

**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: October 19, 2018

Meeting Time: 10:00 am -1:30 p.m.

Meeting Location: St. Clair Conservation Authority Board Room

Proposed Agenda

1	Chair’s Welcome and Introductions (new members)	10:00
2	Adoption of the Agenda	
3	Approval of June 15, 2018 SPC minutes	
4	Delegations (<i>none scheduled</i>)	
5	Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
6	Business arising from the minutes	10:15 -10:20
7	Business	
7a	Proposed Section 36 Workplan (90 min)	10:20-11:50
<i>Break for Lunch</i>		
7b	SPC Reappointment/Replacement Process for 2019 (20 min)	12:30 -12:50
7c	New Regulation under the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act</i> Update (20 min)	12:50 -1:10
8	Information	1:10
8a	Correspondence from South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe SPC to Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks	
8b	Correspondence from John Williamson, Cataraqui SPC, on behalf of the 19 SPC Chairs	
8c	July 2018 Ontario Farmer Article by Tom Van Dusen, Raisin-South Nation SPC	
8d	News Release: Binational Poll re: Great Lakes Protection	
8e	CELA Blog Article re: The Walkerton Tragedy	
9	In Camera Session (not planned)	
10	Other Business	1:15
11	MOE Liaison report	
12	Member Reports	
13	Adjournment	1:30
	<i>Next Meeting:</i> Friday, March 22, 2018 (St. Clair Conservation Authority)	

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 # 2018.10.19 7a

Cc SP Management Committee

Date October 19th, 2018

Prepared By Jenna Allain, Source Protection Coordinator

Re: Section 36 Work Plan

Background

The Section 36 (S. 36) of the Clean Water Act is intended to ensure that assessment reports (ARs) and source protection plans (SPPs) undergo a comprehensive review and update on a periodic basis.

An order was issued under Section 36 of the Clean Water Act by the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) on September 17th, 2015. The Section 36 order issued by the Minister specified that the lead Source Protection Authority (SPA) prepare and submit a workplan to the MECP by November 30th, 2018. The order required that the workplan include detailed steps for the comprehensive review and update of the Assessment Reports and Source Protection Plan. The order also required the workplan to be developed in consultation with non-lead SPA's, the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee (SPC), participating municipalities of the Source Protection Authorities, and the MECP.

Discussion

The proposed S. 36 Workplan is attached to this report. Section 3 of the report which begins on page 30 provides a helpful summary table of all of the proposed updates to the Source Protection Plan and Assessment Reports included in the workplan.

Recommendation

That the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee endorse the draft Section 36 Workplan for submission to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks by November 30th, 2018, subject to any further amendments as a result of feedback from the Source Protection Authorities at their October and November meetings.

Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region

Workplan

for Comprehensive Review and Update of the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Plan

Per Clean Water Act (2006) - Section 36

November 30, 2018

Prepared By

Jenna Allain, Source Protection Coordinator

Upper Thames River Conservation Authority

1424 Clarke Rd., London, Ontario, N5V 5B9



Executive Summary

The Section 36 (S. 36) of the Clean Water Act, 2006 is intended to ensure that assessment reports (ARs) and source protection plans (SPPs) undergo a comprehensive review and update on periodic basis.

An order was issued under S. 36 of the Clean Water Act to the Upper Thames River Source Protection Authority (SPA) by the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change on September 17th, 2015. The Upper Thames River SPA is the lead SPA for the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region (SPR), which also includes the St. Clair Region SPA and Lower Thames Valley SPA.

The S. 36 order issued by the Minister specified that the lead SPA prepare and submit a workplan to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) by November 30, 2018. The order required that the workplan include detailed steps for the comprehensive review and update of the AR and SPP, and be developed in consultation with the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee (SPC), participating municipalities of the source protection authorities, and the MECP.

The Thames-Sydenham and Region SPR includes 31 municipal drinking water systems, 6 of which are surface water based including Great Lakes sources, and 25 are groundwater based. The Region also includes eight First Nations, seven of which have reserves. First Nations communities in the Thames-Sydenham and Region rely on both groundwater and surface water sources of drinking water. The Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation is the only First Nation with an intake included in the assessment report.

The Thames-Sydenham and Region SPP was approved by the Minister on September 17, 2015, with an effective date of December 31, 2015. SPP policy implementation is well underway, with 173 policies being implemented by different implementing bodies. The first annual progress report was prepared and submitted to MECP on May 1, 2018. SPPs are developed under Ontario's Clean Water Act. This legislation was passed in response to Justice O'Conner's inquiry and recommendations stemming out of the water contamination tragedy that occurred in Walkerton, Ontario, in May 2000.

This document provides a workplan proposal for a comprehensive review of, and update to, the Thames-Sydenham and Region SPP and the related AR, in accordance with the S. 36 Order. A preliminary analysis was conducted based on the factors specified in the December 2016 MECP bulletin, also utilizing guidance provided in the MECP support information bulletins of October 2017, March 2018, and July 2018 (updated August 2018).

The required consultation on the workplan was undertaken per the S. 36 order. This included meetings with member municipalities, MECP, the SPC, the SPAs, the SPA boards, and the SPR

management committee, to discuss the proposed workplan and receive feedback. Stakeholder endorsement was also sought.

The proposed review and any necessary updates to the ARs and SPP will represent current and future status of the local scientific information and policy implementation, as it relates to ensuring the protection of municipal drinking water sources per the Clean Water Act, 2006. The proposed reviews and updates contained in this workplan are summarized in the **Table** below:

Update No.	Description of Proposed Review and Update	Applicable Document	Implementer of Relevant SPP Policy
1	Update references to the nitrate issue for the Wallaceburg intake to indicate that it is no longer an issue and remove Policy 4.13 of the SPP.	AR and SPP	Conservation Authority, MECP, Municipality of Chatham-Kent
2	Determine if a nitrate Issue Contributing Area (ICA) should be delineated for the Thornton well field within the Woodstock drinking water system. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate or if modifications to the policies will be necessary	AR for mapping and threats assessment; SPP for policy changes	Oxford County, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Officials.
3	Updating drinking water system information in the Assessment Reports to reflect changes to operating authorities for several systems in the Thames-Sydenham and Region	AR tables	N/A – No applicable policy
4	Updating the WHPA delineations and vulnerability scores for the Beachville, Ingersoll, Mount Elgin, and Woodstock (Tabor wellfield) drinking water systems using the Tier 3 Water Budget Models. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the revised WHPAs or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.	AR for mapping and threats assessment; SPP for policy changes	Oxford County, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Officials.
5	Review managed land and livestock density calculations for the Thornton wellfield within the Woodstock drinking water system for accuracy. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.	AR for mapping and threats assessment; SPP for policy changes	Oxford County, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Officials.
6	Updating the wellhead protection area (WHPA) mapping and vulnerability scores for a new groundwater well at the existing Shakespeare drinking water system, including assessing if	AR for mapping; SPP for policy changes	Municipality of Perth East, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management

