

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.

Policy Example Number	21-1
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant, Moderate and Low
Body Responsible for Implementing	Partnership, Conservation Authority to lead
Threat Status	Future, Existing, Expanding
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Education and Outreach
Policy Idea	<p>Promote Best Management Practices to protect drinking water sources from chemical and pathogen risks generated from livestock 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; • Include runoff management and vaccinations for E-coli risk; • Education to landowners and application technicians on importance of buffers around wells and surface water where the management of livestock manure 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
Implementation schedule	Within 2 years of the approval of the Source Protection Plan
Monitoring Policy	Issuing agency to report to SPA on number of educational packages.

Policy Example Number	21-2
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Conservation Authority, Municipality, MOE, others
Threat Status	Existing, Expanding and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Strategic Action
Policy Tool	Incentives
Policy Idea	<p>It is highly recommended that the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship program 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>The development of new incentive programs are encouraged to assist with the implementation costs of mitigation practices for significant, moderate and low threats on drinking water sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New and innovative practices which reduce risk should be incorporated into incentive programs (e.g. vaccination for cattle reduces E-coli) • Where funding is limited, emphasis shall be on significant threat mitigation • Runoff management and fencing from surface water • Encourage relocation of significant threats to where they would not be significant within the same farm unit
Implementation schedule	
Monitoring Policy	

Appendix B – policy examples

Policy Example Number	21-4
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	MOE
Threat Status	Existing and Expanding
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Prescribed Instrument
Policy Idea	Where a property with existing outdoor confinement area is required to have a nutrient management plan as per the Nutrient Management Act, the property owner shall fulfill the requirements of the Nutrient Management Act in order to adequately manage the significant threat.
Implementation schedule	
Monitoring Policy	

Policy Example Number	21-5
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	OMAFRA, MOE
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.
Implementation schedule	
Monitoring Policy	

Appendix B – policy examples

Policy Example Number	21-6a
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land as an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard
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	Existing outdoor confinement areas deemed a significant threat and not regulated under the NMA will require an approved Risk Management Plan. The Risk Management Plan must be accordance with the outdoor confinement standards as laid out in the NMA.
Implementation schedule	
Monitoring Policy	

Appendix B – policy examples

Policy Example Number	21-6b
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land,
Circumstance	
Vulnerable Area	WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10
Risk	Significant
Body Responsible for Implementing	Municipality
Threat Status	Existing and Future
Land Use	Agricultural
Legal Effect	Conform
Policy Tool	Risk Management Plan
Policy Idea	Livestock grazing and pasturing shall occur in accordance with an approved Risk Management Plan in areas where it has been deemed a significant threat The Risk Management Plan must be reviewed every 5 years.
Implementation schedule	
Monitoring Policy	

Appendix B – policy examples

Policy Example Number	21-7
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard
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	Prohibition
Policy Idea	New outdoor confinement areas will not permitted within vulnerable areas where they are deemed a significant threat.
Implementation schedule	
Monitoring Policy	

Policy Example Number	21-8
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard
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	All
Legal Effect	Strategic action
Policy Tool	Restricted Land use
Policy Idea	The municipality shall amend its zoning by-laws and official plans to include a holding provision for all properties in the affected vulnerable areas. This policy applies to all land use designations.
Implementation schedule	
Monitoring Policy	

Appendix B – policy examples

Policy Example Number	21-9
Sub- Threat(s)	The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard
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	Recommend that municipalities 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	