies DNAPL-3 and SOLV-3 be deleted.	The policies have been revised to be in scope. The source protection committee thought it was important to encourage and support research on less harmful alternative chemicals to replace DNAPL use in Ontario. It was believed that the health risks associated with DNAPLs are well documented but not widely known. The potential impact to drinking water supplies from the improper handling and storage of DNAPLs is great enough to warrant a phasing out. It was felt that research could identify and further the use of less hazardous and cost effective alternatives.
SOLV-3	Oth (SA)	NLB	MOE	E	The MOE is encouraged to consider undertaking research into organic solvent alternatives and phase out their use in Ontario.	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	DNAPL-3 and SOLV-3: These policies are unrelated to vulnerable areas, and are therefore, out of scope as currently worded. In addition, the SPP prohibits these chemicals in vulnerable areas in volumes that make the chemicals significant (policies DNAPL-2 and SOLV-2), so it is questionable why a policy is needed to research alternatives to phase out their use. We suggest that policies DNAPL-3 and SOLV-3 be deleted.	The policies have been revised to be in scope. The source protection committee thought it was important to encourage and support research on less harmful alternative chemicals to replace DNAPL use in Ontario. It was believed that the health risks associated with DNAPLs are well documented but not widely known. The potential impact to drinking water supplies from the improper handling and storage of DNAPLs is great enough to warrant a phasing out. It was felt that research could identify and further the use of less hazardous and cost effective alternatives.
LUP-5	LUP	MC	Mun	F	Municipalities are encouraged to include policies in their official plans that require the preparation of master environmental servicing plans for new developments.	MON-1		MOE	Policy wording	LUP-5: This policy as currently worded is not in scope as it does not address either a threat or an area as required by the legislation. Consider rewording to be in scope. As an example you could request that municipalities address storm water pond discharges and sanitary sewers and related pipes, by requiring master environmental servicing plans (MESPs) as part of a complete application to avoid locating threats associated with development infrastructure in all vulnerable areas. This policy would then be included on List A to address areas where threats are significant, and List B to address areas where threats could be moderate and low. Municipalities could apply this policy more broadly. Alternatively, instead of encouraging the submission of MESPs, a policy could be written to achieve the same outcome, by stating "Development infrastructure associated with threats to drinking water (stormwater ponds and sanitary sewers and related infrastructure) shall avoid, wherever possible, areas where threats could be significant, moderate or low."	The policy has been revised as per the suggestion to be in scope.
DEMD-4	Oth (Re)	NLB	MOE	E	Within a WHPA Q1 where the taking of water without returning it to the same source is a significant drinking water threat, the MOE shall be encouraged to undertake social marketing research focusing on water conservation and to share the results of that research with the local SPA.	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	Policy DEMD-4 relies on authorities under s. 26. p. 1 of the general regulation, and directs MOE "to undertake social marketing research focusing on water conservation and share that information with the SPA". Use of this tool requires that policies must address a threat and area. Additionally, all policies must be written so that the actions or outcomes result in the threat activity ceasing to be significant. Minor revisions to the wording could result in a policy being in scope: "MOE continue its water conservation outreach initiatives and undertake a program analysis to determine, whether using social marketing research could optimize outreach to improve water conservation rates in areas where the withdrawal of water from an aquifer without returning it to the aquifer is a significant threat." This policy would be placed on List K, as it addresses a significant drinking water threat and the implementing body is a body other than a SPA, municipality or local board.	The policy has been revised as per the suggestion.
WAST(c)-2	PI	MC	MOE	F	The future disposal of mine tailings is prohibited where the activity would be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	Policies should address the threat activity (i.e. Waste disposal sites are prohibited...) rather than the actions of the issuing director (MOE shall not issue...). Please review policies that use a PI as a tool to implement the policy and adjust the wording as appropriate. Policy WAST(c)-2 is an example where the activity is prohibited (using appropriate wording), whereas WAST(b)-3 is an example of policy wording that should be revised. Please see comments from the Ministry of the Environment's Operations Division dated January 30, 2012.	The policy has been revised as per the suggestion.