Update No.	Description of Proposed Review and Update	Applicable Document	Implementer of Relevant SPP Policy
	current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the new WHPA or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.		Official
7	Updating the WHPA delineation for the Ridgetown drinking water system to include 4 new wells and remove 3. Determine if current policies in the plan will be appropriate for the adjusted WHPA, or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.	AR for mapping; SPP for policy changes	Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Official
8	New wellhead protection area mapping, vulnerability scores, and threats assessment for private well water systems in St. Clair Township as requested through council resolution. This will include assessing whether the wells meet the criteria for inclusion in the AR/SPP as set out in O.Reg. 287/07, and if current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the new WHPAs or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.	AR for mapping and threats assessment; SPP for policy changes	St. Clair Township, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Official
9	Review agricultural application policies to consider the intent of using the Risk Management Tool to align with Nutrient Management Act prohibitions.	SPP	Risk Management Officials
10	Review the impacts of the specific approaches taken to implement agricultural policies in the Town of St. Marys WHPA, and, if necessary, review agricultural policies to consider whether separate policies should be written for the Town of St. Marys to reflect local RMO decisions based on the sensitivity of the vulnerable area.	SPP	Town of St. Marys, Risk Management Officials
11	Consider change in timeline of Part IV, S. 58 Risk Management Plan Policies	SPP	Risk Management Officials
12	Assess the new prescribed threat per Clean Water Act O. Reg. 287/07 - liquid hydrocarbon pipeline and update the AR and SPP to identify areas where pipelines would be a significant, moderate and low threat. Policies will need to be included to address this threat in these new areas. Where "local threat" is used to describe pipelines it needs to be replaced with "prescribed threat," in both the assessment report and source protection plan	AR for assessment of pipeline risk; SPP for any policies	Municipalities, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Officials

Update No.	Description of Proposed Review and Update	Applicable Document	Implementer of Relevant SPP Policy
13	<p>Assess and make appropriate updates to align with the March 2017 Technical Rule changes including the Tables of Drinking Water Threats that are mandatory to apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect that above grade fuel storage poses a significant risk in IPZs and WHPA-E scoring 9 or higher; • Update the significant groundwater recharge area vulnerability scoring. • Remove any reference to “dairy producer” with respect to the threat circumstances for the application and storage of NASM. 	AR for assessment; SPP for any policies	Municipalities, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Officials
14	<p>Further assess and make appropriate updates to align with the March 2017 Technical Rule changes including the Tables of Drinking Water Threats that are enabling provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Lakes/connecting channel surface water intake vulnerability assessment of surface water drinking water systems that are shallow, near-shore, or more vulnerable to contamination in the Thames-Sydenham and Region. • Reducing setbacks from watercourses based on local conditions • Aligning policy wording with updated ‘short names’ in the Tables of Contents of the Tables of Drinking Water threats. 	AR for assessment; SPP for any policies	Municipalities, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Officials
15	Evaluation of climate change impacts for all drinking water systems within the TSR region based on the pending guidance document and assessment tool.	AR and SPP	Potentially all implementers
16	Removal, addition and/or adjustment of transport pathways identified within vulnerable areas as a result of new information. A reassessment of drinking water threats for these areas is included in this update.	AR and SPP	All implementers
17	Review of information relevant to the local impacts of wind turbine and wind turbine construction on private well water quality for possible inclusion of a new local threat.	AR for any threats updates; SPP for any policies	Municipalities, Provincial Ministries, Risk Management Officials

The timeline for completion of all proposed reviews, updates and submission of Section 36 updates to MECP is October 2020. The Thames-Sydenham and Region source protection committee with support from Upper Thames River SPA, St. Clair Region SPA, and Lower Thames Valley SPA staff, and in consultation with MECP, applicable implementing bodies and municipalities, will complete the proposed updates. Consultation may also take place with persons engaged in significant drinking water threat activities, if the policy changes affect persons engaged in existing significant threat activities.

Acknowledgments

The Upper Thames River SPA acknowledges the efforts and support of the St. Clair Region SPA, Lower Thames Valley SPA, Thames-Sydenham and Region SPC, MECP, and municipalities in the preparation of this workplan. The MECP is also thanked for their continued support through capacity funding under the Ontario Drinking Water Source Protection program.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	9
1.1	Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region	10
1.2	Source Protection Plan Implementation - Highlights	11
1.3	Annual Progress Report - Highlights	12
2.	Workplan Development.....	13
2.1	Preliminary Analysis.....	13
2.1.1	A: Results of Environmental Monitoring Programs	14
2.1.2	B: Growth and Infrastructure Changes	17
2.1.3	C: Council resolutions	20
2.1.4	D: Policy Effectiveness	21
2.1.5	E: Implementation Challenges	21
2.1.6	F: Technical Rule Changes.....	24
2.1.7	G: Impacts of Prohibition Policies on the Agricultural Community	26
2.1.8	H: Specific directions in some source protection plan approval letters.....	27
2.1.9	I: Other local considerations.....	28
2.2	Workplan Consultation	29
3.	Proposed Review and Updates	30
3.1	Project Management and MECP Support for Updates.....	33
4.	Conclusion.....	33
5.	References	34

1. Introduction

Ontario's Clean Water Act, 2006 helps protect sources of municipal drinking water systems in order to protect human health and the environment. The Act was created in response to the "Report of the Walkerton Inquiry - by Justice Dennis R. O'Connor", which was released in 2002. The inquiry was called in response to E. coli bacteria contamination of the municipal drinking water system in Walkerton, Ontario in May of 2000. This contamination was the cause of seven deaths and thousands of residents becoming ill.

Justice O'Connor emphasized that protecting drinking water at the source is the first step in a multi-barrier approach and an important part of ensuring the health of people, ecosystems, and economies. "We should never be complacent about drinking water safety" - Justice Dennis R. O'Connor. Under the Clean Water Act, local source protection plans (SPPs) were developed containing policies to protect the quality and quantity of our municipal drinking water sources.

Assessment reports (ARs) and SPPs must be comprehensively reviewed and updated per section 36 (S. 36) of the Clean Water Act in order to ensure sustained protection of the municipal drinking water sources and for the SPPs to stay current. At the time of SPP approval, a S. 36 order was issued to the Upper Thames River Source Protection Authority (SPA) from the Minister of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (now known as the Ministry of Conservation and Parks (MECP)). The Upper Thames River SPA is the lead SPA for the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region (SPR), which also includes the St. Clair Region SPA and Lower Thames Valley SPA.

The S. 36 order issued by the Minister specified that the lead SPA prepare and submit a workplan to the MECP by November 30, 2018. The order required that the workplan include detailed steps for the review and update of the Source Protection Plan (SPP) and be developed in consultation with the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee (SPC), participating municipalities of the source protection authorities, and the MECP. The order also required that the information gained from implementing the SPP and from the first annual progress report (2017) be taken into consideration in preparation of the workplan.

In addition to the above, the S. 36 order required that the following be considered in the workplan:

- Opportunities to achieve Great Lakes Targets
- Results of monitoring policies, programs, and nutrient loading data
- Effectiveness of education and outreach policies at reducing nutrient loading to Lake Erie.

1.1 Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region

The Thames-Sydenham and Region is made up of the watersheds of Lower Thames Valley, the St. Clair Region, and the Upper Thames River. Map 1-1 depicts the watersheds of the Thames-Sydenham and Region.

The Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area includes those lands draining into the Thames River from the community of Delaware to Lake St. Clair. It also includes the lands that drain into Lake Erie lying south of the lower Thames River watershed and a small triangle of land north of the mouth of the Thames draining directly into Lake St. Clair. This area includes most of the municipality of Chatham-Kent, the western portion of Elgin County, part of southwestern Middlesex County (including some of the City of London) and a portion of eastern Essex County. The Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area also includes four First Nation reserves; the Chippewas of the Thames First Nation, Delaware Nation, Munsee-Delaware Nation and Oneida Nation of the Thames. Caldwell First Nation is also established in the area between Leamington and Rondeau Bay; however they currently do not have a reserve.

The residents of the Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area receive most of their municipal drinking water from Lake Erie through 3 intakes. The communities of Ridgetown and Highgate receive their drinking water from municipal wells. Some parts of the watershed within Essex County receive their municipal drinking water from intakes in Lake St. Clair. Although the drinking water for much of the population of the Lower Thames is supplied from municipal drinking water sources, some residents rely on water from private wells.


The St. Clair Region Source Protection Area includes the Sydenham River drainage basin and several smaller watersheds that drain to Lake Huron, the St. Clair River or Lake St. Clair. The Source Protection Area covers over 4,100 square kilometres and includes most of the County of Lambton, part of the Municipality of Chatham-Kent and part of the County of Middlesex with a total watershed population of 167,000. The area also includes three First Nation reserves; Chippewas of Kettle and Stoney Point, Aamjiwnaang, and Walpole Island First Nations.

The residents of the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area receive most of their municipal drinking water from Lake Huron and the St. Clair River through 3 intakes. Parts of Middlesex County receive their municipally supplied drinking water from an intake in Lake Huron outside the Source Protection Region. There are no longer any communities in the St. Clair Region that receive drinking water from municipal wells. Although the drinking water for much of the population of the St. Clair Region is supplied from municipal drinking water sources, some residents rely on water from private wells.

The Upper Thames River Source Protection Area includes all areas draining into the Thames River above the community of Delaware. This covers large parts of Oxford, Perth and Middlesex Counties including most of the City of London. Very small portions of Huron and Elgin Counties

also drain into the upper Thames River. The area covers approximately 3,423 square kilometres with a total watershed population (2001) of about 472,000. There are no First Nations in the Upper Thames River Source Protection Area.

The residents of the Upper Thames River Source Protection Area receive their municipal drinking water from Lake Huron or Erie through 2 intakes in other Source Protection Areas. Many of the communities in Perth and Oxford Counties rely on groundwater for municipally supplied drinking water. Although the drinking water for much of the population of the Upper Thames is supplied from municipal drinking water sources, many rural residents rely on water from private wells.



1.2 Source Protection Plan Implementation - Highlights

The Thames-Sydenham and Region SPP was approved by the Minister on September 17, 2015, with an effective date of December 31, 2015. SPP policy implementation is well underway, with 173 policies being implemented by different implementing bodies. The experience gained from implementing the SPP to date is considered in this workplan.

1.3 Annual Progress Report - Highlights

The first annual progress report was prepared and submitted to Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) on May 1, 2018. Overall, significant progress in the Thames-Sydenham and Region has been made since the Source Protection Plan came into effect. During the first two years of plan implementation, 84% of the policies that address significant drinking water threats have been implemented or are in progress. Of the 1,054 existing threats that were enumerated at the time of Plan approval, over half are considered addressed because the Plan policies have been implemented, or have been confirmed to no longer exist.

All 27 municipalities with source protection implementation responsibilities have incorporated source protection considerations into municipal business processes. Municipalities have also made considerable progress in the implementation of mandatory septic inspections, with 85% of the first mandatory inspections now complete. Local Risk Management Officials have made substantial efforts to get out and confirm the presence or absence of significant drinking water threats, and negotiate Risk Management Plans where required. Information from the first annual progress report on SPP implementation is considered in this workplan.

2. Workplan Development

The Upper Thames River SPA has followed the guidance in the MECP provided bulletins to develop the S. 36 workplan. In December 2016, the MECP (known then as the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, or MOECC) produced a bulletin, “Overview of Requirements for Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan Amendments under S. 36 of the Clean Water Act”. The bulletin indicates that the S. 36 updates are intended to “build in new information that advances the understanding of risks to sources of drinking water and incorporates local growth”. The three supplemental information bulletins listed below were also used to develop this S. 36 workplan.

- Municipal Engagement (October 2017)
- Prohibition of Agricultural Policies Outside of WHPA-A or IPZ-1 (March 2018)
- Updates to Director Technical Rules and Tables of Drinking Water Threats (July 2018, updated August 2018).

The three main components of the S. 36 process that lead to workplan submission by source protection authorities are:

- Preliminary analysis including review factors and considerations
- Consultation for stakeholder engagement
- Workplan.

The workplan development process undertaken by the Upper Thames River SPA is described in detail below.

2.1 Preliminary Analysis

A preliminary analysis of the AR and SPP was conducted considering the nine factors specified in the December 2016 MECP bulletin:

- Results of environmental monitoring programs
- Growth and infrastructure changes
- Council resolutions
- Policy effectiveness
- Implementation challenges
- Technical rule changes
- Impacts of prohibition policies on the agricultural community
- Specific directions in some source protection plan approval letters
- Other local considerations.

The evaluation of each of these factors is considered below.

2.1.1 A: Results of Environmental Monitoring Programs

Through consultation on this workplan, municipalities were asked to provide information on water quality changes that could necessitate including new drinking water issues in the workplan. Based on the information provided by municipalities, no new drinking water issues were identified.

Drinking water issues previously identified in the Thames-Sydenham Region are summarized below, along with a discussion about the monitoring results for these issues, and the need for changes (if any) to these issues.

Microcystin-LR – Wheatley and Chatham/South Kent

Algal blooms of blue-green algae (cyanobacteria) have been increasing in size and severity in recent years in the western basin of Lake Erie. Annual blooms have resulted in the closure of many Lake Erie beaches, as well as the shut-down of drinking water facilities on Pelee Island, and in Ohio. Microcystin-LR, a neurotoxin, is released when blue-green algae cells break down. If left intact the algae is able to be removed, with the microcystin remaining contained in the cells. Water treatment processes have been adjusted to reduce the likelihood that cells would be ruptured before being removed from the water during a bloom event. All water treatment plants for Lake Erie systems in the Thames-Sydenham and Region have the treatment processes in place to make these necessary adjustments during a bloom event to provide safe drinking water. Additionally, monitoring data shows that total microcystin levels are rarely above the detection limit (0.1 µg/L) and well below the maximum allowable concentration (MAC) for drinking water of 1.5 µg/L. However, there continue to be frequent bloom events that cause raw water concentrations to be much higher than this, and require water operators to adjust their treatment processes.

At the time that the Assessment Reports were completed, microcystin monitoring data did not satisfy the issues evaluation process required to declare microcystin an issue, and delineate an issue contributing area, under the *Clean Water Act* Technical Rule 114. However, Microcystin-LR was identified as an issue for the **Wheatley and Chatham/South Kent** intakes under Technical Rule 115.1, and recommendations were made to continue monitoring efforts.

