

Policy Examples

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

Policy Example Number	4-1
Sub- Threat(s)	Application and Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant, Moderate and Low
Body Responsible for Implementing	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.
Threat Status	Future, Existing, Expanding
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform(significant); Have Regard (moderate, low)
Policy Tool	Education and Outreach
Policy Idea	<p>Develop new or where possible expand on existing education and outreach programs to promote Best Management Practices to protect drinking water sources from chemical and pathogen risks of Agricultural Source Materials including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of nutrient management plans even where not currently required under NMA; • Promotion of voluntary Environmental Farm Plan; • Promotion of planning and implementation of spills prevention and response; • Education to landowners and application technicians on importance of buffers around wells and surface water where the management of ASMs is important; • 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 agricultural source materials; and, • Promotion of partnerships with OMAFRA and others. • 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

Appendix B – policy examples

	across the region.
Implementation schedule	Within 2 years of the approval of the Source Protection Plan
Monitoring Policy	The implementing body shall report 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 in the previous year. Measures of tracking of the uptake by the target audience will also be included in this report.

Policy Example Number	4-2
Sub- Threat(s)	Application and Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Conservation Authority, Municipality, MOE, others (may need to separate to create policies for each type of responsible body)
Threat Status	Existing, Expanding and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Strategic Action
Policy Tool	Incentives
Policy Idea	<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 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>
Implementation schedule	Ongoing implementation for existing programs or within 2 years of the approval of the SPP for new programs.
Monitoring Policy	

Appendix B – policy examples

Policy Example Number	4-3
Sub- Threat(s)	Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Municipality
Threat Status	Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Land Use Planning
Policy Idea	The establishment of new storage facilities for agricultural source materials will not be permitted in vulnerable areas where they would be a significant threat.
Implementation schedule	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.
Monitoring Policy	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

Policy Example Number	4-4a
Sub- Threat(s)	Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	OMAFRA (responsible for approval of Nutrient Management Strategies) ,MOE (responsible for inspections and enforcement)
Threat Status	Existing and Expanding
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Prescribed Instrument-Nutrient Management Act
Policy Idea	Province to review and ensure that Nutrient Management Strategies and Plans adequately manage the risk where the storage of ASMs is a significant threat. OMAFRA shall review Nutrient Management Strategies and Plans within areas >100 m of a municipal well, where the storage of ASM would be a significant threat.
Implementation schedule	Within 1 year of approval of the SPP
Monitoring Policy	Submit an annual report to the CA which identifies the number of NMP, and NMS which were reviewed and the number which required updates to adequately manage the significant threats. MOE will submit an annual report to the CA which identifies the number of inspections and enforcements under the Nutrient Management Act.

Policy Example Number	4-4b
Sub- Threat(s)	Application of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	OMAFRA (responsible for approval of Nutrient Management Strategies), MOE (responsible for inspections and enforcement)
Threat Status	Existing and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Prescribed Instrument-Nutrient Management Act
Policy Idea	Province to review and ensure that Nutrient Management Strategies and Plans adequately manage the risk where the application of ASMs is a significant threat. OMAFRA shall review Nutrient Management Strategies and Plans within areas >100 m of a municipal well, where the application of ASM would be a significant threat.
Implementation schedule	Within 1 year of approval of the SPP
Monitoring Policy	Submit an annual report to the CA which identifies the number of NMP, and NMS which were reviewed and the number which required updates to adequately manage the significant threats. MOE will submit an annual report to the CA which identifies the number of inspections and enforcements under the Nutrient Management Act.

Policy Example Number	4-5a
Sub- Threat(s)	Application and Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	MOE
Threat Status	Existing, Expanding and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Strategic action
Policy Tool	Other-Specify action
Policy Idea	<p>It is recommended that through MOE's on-farm compliance program that location within a source protection vulnerable area is included as a factor in selecting inspection priorities.</p> <p>It is recommended that inspections are conducted every 5 years for significant threats.</p>
Implementation schedule	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.
Monitoring Policy	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.