WAST(b)-3	PI	MC	MOE	F	Where the future establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act would be a significant drinking water threat, the MOE shall not issue an Environmental Compliance Approval.	MON-1		MOE	Policy wording	Policies should address the threat activity (i.e. Waste disposal sites are prohibited...) rather than the actions of the issuing director (MOE shall not issue...). Please review policies that use a PI as a tool to implement the policy and adjust the wording as appropriate. Policy WAST(c)-2 is an example where the activity is prohibited (using appropriate wording), whereas WAST(b)-3 is an example of policy wording that should be revised. Please see comments from the Ministry of the Environment's Operations Division dated January 30, 2012.	The policy has been revised as per the suggestion.
TIME-3	Pro	MC	RMO	E	For the purpose of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, Section 57 does not apply to a person engaged in the designated activity in the area where the threat could be significant until 365 days after the day the source protection plan takes effect.		56	MOE	Policy wording	On page 56, TIME-3 ,we note that you have included this policy to extend the time frame of the s. 57 prohibition to 365 days, and this provision should also be included on List G to have legal effect.	The policy has been added to list G.
LUP-2	LUP	MC	Mun	F	Municipalities shall amend their planning documents to ensure the design of parking lots, roadways and sidewalks minimizes the application of road salt, such as reducing ponding in parking areas and directing runoff outside of vulnerable areas, where the application of road salt would be a significant drinking water threat	MON-1		MOE	Policy wording	Policy LUP-2: The policy as currently worded does not align with the implementation mechanisms under the Planning Act and the requirements of the Clean Water Act to address threats and vulnerable areas. To meet these regulatory mechanisms the policy could be re-worded as follows: "To address application of road salt, vulnerable areas where this threat could be significant shall be subject to site plan control to ensure that where possible: o the extent and location of impervious surfaces such as parking lots, roadways and sidewalks are minimized, o site grading and drainage is designed to reduce ponding, and, o runoff is either directed outside of vulnerable areas or to storm sewers."	The policy has been revised as per the suggestion.
WAST(b)-3	PI	MC	MOE	F	Where the future establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act would be a significant drinking water threat, the MOE shall not issue an Environmental Compliance Approval.	MON-1		MOE	Policy wording	Policy WAST(a)-3 requests that MOE undertake research into hauled sewage treatment options to negate the spreading of hauled sewage in all vulnerable areas. We question why the committee feels it is necessary to include this policy when policy WAST(a)-1 prohibits disposal of hauled sewage in areas where significant and WAST(a)-2 strongly recommends prohibition in areas where the threat would be moderate or low. We note that a similar policy, NASM(App)-5, also requests research by MOE and OMAFRA to be undertaken to address threat activities that are prohibited by other policies in the plan. If the source protection plan prohibits an activity it is questionable why it is necessary to include a policy to research options to eliminate it from vulnerable areas.	The legal effect of the low and moderate threat policies is have regard for. Therefore, the committee included the research policies to address the threat as there is no guarantee the low and moderate threat policy will be enforced. Please see the explanatory document for additional rationale behind including these policies in the source protection plan.
WAST(a)-1	PI	MC	MOE	E/F	The existing and future application of hauled sewage to land is prohibited where the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	Policy WAST(a)-3 requests that MOE undertake research into hauled sewage treatment options to negate the spreading of hauled sewage in all vulnerable areas. We question why the committee feels it is necessary to include this policy when policy WAST(a)-1 prohibits disposal of hauled sewage in areas where significant and WAST(a)-2 strongly recommends prohibition in areas where the threat would be moderate or low. We note that a similar policy, NASM(App)-5, also requests research by MOE and OMAFRA to be undertaken to address threat activities that are prohibited by other policies in the plan. If the source protection plan prohibits an activity it is questionable why it is necessary to include a policy to research options to eliminate it from vulnerable areas.	The legal effect of the low and moderate threat policies is have regard for. Therefore, the committee included the research policies to address the threat as there is no guarantee the low and moderate threat policy will be enforced. Please see the explanatory document for additional rationale behind including these policies in the source protection plan.

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
WAST(a)-2	PI	HR	MOE	F	The MOE should not issue an Environmental Compliance Approval where the application of hauled sewage to land would be a moderate or low drinking water threat.	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	Policy WAST(a)-3 requests that MOE undertake research into hauled sewage treatment options to negate the spreading of hauled sewage in all vulnerable areas. We question why the committee feels it is necessary to include this policy when policy WAST(a)-1 prohibits disposal of hauled sewage in areas where significant and WAST(a)-2 strongly recommends prohibition in areas where the threat would be moderate or low. We note that a similar policy, NASM(App)-5, also requests research by MOE and OMAFRA to be undertaken to address threat activities that are prohibited by other policies in the plan. If the source protection plan prohibits an activity it is questionable why it is necessary to include a policy to research options to eliminate it from vulnerable areas.	The legal effect of the low and moderate threat policies is have regard for. Therefore, the committee included the research policies to address the threat as there is no guarantee the low and moderate threat policy will be enforced. Please see the explanatory document for additional rationale behind including these policies in the source protection plan.
