



Thames – Sydenham and Region Source Protection
Committee

Meeting Notice

Please be advised that a meeting of the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee has been called for the following time. Please confirm attendance with Deb Kirk at 519-451-2800 x256.

Meeting Date: March 24, 2017

Meeting Time: 10:00 am -12:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: St. Clair Conservation Authority Board Room

Proposed Agenda

- | | | |
|-----------|--|--------------|
| 1 | Chair's Welcome and Introductions | 10:00 |
| 2 | Adoption of the Agenda | |
| 3 | Delegations – none | |
| 4 | Declaration of Conflict of Interest | |
| 5 | Business arising from the minutes | |
| 5a | Chair appointment | 10:00- 10:05 |
| 6 | SPC meeting minute approvals and web posting | |
| 7 | Business | |
| 7a | Annual Reporting Requirements (30 min) | 10:05-10:35 |
| 7b | UTRCA Risk Management Services Presentation (30 minutes) | 10:35-11:05 |
| 7c | Section 36 SPP Amendments- presentation (15 minutes) | 11:05-11:20 |
| 7d | EBR Posting-Technical Rule changes (15 minutes) | 11:20-11:35 |
| 8 | Information | |
| 8a | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New online information tool on Lake Erie Harmful Algal Blooms. Project team from University of Toledo opened a new web-based online information database tool for research and studies on Lake Erie HABs. http://lakeeriehabsis.gis.utoledo.edu/• Auditor General's Follow up Report | 11:35 |
| 9 | In Camera Session (not planned) | |
| 10 | Other Business | 11:45 |
| 11 | MOE Liaison report | |
| 12 | Member Reports | |
| 13 | Adjournment | 12:00 |

Next Meeting: Friday, to be determined (SCRCA)

Thames – Sydenham and Region Drinking Water Source Protection Source Protection Committee Discussion Paper

Report to Chair and members
Thames – Sydenham and Region
Source Protection Committee

Agenda # 2017.03.24 7a

Cc SP Management Committee

Date March 7, 2017

Prepared By Jenna Allain, Source Protection Coordinator

Re: Monitoring Report Summary for 2016

Background

All policies in the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Plan have an associated Monitoring Policy. These policies require that implementing bodies provide a report to the SPA annually on February 1, starting in 2017 summarizing the activities taken toward implementing the policy in the previous calendar year. The TSR received reports on or before February 1st, from all municipalities in the Region, all Risk Management Officials in the Region, MOECC, OMAFRA, MTO, MNRF, MGCS, and TSSA.

In 2018, the TSR will be preparing a comprehensive annual report to be submitted to the MOECC along with a summary document for the public. The monitoring reports received in February 2017 allow us a first look at the implementation progress made to date, and the information collected from those reports will inform the comprehensive annual report to be submitted in 2018. MOECC has worked in consultation with SPA staff to develop the reportables and templates for the comprehensive annual reports. Drafts of the reporting templates and reportables were reviewed by the Source Protection Committee at the November 2016 meeting. The MOECC reportables in turn informed the municipal and RMO reporting templates which were prepared by SPA staff for the monitoring reports due on February 1st.

Information gathered from the submitted monitoring reports has been summarized below, to provide an overview of the progress made toward implementing the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Plan policies between January 1 and December 31, 2016.

Discussion

Provincial Implementation

Prescribed Instrument policies use provincially issued documents to address potential significant drinking water threats through their licencing and approval processes (i.e. Environmental Compliance Approvals, Aggregate Licenses, Wayside Permits, etc.). The provincial ministries that are named as implementing bodies in the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Plan include the Ministry of Transportation (MTO), Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC).

Ministry of Transportation (MTO)

The MTO worked with a committee to complete a road sign design to be used across the province. MTO installed a total of 42 signs in Mississippi-Rideau, Niagara Region, North Bay Mattawa, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury and Trent Conservation Coalition. Six signs will be installed in the Thames-Sydenham and Region. The intended completion date for installations in all regions is no later than Fall 2018.

