

## Policy Examples

Appendix B will be added when the SPC gets to the appropriate stage in the policy discussions. The policy examples presented in appendix B are placeholder policies based on the policy ideas noted above. They are presented in this document to facilitate policy discussion at the upcoming SPC meeting. And subsequent review and comment by the Municipal Source Protection Policy Advisory committee.

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-1
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Application and Storage and Handling of Pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant, Moderate and Low
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	Municipal Watershed Partnership with Conservation Authority to lead. The implementation of this policy in this manner builds on the strengths and efficiencies of the Conservation Authorities as a partnership of the municipalities in the watershed.
<b>Threat Status</b>	Future, Existing, Expanding
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Conform
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Education and Outreach
<b>Policy Idea</b>	<p>Develop new or where possible expand on existing education and outreach programs to promote agricultural, recreational and industrial Best Management Practices to protect drinking water sources from risks of pesticides including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of Integrated Pest Management;</li> <li>• Increase awareness of the existing cosmetic pesticide ban including retail, wholesale and end user education programs</li> <li>• Promotion of spill contingency plans;</li> <li>• Increase awareness of areas which are vulnerable;</li> <li>• Education of landowners and application technicians on importance of buffers around wells and surface water where the management of pesticides is important;</li> <li>• Incorporation of source water messaging into existing education and outreach or establish new materials to be provided to landowners whose properties may be utilized for the application or storage of pesticides; and,</li> <li>• Promotion of partnerships with OMAFRA and others.</li> <li>• The implementation of this policy through the existing municipal partnership of the Conservation Authority will allow these programs to be built on existing watershed education and outreach in an efficient manner. The municipalities can be involved in the program development and delivery depending on their individual needs, however the program(s) would be developed in a consistent manner</li> </ul>

Appendix B – policy examples

	across the region.
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	Within 2 years of the approval of the Source Protection Plan
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	The implementing body shall report annually to the SPA the number of educational packages offered as well as a description of the actions/measures they have taken to implement the education/outreach. Measures of tracking the uptake by the target audience will also be included in this report.

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-2
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Application and Storage and Handling of Pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	Conservation Authority, Municipality, MOE, others
<b>Threat Status</b>	Existing, Expanding and Future
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Strategic Action
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Incentives
<b>Policy Idea</b>	<p>The Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship program shall continue to adequately fund risk mitigation practices for significant drinking water threats over the long term.</p> <p>Existing incentive programs (including EFP, Clean Water Program and others) that contribute to protection of drinking water sources should continue to be supported.</p> <p>New incentive programs should be considered for the storage of pesticides to assist with the implementation costs of risk mitigation practices for significant, moderate and low threats on drinking water sources. Where funding is limited, emphasis shall be on significant threat mitigation.</p>
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	Ongoing implementation for existing programs or within 2 years of the approval of the SPP for new programs.
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-3
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Storage of pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	Municipality
<b>Threat Status</b>	Future
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Conform
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Land Use Planning
<b>Policy Idea</b>	The establishment of new pesticide storage facilities involving manufacturing, processing, wholesaling, and retailing of pesticides, as well as storage for extermination will not be permitted in vulnerable areas where they would be a significant threat.
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	Shall be initiated in all Official Plans within 6 months of Source Protection Plan approval date with the goal to be completed within 2 years of the Source Protection Plan approval date. Zoning by-laws shall be updated within 3 years of the Source Protection Plan approval date.
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	Municipalities shall report to SPA on new policies incorporated in Official Plans and any new by-laws relevant to source water protection. All municipalities must report even if it is to indicate that no changes were required. Where no changes were required, the report is to describe how the existing OP and bylaws meet the requirements of this policy.

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-4
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Application of pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	MOE
<b>Threat Status</b>	Existing and Future
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Conform
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Prescribed Instrument – Pesticide Act
<b>Policy Idea</b>	<p>Where a property is required to have a pesticide application permit as per the <i>Pesticide Act</i>, MOE shall ensure existing and future permits adequately manage the threat to drinking water by.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibiting the application of pesticides which are significant threats in areas where they are a significant threat; and,</li> <li>• Including conditions on the permit which emphasize the protection of municipal wellheads where the application of the pesticide is not a significant threat.</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	All new permits shall conform with this policy from the date of approval of the SPP. Existing permits which would be valid one year of the approval of the SPP shall be brought into conformity with the SPP within six months of the approval of the SPP.
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	A report shall be submitted by MOE to the CA annually which indicates the number of permit applications issued and if any, the number that were found to be out of compliance with the Source Protection Plan.