NASM(App)-5	Oth (Re)	NLB	MOE, OMAFRA	E	The MOE and OMAFRA are encouraged to consider continuing research regarding soil limiting factors relevant to non-agricultural source material, and to reflect that research in the management of non-agricultural source material sites located in vulnerable areas where the application of non-agricultural source material to land is a significant drinking water threat.	MON-2, MON-3		MOE	Policy wording	Policy WAST(a)-3 requests that MOE undertake research into hauled sewage treatment options to negate the spreading of hauled sewage in all vulnerable areas. We question why the committee feels it is necessary to include this policy when policy WAST(a)-1 prohibits disposal of hauled sewage in areas where significant and WAST(a)-2 strongly recommends prohibition in areas where the threat would be moderate or low. We note that a similar policy, NASM(App)-5, also requests research by MOE and OMAFRA to be undertaken to address threat activities that are prohibited by other policies in the plan. If the source protection plan prohibits an activity it is questionable why it is necessary to include a policy to research options to eliminate it from vulnerable areas.	The legal effect of the low and moderate threat policies is have regard for. Therefore, the committee included the research policies to address the threat as there is no guarantee the low and moderate threat policy will be enforced. Please see the explanatory document for additional rationale behind including these policies in the source protection plan.
WAST(b)-1	Pro	MC	RMO	E/F	Where the Environmental Protection Act does not require an approval, the expansion of an existing or the future establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act (PCB temporary storage site) is designated for the purpose of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, and is therefore prohibited where the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-6		MOE	Policy wording	Policy WAST(b)-1 addresses "expansions to existing and future" PCB waste management systems. This wording seems to omit "existing" PCB waste management systems as only "expansions to existing and future" systems are addressed. We also want to point out that the term "expansions to" is not necessary in policy WAST(b)-1 as existing has already been defined as including expansions.	The wording of policy WAST(b)-1 has been revised to capture existing PCB waste management systems as was the intent of the SPC.
WAST(b)-2	PI	MC	MOE	E	Where the establishment, operation or maintenance of an existing waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act (PCB temporary storage site) is in an area where this activity is a significant drinking water threat, the MOE shall ensure that the Environmental Compliance Approval that governs the waste disposal site includes appropriate terms and conditions to ensure the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-1		MOE	Policy wording	We note that policy WAST(b)-2 appears to address existing PCB waste disposal sites, however the tool is a PI which is not available for PCB waste management systems. PCB waste management systems are issued by Director's Instructions which are not a PI. We have noted that the phrase (PCB temporary storage site) should be deleted in the list of typographical errors in this memo. When the phrase is deleted, the policy is generally worded and captures all threat subcategories. Therefore, the policy could state "This policy does not apply to the disposal of mine tailings." Please consider other impacts this revision may have to policies addressing threat #1 in the Plan.	Policy WAST(b)-2 has been removed from the plan as there is no Prescribed Instrument available to deal with PCB waste disposal sites.
SEWG(c)-4	Oth	MC	Mun	E	Municipalities shall implement an inspection program for small on-site sewage systems that are located in vulnerable areas where they are a significant drinking water threat in accordance with the Ontario Building Code.	MON-1		MOE	Policy wording	SEWG(c)-4 indicates that municipalities are to implement a septic inspection program in areas where significant. This program would apply to existing and future septic systems (when future systems are installed, these systems also become part of the inspection program and would be inspected every five years). Please clarify that future occurrences are also included.	The table has been updated to indicate that this policy also applies to future occurrences.
Salt(App)-2	Oth (Re)	HR	MTO, OGRA, AMO	F	The MTO, in collaboration with OGRA and AMO, is encouraged to undertake research into cost effective alternatives to salt application that do not compromise public safety in vulnerable areas.	N/A		MOE	Policy wording	It is unclear why a monitoring policy has not been included for policy Salt(App)-2.	The Source Protection Plan has been updated to include a monitoring policy for Salt(App)-2.