MTO has indicated that they cannot make a commitment to consider source water protection information as criterion when establishing and reviewing Emergency Detour Routes (EDRs) in event-based areas as suggested in Policy 2.54 of the SPP. Criteria for EDRs are developed by a committee consisting of provincial and municipal representatives, OPP, and municipal police forces.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)

MNRF Aggregate Inspectors have received an overview of Source Protection and applicable Source Protection policies and have been instructed to screen new applications and amendments using the mapping tool developed by MOECC. To ensure decisions made on PI applications conform with significant drinking water threats policies, all new aggregate licence and permit applications submitted to MNRF must be circulated to the Upper and Lower Tier Municipality for review and comment. In addition, all new licence applications must be circulated to the local Conservation Authority for review and comment.

MNRF is in the process of reviewing existing instruments under the *Aggregate Resources Act* (ARA) (e.g. licences and permits which authorize pits and quarries) issued prior to the effective date of the Source Protection Plan to determine if the applicable sites are storing and handling fuel in wellhead protection areas and intake protection zones.

MNRF has indicated that they have not waived any application fees for PIs as directed by policy 2.06 and O.C.-2.43 in the SPP.

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)

In order to ensure PI decisions on incoming PI applications (new or amendments) conform with SDWT PI policies, OMAFRA is undertaking a detailed screening for SWP policies. If it is determined that significant threat policies apply, then applicable conditions, if necessary, are added to the PI approval.

Where low/moderate threat policies may apply, the process is the same as above, but the addition of any conditions on the PI is up to OMAFRA to decide. Typically, the certified person that prepares the PI works with the farmer to determine what best management practices could be used to address the low or moderate threat, and therefore help ensure there is no threat to drinking water. OMAFRA determines if these practices are acceptable and adds them as a condition on the PI if adequate.

Twenty-two Nutrient Management Strategy applications and 13 Non-Agricultural Source Material Plan applications went through a detailed review for source protection purposes in the Thames-Sydenham Region in 2016. None of the activities associated with those 35 applications were determined to be a SDWT where the activity was prohibited or managed through conditions in the PI.

OMAFRA has identified the existing PIs that need to be reviewed. Every owner of a PI will be contacted and informed that they have a nutrient management strategy or a NASM plan in an area to which local source water protection policies may apply. They must work with a certified person to evaluate their prescribed instrument, make any necessary modification to address local source water protection policies and resubmit the instrument for approval. OMAFRA will evaluate the amended PI and issue an approval with conditions when the PI is complete. Notifications were prepared for the holders of 2 NM Strategies and 2 NASM Plans in the TSR. The notices were sent by January 31, 2017, and the farmers were asked to respond by February 28, 2017.

OMAFRA neither issues nor reviews nutrient management plans and, as such, OMAFRA cannot include/require conditions in this type of approval.

OMAFRA has not issued any Section 61 exemptions in the TS Region that would exempt a property from requiring a risk management plan if a PI exists for that property and is managing the threat.

OMAFRA has never had an application fee for a nutrient management strategy or a NASM plan, and therefore, there were no application fees to waive as directed by policies 2.06 and OC-2.43 in the SPP.

Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)

The MOECC submitted separate monitoring reports to summarize their actions taken to implement prescribed instruments policies related to: waste, hauled sewage and biosolids, wastewater, pesticides, fuel at municipal drinking water system sites, permits to take water, and conditions. There was a significant amount of data and information provided in these reports which is difficult to summarize in

this brief summary report. Although, the MOECC is in various stages of implementation for each of the prescribed instrument policies they are responsible for, the same general approach is being taken for each PI, which is summarized here. The detailed data about the types and numbers of applications screened is not included in this report.