Considerable progress has been made in the last few years with respect to the microcystin issue. The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) recognized that phosphorous is the limiting nutrient for cyanobacteria growth and, as such, contributes to the microcystin issue. Similarly, the Province of Ontario signed the Western Basin of Lake Erie Collaborative Agreement which also recognizes phosphorous as the most important factor in controlling cyanobacteria blooms. Both of these Agreements have set phosphorous reduction targets of 40%. Eight watersheds in the Lake Erie basin have been identified as priority watersheds for phosphorus reduction, including the Thames River watershed. In February 2018, the Canadian

and Ontario governments released a joint Lake Erie Action Plan (LEAP) that contains 120 actions that need to be taken to achieve this target reduction.

The Conservation Authorities of the Thames-Sydenham and Region (TSR) are committed to working with senior levels of government and other partners to implement relevant actions to reduce phosphorous in our region. The primary mechanism through which the TSR has been working on the microcystin issue is through the Thames River Clear Water Revival (TRCWR). This collaborative includes federal, provincial, Conservation Authority, First Nation and City of London representation with an overall goal of improving the health of the Thames River and a short term goal of creating a Water Management Plan for the river. The TSR will also continue to consider all available data for the Wheatley and Chatham/South Kent intakes to determine whether microcystin-LR continues to be an issue for these water treatment plants.

Nitrates - Wallaceburg

At the time that the Assessment Reports were completed, there were two recorded exceedances of the half maximum allowable concentration (MAC) of nitrates for the Wallaceburg intake located in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. Additionally, nitrates had been identified by the water treatment plant manager as being a significant concern, due to increasing occurrences of events producing elevated nitrate levels in raw drinking water at the intake. The treatment system is not able to remove nitrate from the source water. As a result, nitrates were identified as an issue in the Assessment Reports.

Work proceeded to identify the Issue Contributing Area (ICA). Modelling was undertaken to assess nitrate contributions from the subwatersheds of the Sydenham River. The Sydenham River flows by the intake when flow reverses north up the Chenal Ecarte past the intake. It was determined that all subwatersheds contribute relatively equally to the issue. However, there was considerable uncertainty as to the relative contribution of areas connected to the watercourses by transport pathways. Further, through analysis of additional data, it was found that nitrates in the Sydenham River may be levelling off and possibly decreasing. A longer period of record was recommended to determine if nitrates should continue to be considered an issue for Wallaceburg. No ICA was therefore delineated, and Policy 4.13 was included in the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Plan recommending continued and improved monitoring to allow future assessment of the nitrate issue and delineation of the ICA (if warranted).

In October 2017, the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee (SPC) reviewed nitrate monitoring data collected between 2013 and 2017 for the Wallaceburg issue. The results of the monitoring were inconclusive and did not yield enough information to confirm the issue and delineate an ICA. The SPC therefore directed staff to continue monitoring the issue and expand the monitoring locations. TSR staff reached out to water treatment plant

staff and managers for the Wallaceburg intake regarding increasing the monitoring locations and frequency of sampling. Water treatment plant staff indicated to the TSR that they no longer had any significant concerns regarding nitrate concentrations at the intake. TSR staff have therefore identified the nitrate issue for Wallaceburg and the corresponding Source Protection Plan policy be removed from the Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan (Update 1).

Nitrates – Woodstock

Nitrate occurs in the Thornton wellfield and Tabor wellfield of the Woodstock well supply. Nitrate levels are routinely above half of the treated water maximum allowable concentration (MAC) of 10 mg/L. Anthropogenic activities associated with agriculture (fertilizer and agricultural source material), residential development (septic effluent) and wetlands (decaying organic material) are known sources of nitrate in groundwater. Nitrates were therefore identified as an issue for both the Thornton and Tabor wellfields. An analysis of the nitrate levels in some of the wells for the Thornton wellfield revealed that nitrate levels may be leveling off or decreasing. Additional monitoring was recommended to determine whether an Issue Contributing Area (ICA) was required and whether nitrate remains an issue at the Thornton wellfield. Levels at the Tabor wellfield were significantly lower than those seen in the Thornton wellfield, but appeared to be trending upwards. The wellfield contains two highly productive wells that are a main supply of water to the system. An ICA was therefore delineated for the Tabor wellfield.

In their 2017 annual monitoring report, Oxford County indicated that there currently was not enough information available to determine changes to the concentration or trend of nitrates in either the Thornton or Tabor wellfields. The County proposes to complete a detailed review of the Thornton nitrate levels, and the effectiveness of current management strategies to determine whether the delineation of an Issue Contributing Area (ICA) is warranted (Update 2).

2.1.2 B: Growth and Infrastructure Changes

The vulnerable areas in which the Source Protection Plan policies apply are unique for each drinking water system. In order to ensure that our sources of drinking water are protected, Assessment Reports and Source Protection Plans must be updated to reflect changes in growth that affects drinking water system infrastructure. In June 2018, drinking water system owners were surveyed to ensure we had the most up to date information available about each drinking water system in the Thames-Sydenham and Region (TSR). Table 2-1 below lists all of the drinking water systems included in the current Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan. The table indicates whether any changes have been made, or are planned to be made for each system.

Table 2-1 Municipal Drinking Water Systems in the Thames-Sydenham Source Protection Region

Drinking Water System	Operating Authority	No. of Wells/ Surface Water Source for Intakes	Changes or Planned Changes to Drinking Water System
Dorchester	Municipality of Thames Centre	9	No Changes
Thorndale	Municipality of Thames Centre	2	No Changes
London	City of London	7 (Standby wells)	The City of London has taken all seven standby wells out of service. The wells are planned for decommissioning in late 2018 and early 2019. Once completed, these wells will be removed from the AR and SPP through a Section 51 minor amendment.
Birr	American Water Systems	1	The Birr drinking water system is now operated by the Municipality of Middlesex Centre. This change will be updated in the UTR SPA Assessment Report as part of the Section 36 amendment (Update 3).
Melrose	American Water Systems	2	The Melrose well in the Municipality of Middlesex-Centre is planned for decommissioning once the community switches to surface water from the Lake Huron Primary Water Supply System. The timing of the decommissioning is funding dependent and unknown at this time. Once completed, the system will be removed from the AR and SPP through a Section 51 minor amendment. Additionally the Melrose drinking water system is now operated by the Municipality of Middlesex Centre. This change will be updated in the UTR SPA Assessment Report as part of the Section 36 amendment (Update 3).
Beachville	County of Oxford	1	Since the WHPA delineation was completed for Beachville, a Tier 3 Water Budget study was undertaken for this system. Oxford County would like to update the Beachville WHPA delineation using the modelling data obtained through the Tier 3 Water Budget exercise. This