								MOE	Policy wording	We note that DNAPL-1 exempts incidental quantities of DNAPLS for personal/domestic use. We have two comments on this policy. o First, the circumstances determine that any quantity of DNAPLS in specific vulnerable areas could be significant; therefore a policy needs to be included in the plan to address personal/domestic use of DNAPLS in areas where the threat could be significant. If the plan relies on education and outreach or a policy under s. 26 p. 1 to address the threat, then the rationale for this approach must be included in the explanatory document as to why this approach was considered to be sufficient to address a significant threat. In addition, the wording is awkward as the policy designates DNAPLS "in any quantity" and then excludes "incidental volumes". To avoid implementation challenges, the term "in any quantity" should be deleted. o Second, unlike land use planning approaches, Part IV authorities allow specific volumes to be addressed. Therefore, the committee has a few options for dealing with the small quantities of DNAPLS. The committee can leave the term incidental in the policy. If this option is chosen, to assist with implementation in the absence of a specific threshold, you may wish to elaborate in the explanatory document as to what you mean by "incidental". If no explanation is given, the	The explanatory document has been updated to explain why the SPC believes education and outreach will be sufficient to address significant DNAPL threats where the volume in use is classified as "incidental volumes for personal/domestic use". Please note that the term "incidental volumes for personal/domestic use" has been defined within the definitions at the back of the Source Protection Plan.
LSTOCK-1	RMP	MC	RMO	E/F	Existing and future livestock grazing and pasturing is designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act, and therefore requires a risk management plan where the number of animals on the land at any time is sufficient to generate nutrients at an annual rate that is less than 0.5 nutrient units/acre. The risk management plan, at a minimum, will be based on contemporary standards, reflect appropriate nutrient management practices and ensure the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-6		MOE	Policy wording	Policies LSTOCK-1, 2, 3, and 4 designate threat activity #21 for the purpose of s. 57 and 58 of the CWA, however, please note that circumstances 1945 and 1946 are not included in that designation, and could result in a significant drinking water threat relying on an E and O policy during implementation. In addition the circumstances described in policy LSTOCK-1 and LSTOCK-2 do not match the wording in the Table of Circumstances which could also result in a SDWT being omitted. The explanatory document states that relying on E and O would not satisfactorily address a SDWT.	Six policies have been developed to address the use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard where it is or would be a significant drinking water threat. Since livestock grazing and pasturing is not regulated under the Nutrient Management Act and the outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard is regulated under the Act, the source protection committee chose to deal with these threats through different policy approaches. Please see the explanatory document for additional information on how circumstances 1945 and 1946 have been addressed within the policy approaches.
LSTOCK-2	Pro	MC	RMO	E/F	Existing and future livestock grazing and pasturing is designated for the purposes of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, and is therefore prohibited where the number of animals on the land at any time is sufficient to generate nutrients at an annual rate that is greater than 0.5 nutrient units/acre.	MON-6		MOE	Policy wording	Policies LSTOCK-1, 2, 3, and 4 designate threat activity #21 for the purpose of s. 57 and 58 of the CWA, however, please note that circumstances 1945 and 1946 are not included in that designation, and could result in a significant drinking water threat relying on an E and O policy during implementation. In addition the circumstances described in policy LSTOCK-1 and LSTOCK-2 do not match the wording in the Table of Circumstances which could also result in a SDWT being omitted. The explanatory document states that relying on E and O would not satisfactorily address a SDWT.	Six policies have been developed to address the use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard where it is or would be a significant drinking water threat. Since livestock grazing and pasturing is not regulated under the Nutrient Management Act and the outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard is regulated under the Act, the source protection committee chose to deal with these threats through different policy approaches. Please see the explanatory document for additional information on how circumstances 1945 and 1946 have been addressed within the policy approaches.