The MOECC have developed Standard Operating Policies (SOPs) to address existing and future threats. In order to notify stakeholders of this approach, the MOECC posted an information notice with a summary of their source protection SOPs on the Environmental Registry (EBR #012-2968) on April 1, 2015.

Since 2015, the ministry has been screening new PIs to determine if any activities associated with the PI are located in an area where the activity could be a significant drinking water threat. This is called the 'primary screening'. If this criteria applies, the PI is flagged for a more detailed 'secondary screening' to determine if the activity associated with the application is a significant drinking water threat. If yes, the appropriate SOP is applied.

Where a source protection policy relies on a prescribed instrument to prohibit an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an instrument for the activity. It should be noted that source protection policies may be just one of the reasons an application is denied. Where a source protection plan policy outcome is to manage the activity, the ministry will conform to the policy by including terms and conditions that consider the protection of drinking water sources.

The ministry is currently in the process of screening **existing** prescribed instruments for SDWT activities. In some cases existing instruments have been identified and the review and amendment of those instruments has been initiated. In other cases, amendments to existing instruments have not been initiated.

The Ministry is currently undertaking a review of a wide range of non-legally binding policies, which includes policies that address information sharing. Once the policy review is complete, Operations Division will update business practices to address the implementation of non-legally binding policies.

Municipal Implementation

All municipalities in the Thames-Sydenham Region submitted their required reporting by the February 1st deadline, and are in varying stages of implementation. Since the reporting data was almost entirely provided as numbers or check-boxes, there was limited context or information provided to go along with the data. For example, each municipality provided the number of road signs that had been installed on municipal roads. The reporting templates did not ask for any further information, so it is therefore unclear, whether those municipalities that have not installed signs, are planning to install signs in the future, or whether they have chosen not to install signs at all.

Tables 1 to 3 summarize the data that was provided by municipalities regarding the amendment of zoning by-laws and official plan documents, the installation of municipal road signs, and septic system inspections.

Table 1 – Municipal Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment Progress

Municipality	OP Conformity Exercise				Zoning By-law Conformity Exercise			
	Completed	In Process	Not Started	N/A	Completed	In Process	Not Started	N/A
Chatham Kent		1				1		
Lakeshore		1				1		
Lambton County		1						1
Lambton Shores		1					1	
Leamington		1					1	

London		1				1		
Middlesex Centre		1				1		
Middlesex County		1						1
Oxford		1					6	
Perth County		1						1
Perth East				1		1		
Perth South		1				1		
Plympton-Wyoming		1				1		
Point Edward		1				1		
Sarnia		1				1		
St. Clair		1				1		
St. Marys		1					1	
Stratford	1					1		
Thames Centre		1				1		
West Perth		1				1		
TOTALS	1	18	0	1	0	13	9	3

Table 2 – Municipal Installation of Road Signs

Municipality	Number of Signs Installed
Chatham Kent	15
Lakeshore	0
Lambton County	17
Lambton Shores	0
Leamington	4
London	0
Middlesex Centre	0
Middlesex County	3
Oxford	0
Perth County	3
Perth East	1
Perth South	5
Plympton-Wyoming	0
Point Edward	0
Sarnia	15
St. Clair	14
St. Marys	4
Stratford	0
Thames Centre	3
West Perth	0
Totals	84

Table 3 – Municipal Implementation of Mandatory Septic Inspections

Municipality	Number of sewage systems requiring inspection	Number of systems inspected	Number of inspected systems requiring minor maintenance	Number of inspected systems requiring major maintenance
Chatham Kent	26	0	0	0
London	2	0	0	0
Middlesex Centre	32	28	0	0
Middlesex County	0	0	0	0
Oxford	46	13	1	0
Perth South	28	0	0	0
St. Marys	25	0	0	0
Stratford	3	0	0	0
Thames Centre	41	20	3	0
Totals	203	61	4	0

One area of implementation concern is the mandatory septic system inspections. The mandatory septic inspections are a requirement under the Ontario Building Code (OBC) and by Policy 2.17 of the SPP. The OBC requires the first mandatory inspections to be completed within 5 years of the approval of the local Assessment Report which was November 12th, 2015 (LTV AR), November 18th, 2011 (SCR AR) and August 12th, 2011 (UTR AR). This means that all of the mandatory inspections in the TSR should have been completed by August 12th, 2016. As you will see from Table 3, only 61 of 203 systems identified for inspection were completed by December 31st, 2016. SPA staff will be working closely with municipalities over the next several months to understand their obligations to complete the mandatory inspections.