			will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the revised WHPA, or if modifications to the policies will be necessary (Update 4).
Embro	County of Oxford	2	No changes
Hickson	County of Oxford	1	No changes
Ingersoll	County of Oxford	7	Since the WHPA delineation was completed for Ingersoll, a Tier 3 Water Budget study was undertaken for this system. Oxford County would like to update the Ingersoll WHPA delineation using the modelling data obtained through the Tier 3 Water Budget exercise. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the revised WHPA, or if modifications to the policies will be necessary (Update 4).
Innerkip	County of Oxford	2	No changes
Lakeside	County of Oxford	1	No changes
Mount Elgin	County of Oxford	2	Since the WHPA delineation was completed for Mount Elgin, a Tier 3 Water Budget study was undertaken for this system. Oxford County would like to update the Mount Elgin WHPA delineation using the modelling data obtained through the Tier 3 Water Budget exercise. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the revised WHPA, or if modifications to the policies will be necessary (Update 4).
Tavistock	County of Oxford	3	No changes
Thamesford	County of Oxford	3	A new relief well is planned for the River Well site (Wells 1 and 2). The well will be completed in the same aquifer and will not result in an increased taking. No additional technical work or significant changes to the WHPA delineation are anticipated. No updates for inclusion in this Section 36 Workplan are therefore identified at this time.
Woodstock	County of Oxford	11	Since the WHPA delineation was completed for Woodstock, a Tier 3 Water Budget study was undertaken for this system. Oxford County would like to update the Woodstock WHPA delineation for the Tabor wellfield using the modelling data obtained through the Tier 3 Water Budget exercise. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the revised WHPA, or if modifications to the policies will be necessary (Update 4). Additionally, Oxford County would like to review the managed land and livestock density calculations within the Woodstock WHPA for the Thornton wellfield. Assessment report mapping will be updated to reflect any resulting changes to these calculations. This review will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate or if modifications to the policies will be necessary (Update 5)
Mitchell	West Perth Power Inc.	4	The Mitchell drinking water system is now operated by the Municipality of West Perth. West Perth Power was

			absorbed by Erie Thames Power Lines and no longer conducts water operations. This change will be updated in the UTR SPA Assessment Report as part of the Section 36 amendment (Update 3).
Sebringville	Township of Perth South	1	No changes
St. Pauls	Township of Perth South	1	No changes
Shakespeare	Township of Perth East	1	A new well (Well 2) has been drilled as a back-up supply for the Shakespeare well system in the Township of Perth East. Well 2 is in close proximity to Well 1, the capacity of the system is not changing, and the wells are not planned to be operated at the same time. Modelling work is therefore not required to re-delineate the Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA) for the system. Instead the WHPA-A (the 100 metre zone) will be adjusted to include the new Well 2. Additional properties that will fall into the adjusted WHPA-A are all residential, or planned residential, which are fully serviced. It is therefore anticipated that no new significant drinking water threats will be identified as a result of the WHPA adjustment. The amendments to the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Plan to include the WHPA adjustment for the Shakespeare Well 2 are included in this workplan for the next update to the AR and Source Protection Plan (Update 6). The updates to the AR will also note the change in operating authority for the Shakespeare drinking water system from the Township of Perth East to the Municipality of North Perth (Update 3).
St. Marys	Town of St. Marys	3	The St. Marys drinking water system is now operated by the Ontario Clean Water Agency. This change will be updated in the UTR SPA Assessment Report as part of the Section 36 amendment (Update 3).
Stratford	City of Stratford	11	No changes
Lambton Area Water Supply System	Lambton Area Water Supply System (LAWSS)	St. Clair River	No changes
Petrolia Water Treatment Plan	Town of Petrolia and Waterworks Environmental Services Inc.	Lake Huron	No changes
Wallaceburg Water Treatment Plan	Municipality of Chatham-Kent PUC	Chenal Ecarte	No changes
Chatham *	Municipality of Chatham-Kent PUC	Lake Erie	No changes
South Chatham-Kent *	Municipality of Chatham-Kent PUC	Lake Erie	No changes
Wheatley	Municipality of Chatham-Kent PUC	Lake Erie	No changes

Highgate	Municipality of Chatham-Kent PUC	2	The Highgate wells in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent have been taken out of service and the community has been connected to the groundwater system in the neighbouring community of Ridgetown. Once the Highgate wells have been appropriately decommissioned, the system will be removed from the AR and SPP through a Section 51 minor amendment.
Ridgetown	Municipality of Chatham-Kent PUC	7	Since the approval of the Source Protection Plan, there have been some changes made to the Ridgetown system. Three of the 7 production wells have been taken out of service and 4 new wells have been installed. Technical work to adjust the WHPA delineation for this system has not yet been completed. However, outside of the WHPA-A, vulnerability scores for this system are low. The new wells have been installed in close proximity to the existing wells, so it is anticipated that the WHPA-A's for this system will only change slightly and will not impact any new properties. The technical work required to adjust the WHPA for Ridgetown is therefore included in this Section 36 workplan (Update 7).
West Elgin	Ontario Clean Water Agency	Lake Erie	No changes
Wheatley	Municipality of Chatham-Kent PUC	Lake Erie	No changes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These systems share one intake 			

2.1.3 C: Council resolutions

Municipalities may identify any well, or cluster of wells, other than a municipal drinking water system, that they want to include within the local Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan by passing a council resolution to bring the desired additional systems in. To be eligible for inclusion in the assessment report/plan, the well (or wells) must meet at least one of the three requirements for the inclusion as set out in Section 4.1(1) of Ontario Regulation 287/07: a) the well is part of a cluster of six or more wells; *or*, b) is located in an “area of settlement” as defined under the *Planning Act*; *or*, c) is a designated facility or public facility as defined in O.Reg. 170/03, under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

A letter dated April 19th, 2018 was received from St. Clair Township indicating that the Township recognized the proposed Otter Creek Wind Farm as a threat to the private wells that border the proposed wind farm project area. They requested that the private wells in the 4 most southerly concessions of the Township be included in the next update to the Assessment Report. It is unclear whether the recent cancellation of the Otter Creek Wind Project will change the Township’s decision to include these systems in the Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan. For now, an assessment to determine whether the wells are eligible to be

included in assessment report and source protection plan under O.Reg. 287/07 is included in this Section 36 workplan (Update 8). If eligible, the technical work necessary to delineate the vulnerable areas around the new systems, identify potential drinking water threats to those systems, and write applicable policy will also be undertaken.

No other council resolutions regarding the addition of other systems were received other than the St. Clair Township resolution.

2.1.4 D: Policy Effectiveness

The experience gained from implementing the SPP to date, as well as findings from the annual progress reports, did not result in any SPP policies being identified as ineffective.

2.1.5 E: Implementation Challenges

Implementation challenges have arisen with some of the agricultural policies in the Thames-Sydenham Source Protection Plan. The details surrounding these challenges are outlined below.

Consistency with the Nutrient Management Act

The *Nutrient Management Act* (NMA) prohibits the application and storage of Agricultural Source Materials (ASMs), Non-Agricultural Source Materials (NASMs), and the application of commercial fertilizers within the 100 m zone of municipal wells. The Source Protection Plan policies for the Thames-Sydenham Region outside of Oxford (Policy 2.21, 2.22, 2.24, 2.26, 2.27, and 2.51) refer to managing rather than prohibiting these activities within 100 m of municipal wells (WHPA-A) and the two-year time-of-travel (WHPA-B). However, these management policies require that NMA principals, *including any NMA prohibitions*, form the basis of the RMP. The intent of this was to allow for consistency with the NMA in prohibiting the activities within the WHPA-A while managing in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. Policy 2.26 is provided below for reference:

Policy 2.26 Application of Commercial Fertilizer – Management

To reduce the risk to municipal drinking water sources from the application of commercial fertilizer, this activity shall be managed where it is or would be a significant drinking water threat.