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
LSTOCK-3	RMP	MC	RMO	E/F	Existing and future outdoor confinement areas and farm-animal yards are designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act, and therefore require a risk management plan for those not phased in under the Nutrient Management Act where the activity is a significant drinking water threat outside of WHPA-A/IPZ-1. The risk management plan, at a minimum, will be based on contemporary standards, reflect appropriate nutrient management practices and ensure the activity ceases to be or does not become a significant drinking water threat.	MON-6		MOE	Policy wording	Policies LSTOCK-1, 2, 3, and 4 designate threat activity #21 for the purpose of s. 57 and 58 of the CWA, however, please note that circumstances 1945 and 1946 are not included in that designation, and could result in a significant drinking water threat relying on an E and O policy during implementation. In addition the circumstances described in policy LSTOCK-1 and LSTOCK-2 do not match the wording in the Table of Circumstances which could also result in a SDWT being omitted. The explanatory document states that relying on E and O would not satisfactorily address a SDWT.	Six policies have been developed to address the use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard where it is or would be a significant drinking water threat. Since livestock grazing and pasturing is not regulated under the Nutrient Management Act and the outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard is regulated under the Act, the source protection committee chose to deal with these threats through different policy approaches. Please see the explanatory document for additional information on how circumstances 1945 and 1946 have been addressed within the policy approaches.
LSTOCK-4	PRO	MC	RMO	E/F	Where the Nutrient Management Act does not require an approval, existing and future outdoor confinement and farm-animal yards is designated for the purposes of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, and is therefore prohibited within WHPA-A/IPZ-1.	MON-6		MOE	Policy wording	Policies LSTOCK-1, 2, 3, and 4 designate threat activity #21 for the purpose of s. 57 and 58 of the CWA, however, please note that circumstances 1945 and 1946 are not included in that designation, and could result in a significant drinking water threat relying on an E and O policy during implementation. In addition the circumstances described in policy LSTOCK-1 and LSTOCK-2 do not match the wording in the Table of Circumstances which could also result in a SDWT being omitted. The explanatory document states that relying on E and O would not satisfactorily address a SDWT.	Six policies have been developed to address the use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard where it is or would be a significant drinking water threat. Since livestock grazing and pasturing is not regulated under the Nutrient Management Act and the outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard is regulated under the Act, the source protection committee chose to deal with these threats through different policy approaches. Please see the explanatory document for additional information on how circumstances 1945 and 1946 have been addressed within the policy approaches.
COND-2	Mon	Mun	MC	E	The local planning authority is directed to give notice to the SPA of any applications under the Planning Act to re-develop a site identified as a significant threat condition in the assessment reports.			MOE	Policy wording	Policy COND-2 requests that the local planning authority circulate development applications to the SPA. It is unclear how this policy, which requests information to be circulated, meets the test "cease to be" or manages the risk to drinking water. As currently written, the policy appears to be specifying an action using the authorities under s. 26 p. 1 of the regulation, rather than monitoring changes in the condition, and therefore would belong on List E rather than List F. Source protection plans must include policies governing the monitoring of conditions in areas where the assessment report shows they are a significant threat. It is optional for Plans to include policies to address significant threat conditions resulting from a past activity. If the committee's intention was to develop a monitoring policy based on the change in time of the condition as it was remediated through redevelopment, then a modest revision to the policy could be "To monitor the change in the condition over time, the municipality shall notify the SPA of applications under the Planning Act affecting a site identified as a significant drinking water threat condition." The local planning authority could require that where development is being proposed on a contaminated site identified as a significant drinking water threat, that the site shall be remediated in relation to the proposed use. This policy direction supports the provisions in	The intent of the SPC was to develop a monitoring policy. The policy has been revised as per the suggestion.
EDU-4	EO	MC	Province	E	The MOE shall be encouraged to maintain and enhance education and outreach programs focusing on water conservation.	MON-4		MOE	Policy wording	It is not clear whether policies EDU-4, EDU-8, INCENT-2, INCENT-5 belong under s. 22(7) of the act or under s. 26 p. 1 of the regulation. Policies under s. 22(7) of the act may be applied more broadly across the municipality/watershed and are non legally binding, whereas policies authorized under s. 26 p.1 of the regulation must address a vulnerable area and threat and may be legally binding depending on the implementing body. In order to determine whether these policies were intended to be legally binding, we reviewed the legal effect lists. From these lists it appears the policies are intended to address SDWT, however the policy wording itself does not specify an "area where significant" which should be included for clarity. Alternatively, if it was the committee's intention to include these policies more broadly across the community, these policies should be placed on List J.	Yes, the intent of policies EDU-4, EDU-8, INCENT-2 and INCENT-5 is to address significant drinking water threats. The policies have been revised to clearly specify an "area where significant".