All remaining policies directed at specific municipalities are in progress and SPA staff continue to work closely with municipalities to ensure their completion.

Conservation Authority Implementation

The main role of Conservation Authority staff in the Thames-Sydenham Region has been to provide guidance to municipalities related to the implementation of their policies. There are some outstanding policies for CA staff to address, such as the finalization of transport pathway guidance, which will be completed in 2017.

One area the Conservation Authorities will be focusing on in 2017 is education and outreach. The general education and outreach policy in the SPP (Policy 1.01) identifies the CA's, municipalities, and Provincial partners as the implementing bodies to collaboratively develop education and outreach programs, with the CA to provide a lead role. In 2016 limited education and outreach efforts were undertaken. It is the intent of the Conservation Authority to develop an education strategy, along with specific communications pieces that have been identified as a priority, for providing education and outreach throughout the region.

In addition, CA staff are currently preparing a Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL) fact sheet about keeping our water safe in order to address Policy 2.45 that prescribes education and outreach for DNAPL storage in concentrations typical of household use. The intent of these flyers is that they be delivered door to door in residential sections of wellhead protection areas in 2017.

Part IV Implementation – Risk Management Services

In the Thames-Sydenham Region some municipalities have chosen to retain their Part IV authorities and are delivering risk management services themselves, while others have delegated their authority to

either the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA), the Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA), or the Lambton Area Water Supply System (LAWSS). The following table shows how each municipality with Part IV authorities in the Thames-Sydenham Region is delivering risk management services:

Municipality	Retained or Delegated Part IV Authorities
Chatham-Kent	Delegated to UTRCA and ERCA
Lakeshore	Delegated to LAWSS
Lambton Shores	Delegated to LAWSS
Leamington	Delegated to ERCA
London	Delegated to UTRCA
Middlesex Centre	Retained
Oxford	Retained
Perth East	Delegated to UTRCA
Perth South	Delegated to UTRCA
Plympton-Wyoming	Delegated to LAWSS
Point Edward	Delegated to LAWSS
Sarnia	Retained
St. Clair	Delegated to LAWSS
St. Marys	Delegated to UTRCA
Stratford	Delegated to UTRCA
Thames Centre	Retained
West Perth	Delegated to UTRCA

Whether a municipality has chosen to delegate or retain their Part IV authorities, a Risk Management Official (RMO) and Inspector (RMI) has been appointed for each municipality in the Region with Part IV responsibilities. The designated RMO/I is responsible for implementing the Part IV policies that prohibit (section 57) or manage (section 58) activities identified as Significant Drinking Water Threats (SDWTs).

As with the municipal reporting templates, the RMO reporting templates requested very specific data, and limited context or additional information was required. The data collected is very specific to the legislated responsibilities and authorities that RMO's and RMI's have under the Act, and does not necessarily reflect the other activities that an RMO/RMI may be undertaking (e.g. threat verification, surveys sent, letters mailed, phone calls made, site visits). The table below summarizes the data collected from Risk Management Officials in the Thames-Sydenham Region.