This activity shall be designated for the purposes of Section 58 of the Clean Water Act and a Risk Management Plan shall be required. Nutrient Management Act principles (including NMA prohibitions) shall form the basis of the risk Management Plan, provided the Risk Management Official is satisfied these principles adequately manage the activity so that it ceases to be or never becomes a significant drinking water threat.

Any Prescribed Instrument related to the Application of Commercial fertilizer that is created, amended, or used as part of a notice for the purpose of a Section 61 exemption, shall manage the activity so that it ceases to be or never becomes a significant drinking water threat. OMAFRA is expected to review all Prescribed Instruments issued under the Nutrient Management Act in areas where the activities they regulate are, or would be, significant drinking water threats to ensure the Prescribed Instruments contain such terms and conditions. This review is expected to include Prescribed Instruments that are not directly created or issued by OMAFRA, such as Nutrient Management Plans. Further, OMAFRA and other Prescribed Instrument creators/issuers are expected to consult with the Risk Management Official with respect to any modifications or requirements that may need to be incorporated into the Prescribed Instruments under the Nutrient Management Act to ensure the activities they regulate cease to be or never become significant drinking water threats. However, nothing in this policy grants the Risk Management Official authority to specify requirements for a prescribed instrument issued under the Nutrient Management Act, or where a person is seeking an exemption from a risk management plan under section 61 or O. Reg. 287/07.

The policy rationale contained in the explanatory document does not stipulate that the *Nutrient Management Act* principals should only apply where the *Nutrient Management Act* already applies (i.e. phased-in farms). Instead, the explanatory document appears to imply that the principals of the *Nutrient Management Act* should be applied to all farms with significant drinking water threats, regardless of whether they are currently subject to the *Nutrient Management Act* or not.

The use of a management tool (Risk Management Plan policies 2.21, 2.22, 2.24, 2.26, 2.27 and 2.51) to prohibit activities (as prohibited by the NMA) has been very challenging for Risk Management Officials to implement. In several WHPA's within the TSR, the only portion of the WHPA that has a vulnerability score of 10 is the WHPA-A. In those cases, RMO's are approaching farmers to negotiate a risk management plan for the portion of their property that falls into a WHPA-A, only to find that all of the threat activities for the property would be prohibited according to the policy, thereby negating the need for a management plan. Communicating to farmers that the policies say to risk manage, but there is a caveat in the policies which dictates prohibitions, has been extremely challenging. It also creates some challenges for monitoring and enforcement. In light of these challenges, the Source Protection Committee will review the wording of these risk management plan polices as indicated above as part of this Section 36 workplan (Update 9).

Agriculture Policies in the Town of St. Marys

Section 58(15) of the *Clean Water Act* sets out the following criteria for agreeing to or establishing a risk management plan:

(15) Subject to subsection (16), a risk management official shall agree to or establish a risk management plan for an activity at a location under this section if, and only if, all applicable fees have been paid and,

(a) the risk management official,

(i) is satisfied that the risk management plan complies with the requirements, if any, of the regulations, rules and source protection plan, and

(ii) is satisfied that the activity will not be a significant drinking water threat if it is engaged in at that location in accordance with the risk management plan;

The highlighted provision above allows Risk Management Officials to use their judgement to determine whether a threat activity can be successfully managed to reduce risk.

Based on a number of factors affecting the vulnerability of the St. Marys wellhead protection area, including: the presence of fractured bedrock; the presence of exposed bedrock in, and adjacent to Trout Creek; and the historical documented evidence of microbial contamination for the municipal groundwater supply wells within this WHPA, it was concluded by the local Risk Management Officials that the threat of livestock grazing and pasturing cannot be reasonably managed through a risk management plan in the St. Marys WHPA. Farmers have been asked to fence cattle out of the most vulnerable parts of the WHPA (WHPA-A and B with a vulnerability score of 10). This decision affects several farms in St. Marys and neighbouring farms in the Township of Perth South which fall within the St. Marys WHPA. Given this decision by local Risk Management Officials, the Source Protection Committee would like to review the impacts of this policy approach on the farms in the St. Marys WHPA, and, if necessary, to review the agricultural policies in the source protection plan and discuss whether separate policies for the St. Marys WHPA should be considered as part of this Section 36 workplan (Update 10).

Risk Management Plan Policy Timeline for Existing Threats

The Section 58 Risk Management Plan (RMP) policies of the Thames-Sydenham SPP do not have specific timelines associated with their implementation for existing threats. When writing the SPP policies, the Source Protection Committee (SPC) felt that it was important that RMPs be established in a timely manner; but also felt it was important that the RMO have adequate time to establish RMPs for existing activities while negotiating any plans required for new development approvals within accepted approval timeframes. Therefore, the SPC did not specify implementation timing for the establishment of RMPs for existing activities, to provide

the RMO with the flexibility to determine local priorities and implementation timing for the establishment of such plans.

Now that over two years of implementation of the Risk Management Plan policies have passed, annual reporting has shown that the implementation of these policies across the Region has been going well. The Source Protection Committee would like to consider adding a timeframe into the Section 58 RMP policies to ensure that at the RMPs for existing threats are completed and established in a timely fashion. An adjustment to these policies to include an implementation timeline is included in this Section 36 workplan (Update 11).

2.1.6 F: Technical Rule Changes

In 2017 the province made changes to the Director Technical Rules to:

- Provide clarity with respect to terminology,
- Remove redundancies,
- Incorporate flexibility and new scientific approaches,
- Correct and update the Tables of Drinking Water Threats

A number of these changes are mandatory, and the Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan must be updated to reflect them, while other changes are discretionary and allow for source protection authorities to consider their local needs and interests.

Mandatory Updates:

The changes made by the MECP to the Tables of Drinking Water Threats (TDWT) are **mandatory** for the source protection authority to incorporate into SPPs and ARs and are included in this Section 36 workplan. Mandatory updates include:

- An assessment of the new prescribed drinking water threat ‘the establishment and operation of liquid hydrocarbon pipelines’. Liquid hydrocarbon pipelines are already included in the Thames-Sydenham and Region as a local threat in event-modelled areas. This change expands the area within which liquid hydrocarbon pipelines are a significant threat in the Thames-Sydenham and Region. The Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan should be updated to identify areas where pipelines would be a significant, moderate and low threat, and policies will need to be included to address this threat in these new areas. Where “local threat” is used to describe pipelines it needs to be replaced with “prescribed threat,” in both the assessment report and source protection plan (Update 12).
- The threat circumstances for above grade handling and storage of fuel has been changed so that it is now a significant threat in intake protection zones and WHPA-Es where the vulnerability score is 9 or higher. An updated risk assessment of where fuel

would be a low, moderate or significant threat in IPZs and WHPA-E will be undertaken. Maps and tables within the assessment reports will be updated accordingly (Update 13).