EDU-8	EO	MC	MOE	E	The Ministry of Environment should undertake community-based social marketing research, in consultation with local source protection authorities. The research should be targeted at fostering behaviour aimed at protecting drinking water by understanding the barriers to behaviour. The results of this research would be shared with source protection authorities to implement education and outreach activities at a local level.	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	It is not clear whether policies EDU-4, EDU-8, INCENT-2, INCENT-5 belong under s. 22(7) of the act or under s. 26 p. 1 of the regulation. Policies under s. 22(7) of the act may be applied more broadly across the municipality/watershed and are non legally binding, whereas policies authorized under s. 26 p.1 of the regulation must address a vulnerable area and threat and may be legally binding depending on the implementing body. In order to determine whether these policies were intended to be legally binding, we reviewed the legal effect lists. From these lists it appears the policies are intended to address SDWT, however the policy wording itself does not specify an "area where significant" which should be included for clarity. Alternatively, if it was the committee's intention to include these policies more broadly across the community, these policies should be placed on List J.	Yes, the intent of policies EDU-4, EDU-8, INCENT-2 and INCENT-5 is to address significant drinking water threats. The policies have been revised to clearly specify an "area where significant".
INCENT-2	In	MC	SPA	E	If stewardship program funding is extended, local source protection authorities should implement risk reduction projects through the stewardship program targeting prescribed drinking water threats, as appropriate.	MON-5		MOE	Policy wording	It is not clear whether policies EDU-4, EDU-8, INCENT-2, INCENT-5 belong under s. 22(7) of the act or under s. 26 p. 1 of the regulation. Policies under s. 22(7) of the act may be applied more broadly across the municipality/watershed and are non legally binding, whereas policies authorized under s. 26 p.1 of the regulation must address a vulnerable area and threat and may be legally binding depending on the implementing body. In order to determine whether these policies were intended to be legally binding, we reviewed the legal effect lists. From these lists it appears the policies are intended to address SDWT, however the policy wording itself does not specify an "area where significant" which should be included for clarity. Alternatively, if it was the committee's intention to include these policies more broadly across the community, these policies should be placed on List J.	Yes, the intent of policies EDU-4, EDU-8, INCENT-2 and INCENT-5 is to address significant drinking water threats. The policies have been revised to clearly specify an "area where significant".
INCENT-5	In	NLB	OSCIA	E	To address threats to drinking water related to agricultural activities (application, handling and storage of agricultural source material, pesticides, fertilizers) the OSCIA is encouraged to prioritize the Environmental Farm Plan monies for use within vulnerable areas identified in assessment reports developed under the Clean Water Act.	N/A		MOE	Policy wording	It is not clear whether policies EDU-4, EDU-8, INCENT-2, INCENT-5 belong under s. 22(7) of the act or under s. 26 p. 1 of the regulation. Policies under s. 22(7) of the act may be applied more broadly across the municipality/watershed and are non legally binding, whereas policies authorized under s. 26 p.1 of the regulation must address a vulnerable area and threat and may be legally binding depending on the implementing body. In order to determine whether these policies were intended to be legally binding, we reviewed the legal effect lists. From these lists it appears the policies are intended to address SDWT, however the policy wording itself does not specify an "area where significant" which should be included for clarity. Alternatively, if it was the committee's intention to include these policies more broadly across the community, these policies should be placed on List J.	Yes, the intent of policies EDU-4, EDU-8, INCENT-2 and INCENT-5 is to address significant drinking water threats. The policies have been revised to clearly specify an "area where significant".
EDU-9	EO	MC	MOE	E	The MOE should require products containing DNAPL to be clearly labeled as such	MON-2		MOE	Policy wording	EDU-9: It is unclear why MOE has been requested to implement a policy requiring product labeling as Health Canada regulates dangerous products labels under the Hazardous Products Act and associated Controlled Products Regulations. This policy could be included separately as a recommendation to the Minister. If the committee feels it is absolutely necessary to include this policy, then the policy could be reworded so that MOE considers requesting Health Canada include products containing DNAPLs (TCE, PAHs, and vinyl chloride) and organic solvents (chloroform, carbon tetrachloride, pentachlorophenol, methylene chloride) as controlled products, requiring cautionary labeling. Please note that specific chemicals listed in the circumstances that contaminate drinking water were added to the suggested wording for clarity and to assist with scoping the parameters of a labeling program.	The policy has been revised as suggested " the MOE shall petition Health Canada..."