Municipality	Existing Threats Managed through Established RMP's	Section 59 Notices Issued	Number of Site Inspections	Number of Existing Threats Prohibited
Chatham Kent	0	2		
Lakeshore	0	0	0	
Lambton Shores	0	0	0	
Leamington	1	1	3	
London	2	0		
Middlesex Centre	0	0	28	
Oxford	0	17	3	1
Perth East	0	0		
Perth South	2	1		
Plympton-Wyoming	0	0	0	

Point Edward	0	0	0	
Sarnia	0	0	0	
St. Clair	0	0	0	
St. Marys	1	2		
Stratford	0	1		
Thames Centre	0	0	38	
West Perth	5	2		
Totals	11	26	72	1

Source Protection Plan Bulletin – Overview of Requirements for Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan Amendments under S.36 of the Clean Water Act



December 2016

Introduction

The purpose of the Clean Water Act (CWA) is to protect Ontario's existing and future sources of drinking water as part of an overall commitment to safeguard human health and the environment. A key focus of the legislation is the preparation of science-based assessment reports and locally-developed source protection plans. The source protection plans consist of a range of policies that together, will reduce risks to water quality and quantity.

Under this framework, the source protection planning process ensures that affected and interested parties have opportunities to contribute to the preparation of amendments to source protection plans and assessment reports. Source protection planning is a locally-driven, collaborative process between many partners, and includes significant municipal and public involvement through the source protection committees (SPCs), supported by local source protection authorities (SPAs).

Plan Revisions under the CWA

The CWA enables assessment reports and source protection plans to be revised using one of four methods: 1) a locally initiated amendment under section 34; 2) a Minister ordered amendment under section 35; 3) an update resulting from a review under section 36; or 4) an amendment under section 51 of O.Reg.287/07 for minor/administrative revisions. Ultimately, the method used will depend on factors such as the level of complexity of the revisions and their time sensitivity.

This bulletin provides guidance for SPAs on considerations for the review of their source protection plan under section 36 of the CWA. Guidance on the considerations and process for reviewing and updating assessment reports and plans under sections 34 and 35 is available under a separate bulletin.

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information in this document, it should not be construed as legal advice or relied on as a substitute for the legislation.

Background

At the time each of the source protection plans were approved, the Minister was required to issue an order to specify which parts of the source protection plan and assessment report were to be reviewed under section 36 of the CWA. When the plans were being approved, we recognized that the review needed to be informed by the first few years of implementation, and that we needed input from the SPAs, SPCs and municipalities on the extent of the review of each plan. Given this, the Minister's order put in place a requirement for one of the following as an initial step in the development of detailed requirements to govern the plan's review:

1. A requirement for a workplan, developed in consultation with the local SPC, SPAs, municipalities and the MOECC, that will set out what aspects of the assessment report and source protection plan should be reviewed. Based on this workplan, the Minister may then issue another order specifying more detailed requirements governing the content and timeframes of the review. This approach is in place for 20 of the 22 plans.
2. A requirement that the SPA align the review of their source protection plan with the timing of the local municipality's official plan update. Based on this review, and following consultation between the MOECC and the SPA, the Minister may then issue another order specifying the content of the review of the plan and submission timelines.

Regardless of the approach set out in the Minister's approval letter, the lead SPA will need to undertake an analysis of the existing assessment report and source protection plan and develop a recommendation on the extent and timeline of their review. The only difference between the two approaches is that 20 of these workplans must be submitted to the province, whereas it's optional for the remaining 2 (Sudbury and Mattagami) to submit their workplans.

Considerations and factors that may help a SPA identify which parts of the assessment report and source protection plan need review are detailed in the 'Factors Influencing the Extent of a Review' section of this document.

When assessing these factors, the SPAs should keep in mind that updates under section 36 of the CWA are not intended to focus on simply making the source protection plans read better, rather the updates are intended to build in new information that advances understanding of risks to sources of drinking water and incorporates local growth.

In general, whether developing a workplan to inform a review or undertaking a review the SPA must take into consideration any experience gained from implementing the plans and information learned from the first annual progress report on implementation. In addition, any workplan must be developed in consultation with the SPC, participating municipalities within the Source Protection Area/Region, other SPAs within the region, and the MOECC.