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-5
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Application and Storage and Handling of Pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	MOE
<b>Threat Status</b>	Existing, Expanding and Future
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Strategic action
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Specify action
<b>Policy Idea</b>	Location within a source protection vulnerable area shall be included as a factor in selecting inspection priorities for pesticide application permits.  It is recommended that inspections are conducted at least every 5 years for significant threats where pesticide application under a permit occurs more than once.
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	The implementation of a program which targets significant threats shall be initiated within 1 year of the approval of the SPP. All significant threats shall be inspected within 5 years of the approval of the SPP.
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	A report shall be submitted to the CA annually which indicates the number of inspections undertaken within the areas where these activities can be significant threats, the number of situation identified where the plan holder was found to be out of compliance with their plan or strategy, the number of orders issued, and the number of changes to strategies or plans as a result of the inspection.

Appendix B – policy examples

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-6a
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Storage of pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	Municipality
<b>Threat Status</b>	Existing and Expanding
<b>Land Use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Conform
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Risk Management Plan
<b>Policy Idea</b>	<p>Existing pesticide storage deemed a significant threat shall have an approved Risk Management Plan. A spills contingency plan must be included as part of the Risk Management Plan.</p> <p>The expansion of an existing pesticide storage site shall only be permitted in accordance with a Risk Management Plan. As such, where an adequate risk management plan cannot be negotiated, the significant threat cannot be undertaken. It is believed that in most cases BMPs, if properly implemented, can adequately manage the significant threat.</p>
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	Existing pesticide storage facilities shall be brought into compliance with the SPP within 1 year of the approval of the SPP. For new pesticide storages this policy shall come into effect when the SPP is approved.
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	The Risk Management Official shall submit an annual report which includes the number of RMP required and approved to the CA

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-6b
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Application of pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	Municipality
<b>Threat Status</b>	Existing and Future
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Conform
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Risk Management Plan
<b>Policy Idea</b>	<p>Pesticides which are considered significant threats shall only be applied in accordance with an approved Risk Management Plan in areas where application is a significant threat. As such, where an adequate risk management plan cannot be negotiated, the significant threat cannot be undertaken. It is believed that in most cases BMPs, if properly implemented, can adequately manage the significant threat.</p> <p>The Risk Management Plan must be reviewed every 5 years.</p>
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	Within 1 year of the approval of the SPP
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	The Risk Management Official shall submit an annual report which includes the number of RMP required and approved to the CA

Appendix B – policy examples

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-7
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Storage of Pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	Municipality
<b>Threat Status</b>	Existing, Future
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Conform
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Prohibition
<b>Policy Idea</b>	Temporary pesticide storage sites will not be permitted within vulnerable areas where they are deemed a significant threat.
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	The policy takes effect one year after the approval date of the first source protection plan.
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	The municipality shall submit a report which includes the number of storage facilities which were found in contravention of this policy. The report shall be submitted annually to the CA

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-8
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Application and Storage and Handling of Pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	Municipality
<b>Threat Status</b>	Existing, Expanding and Future
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Conform
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Restricted Land use
<b>Policy Idea</b>	Within the area where the application, storage or handling of pesticides is a significant threat, the municipality shall amend its zoning by-laws and official plans to identify, as restricted, all land uses where application, storage or handling of pesticides could occur.
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	Shall be initiated in all Official Plans within 6 months of Source Protection Plan approval with the goal to be completed within 2 years of the Source Protection Plan approval date. Zoning bylaws shall be updated within 3 years of the Source Protection Plan approval date.
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	Municipalities shall report to SPA on new policies incorporated in Official Plans and any new by-laws relevant to source water protection. All municipalities must report even if it is to indicate that no changes were required. Where no changes were required, the report is to describe how the existing OP and bylaws meet the requirements of this policy.

Appendix B – policy examples

<b>Policy Example Number</b>	10-9
<b>Sub- Threat(s)</b>	Application and Storage and Handling of Pesticides
<b>Circumstance</b>	Pesticides and application circumstances which are significant drinking water threats
<b>Vulnerable Area</b>	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
<b>Risk</b>	Significant
<b>Body Responsible for Implementing</b>	Municipality
<b>Threat Status</b>	Existing, Expanding and Future
<b>Land Use</b>	All
<b>Legal Effect</b>	Strategic Action
<b>Policy Tool</b>	Land Securement
<b>Policy Idea</b>	Municipalities shall consider land securement around wellheads in instances where the municipality wishes to exceed the level of protection identified in the SPP.
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	
<b>Monitoring Policy</b>	When land securement has been pursued the municipality shall report the progress and outcomes to the CA.