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
MON-4	Mon	MC	MOI/MMAH	E/F	By February 1 of each year, MOI and MMAH shall report to the local SPA on the steps taken in the previous calendar year to implement the Significant Threat policies and recommendations, where appropriate.			MOE	Policy wording	Please be reminded that only public bodies, as defined in section 2 of the CWA, can carry out monitoring related to significant threats, therefore, these monitoring policies that require non-public bodies such as Transport Canada to monitor implementation of a policy should be changed. For example, you could make changes to require the SPA (instead of Transport Canada) to gather the information from the non-public body and report on the status of implementation. As such please amend MON-4.	Policy revised as suggested
TIME-2	RMP	MC	RMO	F	On the date the source protection plan takes effect, all future activities designated for the purpose of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act require a risk management plan to be established prior to engaging in the designated activity in the area where the threat could be significant.		56	MOE	Timing for conformity	On page 56 and 57 we note that a number of new policies that address effective dates and conformity requirements have been included since the draft plan as recommended/required. Please ensure that the policies are included on the appropriate lists in Appendix A (as noted in the comments on lists at the end of this memo). Please note that policies TIME-2, TIME-4, and TIME-6 are stated in legislation and do not have to be included in the Plan. It may be more appropriate to include these policies as contextual information in the timing section.	The timing for conformity policies have now been included on the correct legal effect list. The committee recognizes that policies TIME-2, TIME-4 and TIME-6 are not required to appear in the plan as they are stated in legislation. However, the committee choose to include these policies for clarity.
TIME-4	Pro	MC	RMO	F	On the date the source protection plan takes effect, all future activities designated for the purpose of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act are prohibited in the area where the threat could be significant.		56	MOE	Timing for conformity	On page 56 and 57 we note that a number of new policies that address effective dates and conformity requirements have been included since the draft plan as recommended/required. Please ensure that the policies are included on the appropriate lists in Appendix A (as noted in the comments on lists at the end of this memo). Please note that policies TIME-2, TIME-4, and TIME-6 are stated in legislation and do not have to be included in the Plan. It may be more appropriate to include these policies as contextual information in the timing section.	The timing for conformity policies have now been included on the correct legal effect list. The committee recognizes that policies TIME-2, TIME-4 and TIME-6 are not required to appear in the plan as they are stated in legislation. However, the committee choose to include these policies for clarity.
TIME-6	PI	MC	MOE, OMAFRA	F	All future prescribed instruments shall comply with the applicable significant drinking water threat policies on the day the source protection plan takes effect.		57	MOE	Timing for conformity	On page 56 and 57 we note that a number of new policies that address effective dates and conformity requirements have been included since the draft plan as recommended/required. Please ensure that the policies are included on the appropriate lists in Appendix A (as noted in the comments on lists at the end of this memo). Please note that policies TIME-2, TIME-4, and TIME-6 are stated in legislation and do not have to be included in the Plan. It may be more appropriate to include these policies as contextual information in the timing section.	The timing for conformity policies have now been included on the correct legal effect list. The committee recognizes that policies TIME-2, TIME-4 and TIME-6 are not required to appear in the plan as they are stated in legislation. However, the committee choose to include these policies for clarity.
WAST(b)-2	PI	MC	MOE	E	Where the establishment, operation or maintenance of an existing waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act (PCB temporary storage site) is in an area where this activity is a significant drinking water threat, the MOE shall ensure that the Environmental Compliance Approval that governs the waste disposal site includes appropriate terms and conditions to ensure the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-1	62	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 62, WAST(b)-2: delete (PCB waste disposal site) replace MON-1 with MON-2, WAST(b)-3: replace MON-1 with MON-2.	Policy WAST(b)-2 has been removed from the plan as there is no Prescribed Instrument Available to deal with PCB waste disposal sites. The monitoring policy reference for WAST(b)-3 has been corrected to reference MON-2.
WAST(b)-3	PI	MC	MOE	F	Where the future establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act would be a significant drinking water threat, the MOE shall not issue an Environmental Compliance Approval.	MON-1	62	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 62, WAST(b)-2: delete (PCB waste disposal site) replace MON-1 with MON-2, WAST(b)-3: replace MON-1 with MON-2.	Policy WAST(b)-2 has been removed from the plan as there is no Prescribed Instrument Available to deal with PCB waste disposal sites. The monitoring policy reference for WAST(b)-3 has been corrected to reference MON-2.