Factors Influencing the Extent of a Review

When determining the scope of assessment report and source protection plan updates that will be addressed within the workplan, the SPA should consider the local nature of the source protection plan and continue engaging local stakeholders to further understand local risks, growth and development pressures. The SPA should also consider the cyclical nature of plan updates, and whether they are needed in this cycle, or should be addressed in future cycles.

At a minimum, the SPA should take into account the following considerations and factors when assessing and prioritizing which portions of the assessment report and plan are to be reviewed and potentially updated, and the timelines for the review and/or updates:

- a. Results of environmental monitoring programs (Do the results of local environmental monitoring analysis identify a trend; Do results indicate policy approaches are/are not effective at meeting the 'cease to be significant' test under s22 of the CWA; Is there a need for additional environmental monitoring to inform future decisions and source protection plan updates).
- b. Growth and infrastructure changes (Has there been substantial growth within the Source Protection Area; Is new growth planned that was not considered in the original plan; Are there new drinking water systems; Are any municipalities planning to new or expanded drinking water systems; Are there new wells or intakes in existing systems).
- c. Council resolutions (Has there been any municipal council or First Nation Band council resolutions to add new drinking water systems; Are you aware of any plans for council resolutions to include other types of drinking water systems).
- d. Policy effectiveness (What is your annual report saying about your plan implementation; Is there a need to make changes to address new policy gaps or ineffective policies).
- e. Implementation challenges (Are there local concerns with source protection plan implementation that need to be addressed).
- f. Technical rule changes (Did your assessment report indicate your Great Lakes drinking water systems were more vulnerable to contamination than deeper systems; Are there Changes in the Tables of Drinking Water Threats that affect activities in your Area/Region; Are there changes to the Director Technical Rules that significantly changes the conclusions of your assessment report, or the outcomes of your source protection plan).
- g. Where your plan used prohibition policies for agricultural activities outside of the WHPA-A, you should undertake an assessment of the impacts of these prohibition policies on the agricultural community. The analysis should include an assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the prohibition policies versus what could be achieved through possible management approaches to the agricultural drinking water risks.
- h. Specific directions in your approval letters which is applicable to: North Bay-Mattawa; Essex; Thames-Sydenham; Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce

Peninsula; Lake Erie-Long Point; Lake Erie-Grand River.

- i. Other local considerations.

It is important to document your analysis in the submitted workplans to the MOECC as this will inform any recommendations to the Minister on the review of your plans.

Workplan Content

Once the SPA has completed the preliminary assessment noted above, they should develop their workplan outlining the recommended content and timelines for their assessment report and plan review. Early engagement with the MOECC and municipalities on the contents of your proposed workplan is advisable. Based on this early feedback received from the MOECC and affected municipalities, the SPAs would then develop the workplan.

At this time, the MOECC is not prescribing a specific format or limits for the workplan; however, the workplan must be completed in a 'word' document and contain the following information:

1. Insert the names of all the source protection plans that this workplan applies to.
2. A brief description of your source protection area/region that specifies the upper and lower tier municipalities, their drinking water systems, and the number of current and planned wells and intakes associated with each.
3. Highlight the experience gained from implementing the plan(s) to date.
4. Highlight information from the first annual progress report on plan(s) implementation that helped you arrive at this workplan proposal.
5. Additional requirements as outlined in your initial Minister plan(s) approval letter (if applicable).
6. Identify the portions of the assessment report and plan that warrant further review, detailed rationale for including each portion, and who will carry out the review and associated updates, where updates are necessary.
7. The detailed steps for carrying out the review.
8. The timeframes for each step of the review.
9. Include the roles and responsibilities for plan amendments and identify if any municipality within your Source Protection Area/Region passed a council resolution consenting to perform a task identified by the SPC in connection with the preparation of the assessment report or source protection plan.
10. The consultation that will be undertaken as part of the review.