Policy Example Number	4-5b
Sub- Threat(s)	Application and Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	OMAFRA (responsible for approving Nutrient Management Strategies), MOE (responsible for inspections and enforcement)
Threat Status	Existing, Expanding and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Strategic action
Policy Tool	Specify action
Policy Idea	It is recommended that OMAFRA include voluntary Nutrient Management Plans and Strategies in its review program where the application and storage of ASMs is a significant threat.
Implementation schedule	Within 1 year of approval of the SPP
Monitoring Policy	Submit an annual report to the CA with the number of voluntary NMP and NMS reviewed. MOE will submit an annual report to the CA which identifies the number of inspections and enforcements of these voluntary plans and strategies under the Nutrient Management Act.

Policy Example Number	4-6a
Sub- Threat(s)	Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Municipality
Threat Status	Existing and Expanding
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Risk Management Plan
Policy Idea	<p>Existing ASM storages deemed a significant threat and not regulated under the NMA shall have an approved Risk Management Plan.</p> <p>The Risk Management Plan must meet the requirements of the Nutrient Management Act provided it adequately manages the significant threat. In most cases, the Nutrient Management Plan is believed to adequately manage the risk. Where an adequate risk management plan cannot be negotiated, the significant threat cannot be undertaken..A spills contingency plan must be included as part of the RMP.</p> <p>The expansion of an existing storage site for agricultural source materials, for which a Nutrient Management Plan is not required, will only be permitted in accordance with a Risk Management Plan.</p>
Implementation schedule	Within 1 year of the approval of the SPP
Monitoring Policy	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

Policy Example Number	4-6b
Sub- Threat(s)	Application of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Municipality
Threat Status	Existing, Expanding, and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Risk Management Plan
Policy Idea	<p>Agricultural source material shall only be applied in accordance with an approved Risk Management Plan in areas where it has been deemed a significant threat and the farm managing the land within the vulnerable area is not regulated under the NMA.</p> <p>The Risk Management Plan shall be in accordance with the ASM application standards as laid out in the NMA provided it adequately manages the significant threat. In most cases, the Nutrient Management Plan is believed to adequately manage the risk. Where an adequate risk management plan cannot be negotiated, the significant threat cannot be undertaken.. A spills contingency plan must be included as part of the RMP.</p> <p>The Risk Management Plan must be reviewed every 5 years.</p>
Implementation schedule	Within 1 year of the approval of the SPP
Monitoring Policy	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

Policy Example Number	4-7
Sub- Threat(s)	Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Municipality
Threat Status	Existing, Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Prohibition
Policy Idea	Temporary field nutrient storage sites will not be permitted within vulnerable areas where they are deemed a significant threat.
Implementation schedule	The policy takes effect one year after the approval date of the first source protection plan.
Monitoring Policy	The municipality shall submit a report which includes whether they have identified any storage which was used in contravention of this policy. The report shall be submitted annually to the CA

Appendix B – policy examples

Policy Example Number	4-8
Sub- Threat(s)	Application and Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Municipality
Threat Status	Existing, Expanding and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Restricted Land use
Policy Idea	Within the area where the application or storage of ASM is a significant threat, the municipality shall amend its zoning by-laws and official plans to identify all land uses which could be associated with the application and/or storage of ASM as restricted.
Implementation schedule	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.
Monitoring Policy	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

Policy Example Number	4-9
Sub- Threat(s)	Application and Storage of ASMs
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Municipality
Threat Status	Existing, Expanding and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Strategic Action
Policy Tool	Land Securement
Policy Idea	Municipalities shall consider land securement around wellheads in instances where the municipality wishes to exceed the level of protection identified in the SPP.
Implementation schedule	
Monitoring Policy	When land securement has been pursued the municipality shall report the progress and outcomes to the CA.