- The technical rule changes have removed the vulnerability scores associated with Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (SGRA) as well as the requirement to delineate SGRAs for Great Lakes, Connecting Channels and Lake St. Clair. The AR and SPP need to be updated to remove all references to SGRA vulnerability scores and remove SGRA delineations where they are not required. All delineated SGRAs (vulnerability scores of 2, 4 and 6) need to be grouped into a single SGRA (Update 13).
- The threat circumstances for the application and storage of NASM have been updated to remove the term “dairy producer”. Any references to “dairy producer” in the assessment reports or source protection plan will be removed (Update 13)

Discretionary Updates:

The MECP amendments to the Director Technical Rules are enabling provisions which allow for source protection authorities to consider local circumstances in order to determine if an update to the SPP and AR is warranted. These **discretionary** updates have been considered and the items identified for inclusion in this Section 36 workplan are listed below (Update 14):

- An enabling rule was created that allows for a broader range of vulnerability scores for Great Lakes and connecting channel intakes. The Thames-Sydenham and Region would like to consider changes to the vulnerability scoring for surface water intakes to determine whether a change in vulnerability scores is appropriate. This assessment will be conducted for those intakes determined to be shallow, near-shore, or more vulnerable to contamination than the previous rules would allow. These updates will be undertaken in consultation with the SPC, affected municipalities, and neighbouring Source Protection Regions, to share information and check for consistency in analysis and conclusions.
- An amendment to the rules now allows the setback from a water body to be reduced based on local conditions. The Thames-Sydenham and Region will determine if areas were included within existing intake protection zones that should now be removed. The Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan will be updated accordingly.
- “Short Names” in the Tables of Contents of the Tables of Drinking Water threats have been updated to align with legal descriptions. The Thames-Sydenham and Region will update the terminology in the AR and SPP to reflect these changes.

Incorporation of climate change into water quality risk assessments:

The MECP has identified the importance and need to better incorporate potential climate change impacts into source protection planning and management. The Technical Rules allow for the MECP to direct SPCs to ensure that the potential impacts of climate change are taken into account in local science-based assessment reports, if the rules require a climate change analysis. A project is currently in progress to develop a guidance document and assessment tool for SPAs to use to identify climate vulnerabilities to the quality of their sources of municipal drinking water. It is expected to be completed in fall 2018. If completed in the established timeframe, the Thames-Sydenham and Region intends to use the tool to evaluate climate change impacts for all drinking water systems within the region (Update 15).

2.1.7 G: Impacts of Prohibition Policies on the Agricultural Community

This section focuses on the analysis of policies that prohibited agricultural activities outside of a WHPA-A or IPZ-1. Source Protection Authorities with these types of policies contained in their Source Protection Plans were asked to conduct an analysis. The analysis was to review the cumulative impact of these prohibition policies and assess whether or not they are having a notable impact, either through a negative impact on agricultural operations, or from a positive impact on water quality.

The following table lists the policies in the Thames-Sydenham Region Source Protection Plan that prohibit agricultural activities outside of WHPA-A or IPZ-1:

Policy Number	Policy Title	Existing/Future Threats	Applicable Zone outside of WHPA-A and IPZ-1
Thames-Sydenham and Region Excluding Oxford County			
2.23	Application of Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) to Land – Prohibition	Existing/Future	WHPA-B (vulnerability score 10)
2.25	Future Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Storage - Prohibition	Future	WHPA-B (10)
2.28	Future Commercial Fertilizer Storage – Prohibition	Future	WHPA-B (10)
2.30	Application of Pesticides – Management and Prohibition	Existing/Future	WHPA-B (10)
2.33	Future Pesticide Storage (greater than 2500 kg) – Prohibition	Future	WHPA-B (10)
Oxford County			
OC-2.16	New Storage of Agricultural Source Material - Prohibition	Future	WHPA-B (10)

OC-2.18	Application of Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) to Land – Prohibition	Existing/Future	WHPA-B (10) & ICA
OC-2.20	Future Handling/storage of Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) – Prohibition	Future	WHPA-B (10) & ICA
OC-2.23	Future Commercial Fertilizer Storage (greater than 2500 kg) – Prohibition	Future	WHPA-B (10) & ICA
OC-2.26	Future Pesticide Storage/Handling Retail– Prohibition MCPA & Mecoprop >250 Kg All other prescribed pesticides >2500 Kg Manufacture – Prohibition MCPA & Mecoprop >2500 Kg	Future	WHPA-B (10)

In the spring of 2018, Thames-Sydenham and Region staff contacted Risk Management Officials throughout the Region to determine the impacts of these prohibition policies on agricultural properties that they are working with. Results from that communication indicated that there had been no property-specific or cumulative impact as a result of implementing these policies. Prohibition policies in the Thames-Sydenham and Region SPP largely apply to future threats, and based on our review, no new threats have been proposed that would be subject to these prohibitions. Likewise with the two policies that apply to existing threats, no existing threat activities to which these prohibitions apply have been identified. Based on this analysis, it has been determined that no change to these policies is required at this time.

It should be noted however, that there have been some limited impacts to farms where the prohibition of agricultural activities is being implemented by local risk management officials through risk management plan policies. Please refer to Section 2.1.5 E above for more information. As indicated in Section 2.1.5 E, an evaluation of the impacts to farms as a result of these risk management plan prohibitions is included in this Section 36 workplan as an item for review.

2.1.8 H: Specific directions in some source protection plan approval letters

The S. 36 Order issued to the Upper Thames River SPA required that the following be considered in the workplan:

- Opportunities to achieve Great Lakes Targets
- Results of monitoring policies, programs, and nutrient loading data
- Effectiveness of education and outreach policies at reducing nutrient loading to Lake Erie.

Consideration of the above noted items have all been previously discussed in Section 2.1.1 A, “Results of Environmental Monitoring Programs” above. Please refer to this section for further information about these items.

2.1.9 I: Other local considerations

Transport Pathway Adjustments:

Thames-Sydenham and Region are aware of several transport pathways which have been decommissioned so that they no longer present a conduit to the drinking water source. These pathways have therefore been identified for removal from vulnerable area mapping and vulnerability scores adjusted accordingly. Likewise, in some cases new pathways have been identified which should be recognized on SPP and AR vulnerable area mapping and are being identified for inclusion in this Section 36 workplan (Update 16). These updates will include a reassessment of the drinking water threats for the areas were adjustments to mapping and vulnerability scoring are made.

Consideration of Wind Turbines and Wind Turbine Construction as a Local Threat:

Recent concerns about the impact of wind turbines and wind turbine construction on private well water quality have been raised through delegations to the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee. Committee members have also expressed their concerns about these water quality issues presented through delegations, and are interested in pursuing any actions they can take to help resolve it. They consider the Source Protection Plan a “living document” that should be updated to reflect local changes, including the identification of any new local threats to drinking water.

The Technical Rules under the *Clean Water Act* allow for activities to be identified as local drinking water threats provided that there is evidence that the activity poses a chemical or pathogen risk to drinking water. The Source Protection Committee is interested in pursuing further information about the hazard that wind turbines present to drinking water before requesting that they be added as a local threat. An analysis of the information about the hazards of wind turbines on groundwater is therefore included in this Section 36 workplan (Update 17).