Workplan Consultation

While the initial workplan content will be developed by the SPA (or lead SPA identified in the Minister plan approval letter), effective engagement with a number of key stakeholders throughout the process is necessary to ensure a comprehensive/local

workplan is submitted to the MOECC.

Participating Municipalities within the Source Protection Area/Region: Regularly engaging municipalities is important in order to identify potential new sources of drinking water (wells or intakes) or new systems that local municipalities plan to bring on-line in the future, and better understand local risks. Furthermore, consulting with local municipalities affords them the opportunity to identify a desire to lead any technical work and/or plan updates going forward.

Other SPAs within the Region: Consultation with other SPAs within the source protection region will help identify local concerns in plan implementation and afford opportunities to find efficiencies.

SPC: The local SPC should play an active role in the development of the workplan. This will help ensure local stakeholder content is addressed and will ensure the knowledge and experience of the SPC informs the plan review.

MOECC: Consultation with the MOECC on the proposed workplan in order to identify any potential issues of concern, as well as appropriate content.

Workplan Submission and Review/Approval Process

Completed workplans are required to be submitted electronically to the source.protection@ontario.ca email address by the date prescribed in your initial Minister plan(s) approval letter (see Table 1 for summary).

Following submission of the workplans, the MOECC will review and consult with the lead SPA to finalize the scope of work as prescribed in each workplan. The Minister would then consider the issuance of a further order under section 36 that would set out detailed requirements for review of the assessment report and plans.

SPAs not required to submit a workplan, can choose to follow this same process. Their workplans will be considered in the same way as the mandatory workplans.

Resources Available

When developing the workplan, and also during consultation on the workplan proposal with the MOECC, SPAs can contact your local Liaison Officer as well as the source.protection@ontario.ca email address.

Table 1: Workplan submission deadlines

Source Protection Plan	Plan Effective Date	Date First Annual Progress Report Due	Workplan Due
1.Lakehead	October 1, 2013	May 2016	November 30, 2017
2.Niagara Peninsula	October 1, 2014	May 2017	November 30, 2017
3.Mattagami	October 1, 2014	May 2017	N/A: A workplan was not formally requested; however, could be developed and submitted.
4. Mississippi-Rideau	January 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
5.Lake Erie -Kettle Creek	January 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
6.Quinte	January 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
7.Lake Erie -Catfish Creek	January 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
8.Sudbury	April 1, 2015	May 2018	N/A: A workplan was not formally requested; however, could be developed and submitted.
9.TCC	January 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
10.Raisin South Nation	April 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
11.Cataraqui	April 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
12.Ausable Bayfield Maitland Valley	April 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
13.South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe	July 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
14.North Bay Mattawa	July 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
15.Sault Ste. Marie	July 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
16.Essex	October 1, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
17.CTC	December 31, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
18.Halton-Hamilton	December 31, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
19. Thames Sydenham	December 31, 2015	May 2018	November 30, 2018
20.Saugeen Grey Sauble Northern Bruce Peninsula	July 1, 2016	May 2019	November 30, 2019
21.Lake Erie -LongPoint	July 1, 2016	May 2019	November 30, 2019
22. Lake Erie -Grand River	July 1, 2016	May 2019	November 30, 2019

Thames – Sydenham and Region Drinking Water Source Protection Source Protection Committee Discussion Paper

Report to Chair and members
Thames – Sydenham and Region
Source Protection Committee

Agenda # 2017.03.24 7d

Cc SP Management Committee

Date March 14, 2017

Prepared By Jenna Allain, Source Protection Coordinator

Re: EBR Posting – Phase 1 Amendments to the Director’s Technical Rules

Background

The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) is conducting a broad review of the Source Protection Program in order to develop program design options/recommendations that identify areas for improvement with regard to effectiveness, efficiency, long-term sustainability, and local accountability. Part of this broad review includes some amendments to the technical framework that governs the work completed for the Assessment Reports.