SEWG(c)-4	Oth	MC	Mun	E	Municipalities shall implement an inspection program for small on-site sewage systems that are located in vulnerable areas where they are a significant drinking water threat in accordance with the Ontario Building Code.	MON-1	72	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 72, SEWG(c)-4: please indicate that this policy also applies to future occurrences.	The table has been updated to indicate that this policy also applies to future occurrences.
ASM(App)-4	PI	MC	OMAFRA	E/F	Where the existing and future application of agricultural source material to land is in an area where this activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat outside of WHPA-A or IPZ-1, and the activity requires an approval under the Nutrient Management Act, OMAFRA shall ensure that the nutrient management plan or strategy that governs the application of agricultural source material to land includes appropriate terms and conditions to ensure that the activity ceases to be or does not become a significant drinking water threat.	MON-1	76	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 76, ASM(App)-4: replace MON-1 with MON-3.	The reference to Monitoring Policy 1 has been changed to Monitoring Policy 3
LSTOCK-3	RMP	MC	RMO	E/F	Existing and future outdoor confinement areas and farm-animal yards are designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act, and therefore require a risk management plan for those not phased in under the Nutrient Management Act where the activity is a significant drinking water threat outside of WHPA-A/IPZ-1. The risk management plan, at a minimum, will be based on contemporary standards, reflect appropriate nutrient management practices and ensure the activity ceases to be or does not become a significant drinking water threat.	MON-6	125	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 125, LSTOCK-3 should be replaced with LSTOCK-5 and LSTOCK-4 should be replaced with LSTOCK-6.	The policy numbering has been corrected.
LSTOCK-5	PI	MC	OMAFRA	E/F	Where existing and future outdoor confinement areas and farm-animal yards are in an area where the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat outside of WHPA-A/IPZ-1, and the activity requires an approval under the Nutrient Management Act, OMAFRA shall ensure that the nutrient management plan or strategy that governs the outdoor confinement area or farm-animal yard include appropriate terms and conditions to ensure the activity ceases to be or become a significant drinking water threat.	MON-3	125	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 125, LSTOCK-3 should be replaced with LSTOCK-5 and LSTOCK-4 should be replaced with LSTOCK-6.	The policy numbering has been corrected.
LSTOCK-4	PRO	MC	RMO	E/F	Where the Nutrient Management Act does not require an approval, existing and future outdoor confinement and farm-animal yards is designated for the purposes of Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, and is therefore prohibited within WHPA-A/IPZ-1.	MON-6	125	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 125, LSTOCK-3 should be replaced with LSTOCK-5 and LSTOCK-4 should be replaced with LSTOCK-6.	The policy numbering has been corrected.
LSTOCK-6	PI	MC	OMAFRA	E/f	Existing and future outdoor confinement areas and farm-animal yards are prohibited within WHPA-A/IPZ-1, where the activity would be a significant drinking water threat.	MON-3	125	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 125, LSTOCK-3 should be replaced with LSTOCK-5 and LSTOCK-4 should be replaced with LSTOCK-6.	The policy numbering has been corrected.
EDU-2	EO	MC	SPA	E	The local SPA shall undertake an education and outreach program, and use materials developed by the MOE where possible to target those applying, handling or storing: 15) fuel 16) dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs); and 17) organic solvents within vulnerable areas where the activity would be a significant drinking water threat. The program will promote pollution prevention by explaining the importance of proper storage and disposal of hazardous waste, and will promote the use of alternatives to DNAPLs. The program will be carried out in consultation with the municipality responsible for waste and TSSA, where appropriate.	MON-5	132	MOE	Typographical errors	Page 132, EDU-2: suggest deleting the word "applying" from the policy.	The word "applying" has been deleted from the policy as per your suggestion.

Policy Number	Tool	Legal Effect	Implementer	Existing / Future	Policy Text	Policy Monitoring Requirement	Page number	Comment From	Theme	Comments Received by SPA	SPC Comments / Responses as endorsed by each SPA
								Amaranth	Water Conservation Plans funding and implementation	Funding for the preparation and implementation of Water Conservation Plans is required by the Province or the Conservation Authority. In addition, it is unclear how Water Conservation Plans are to be implemented by the municipalities.	Concerns about implementation costs have been forwarded to the Ministry a number of times and through a number of channels.