At the Chair’s meeting in October 2015, the MOECC presented the Chairs and Project Managers with some proposed updates to the Drinking Water Threats Tables and the Technical Rules. The proposed changes were Phase 1 of a multi-phased amendment process, and were considered “short-term” changes, meaning that they were more minor in nature, and would be amended over a shorter period of time than the “long-term” changes of the Phase 2 and 3 amendments.

On February 29, 2016 a draft list of the proposed Phase 1 changes was circulated to the Project Managers for comment. The MOECC addressed all comments received from SPAs and the amendments were posted to the Environmental Registry (EBR) on September 21, 2016 for a 45-day commenting period. Conservation Ontario coordinated comments provided by SPA’s and submitted them formally through the EBR. All comments submitted through the EBR were reviewed by the MOECC and the final version of the Phase 1 amendments to the Technical Rules was posted to the EBR on March 9th, 2017 (EBR Registry Number: 012-8507).

The following discussion summarizes the Phase 1 amendments made to the Rules, and provides information about the upcoming Phase 2 and 3 amendments.

Discussion

The Phase 1 amendments:

- Create or amend definitions and rules to provide clarity (e.g. definition of high water mark).
- Remove rules concerning the scoring of significant groundwater recharge areas to eliminate overlap/duplication.
- Incorporate flexibility and a new scientific approach including amendments to allow higher vulnerability scores to be assigned to drinking water systems in larger water bodies, such as the Great Lakes and Connecting Channels, to recognise that these systems can be more vulnerable to contamination in the near shore environment.
- Update the Table of Drinking Water Threats to remove confusing language and redundant sections and to correct underlying assumptions. For example:
 - Remove septic systems as a source of sodium and chloride to address implementation challenges.
 - Remove redundant rows related to Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas.
 - Amend the protection zones and volumes for the storage and handling of fuel to correct underlying assumptions.

In addition to these amendments, an alternative road salt application methodology was initially introduced to assess the application of road salt risks. After consulting with the Ministry of Transportation, this methodology was removed from the amendments package to allow more time to improve the proposal.

Phase 2 Amendments to the Technical Rules

The second phase of amendments to the Technical Rules are now under review and include surface water vulnerability delineation and risk assessment, groundwater vulnerability delineation and risk assessment, drinking water threats and circumstances, and water budget risk assessment.

A technical working group was established in July 2016 to discuss surface water aspects to the amendments. Draft recommendations established by the working group have been sent to MOECC for consideration. A similar working group is expected to form to discuss groundwater aspects to the amendments.

There are two categories of drinking water threats and circumstances that are currently under review by MOECC. The first category is the addition of new threats such as pipelines, water softeners, and transportation of hazardous chemicals. These types of threats can currently be added as local threats by the SPC's/SPA's, but consideration is being made to add them to the Tables of Drinking Water Threats. The second category under consideration is the amendment of existing threats. The MOECC has engaged internal experts to explore options to address technical challenges associated with the following threats:

- Handling and storages of DNAPLs, LNAPLs, Organic Solvents
- Sewage Works
- Waste Disposal Sites
- Pesticides
- NASM and Biosolids

Phase 3 Amendments to the Technical Rules

Other related review work to be included in future amendments:

- Merge threats and circumstances to reduce overlap and confusion (e.g. septic systems and holding tanks)
- Remove activities that are no longer commonly undertaken in Ontario
- Review of hazard ratings for pathogen threats
- Include new threats such as dead-stock disposal as a result of the Nutrient Management Act regulations amendments.

It is important to note that many of the proposed changes being considered, if translated into technical rules, will not replace the existing prescribed methods or approaches in the rules, but will allow for more flexibility to the SPAs to adopt other technical approaches that reflect the local characteristics and concerns of the drinking water systems. The SPC will be updated as these amendments become available.