2.2 Workplan Consultation

Consultation on the workplan was conducted in a variety of forms. This included in-person meetings, emails, presentations and phone calls with staff from the municipalities of the Thames-Sydenham and Region, including risk management officials (RMOs) appointed and also delegated to the CAs, MECP, the SPC and the SPAs.

The purpose of the consultation was to discuss the proposed workplan and receive comments and feedback. The following list outlines the consultation conducted:

No.	Date	Consultation Details
3	May-July 2018	Consultation with MECP on workplan content (phone calls, emails)
4	June 15, 2018	The SPC reviewed a listing of identified SPP (including ARs) issues, challenges and limitations. This was in preparation of the workshops to consult with municipalities. Workshop materials were further revised following this meeting.
5	June 25, 26, and 28 th , 2018	Three municipal consultation workshops were held for municipalities. The purpose is to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend areas of the SPP incl. ARs, to be updated (with rationale) • Obtain feedback and comments regarding the proposed updates.
6	June and July 2018	Some individual communications were conducted for stakeholders unable to attend the workshops.
7	September 2018	Draft workplan for S. 36 updates circulated for consultation and comment
8	Oct. 5, 2018	Stakeholder comments on Draft workplan for S. 36 updates due
9	Oct. 19, 2018	An SPC meeting to discuss the draft workplan and receive comments.
10	Oct./Nov. 2018	SPA meetings to approve the proposed workplan.
11	Nov. 30, 2018	The proposed S. 36 workplan gets submitted electronically to MECP.

3. Proposed Review and Updates

Based on the preliminary analysis, consultations with various stakeholders, and feedback from the Ministry on the draft proposal, the Upper Thames River SPA recommends that updates be carried out under S. 36 of the Clean Water Act, 2006 as described in the table below. Most of the proposed updates result in updates to both the AR and SPP.

Update No.	Description of Proposed Review and Update	Applicable Document	Timeline
1	Update references to the nitrate issue for the Wallaceburg intake to indicate that it is no longer an issue and remove Policy 4.13 of the SPP.	AR and SPP	Updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
2	Determine if a nitrate Issue Contributing Area (ICA) should be delineated for the Thornton well field within the Woodstock drinking water system. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate or if modifications to the policies will be necessary	AR for mapping and threats assessment; SPP for policy changes	Technical work will be completed by Oxford County. Updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
3	Updating drinking water system information in the Assessment Reports to reflect changes to operating authorities for several systems in the Thames-Sydenham and Region	AR tables	This update will be completed by the TSR SPC by July 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
4	Updating the WHPA delineations and vulnerability scores for the Beachville, Ingersoll, Mount Elgin, and Woodstock (Tabor wellfield) drinking water systems using the Tier 3 Water Budget Models. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the revised WHPAs or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.	AR for mapping and threats assessment; SPP for policy changes	Technical work will be completed by Oxford County. Updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
5	Review managed land and livestock density calculations for the Thornton wellfield within the Woodstock drinking water system for accuracy. This will include assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.	AR for mapping and threats assessment; SPP for policy changes	Technical work will be completed by Oxford County. Updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
6	Updating the wellhead protection area (WHPA) mapping and vulnerability scores for a new groundwater well at the existing Shakespeare drinking water system, including assessing if current policies in the plan will be appropriate	AR for mapping; SPP for policy changes	This update will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.

Update No.	Description of Proposed Review and Update	Applicable Document	Timeline
	in the new WHPA or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.		
7	Updating the WHPA delineation for the Ridgetown drinking water system to include 4 new wells and remove 3. Determine if current policies in the plan will be appropriate for the adjusted WHPA, or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.	AR for mapping; SPP for policy changes	Updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
8	New wellhead protection area mapping, vulnerability scores, and threats assessment for private well water systems in St. Clair Township as requested through council resolution. This will include assessing whether the wells meet the criteria for inclusion in the AR/SPP as set out in O.Reg. 287/07, and if current policies in the plan will be appropriate in the new WHPAs or if modifications to the policies will be necessary.	AR for mapping and threats assessment; SPP for policy changes	Technical work to be completed by Chatham-Kent by December 2019; AR and SPP updates by the SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
9	Review agricultural application policies to consider the intent of using the Risk Management Tool to align with Nutrient Management Act prohibitions.	SPP	Review and any updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
10	Review the impacts of the specific approaches taken to implement agricultural policies in the Town of St. Marys WHPA, and, if necessary, review agricultural policies to consider whether separate policies should be written for the Town of St. Marys to reflect local RMO decisions based on the sensitivity of the vulnerable area.	SPP	Review and any updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
11	Consider change in timeline of Part IV, S. 58 Risk Management Plan Policies	SPP	This update will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
12	Assess the new prescribed threat per Clean Water Act O. Reg. 287/07 - liquid hydrocarbon pipeline and update the AR and SPP to identify areas where pipelines would be a significant, moderate and low threat. Policies will need to be included to address this threat in these new areas. Where "local threat" is used to describe pipelines it needs to be replaced with "prescribed threat," in both the assessment	AR for assessment of pipeline risk; SPP for any policies	Assessments will be completed by Oxford County in Oxford, and by TSR staff for the rest of the TSR by December 2019; Updates will be completed by TSR SPC by July 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.

Update No.	Description of Proposed Review and Update	Applicable Document	Timeline
	report and source protection plan.		
13	<p>Assess and make appropriate updates to align with the March 2017 Technical Rule changes including the Tables of Drinking Water Threats that are mandatory to apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect that above grade fuel storage poses a significant risk in IPZs and WHPA-E scoring 9 or higher; • Update the significant groundwater recharge area vulnerability scoring. • Remove any reference to “dairy producer” with respect to the circumstances for the application and storage of NASM. 	AR for assessment; SPP for any policies	Updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
14	<p>Further assess and make appropriate updates to align with the March 2017 Technical Rule changes including the Tables of Drinking Water Threats that are enabling provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Lakes/connecting channel surface water intake vulnerability assessment of surface water drinking water systems that are shallow, near-shore, or more vulnerable to contamination in the Thames-Sydenham and Region. • Reducing setbacks from watercourses based on local conditions • Aligning policy wording with updated ‘short names’ in the Tables of Contents of the Tables of Drinking Water threats. 	AR for assessment; SPP for any policies	Assessment and updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
15	Evaluation of climate change impacts for all drinking water systems within the TSR region based on the pending guidance document and assessment tool.	AR and SPP	Assessment and updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
16	Removal, addition and/or adjustment of transport pathways identified within vulnerable areas as a result of new information. A reassessment of drinking water threats for these areas is included in this update.	AR and SPP	Updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.
17	Review of information relevant to the local impacts of wind turbine and wind turbine construction on private well water quality for possible inclusion of a new local threat.	AR for any threats updates; SPP for any policies	Review and updates will be completed by the TSR SPC by September 2020; Submission of S.36 updates to MECP in October 2020.

3.1 Project Management and MECP Support for Updates

The Ministry provides support through its capacity funding under the DWSP program, technical bulletins, guidance, and feedback, and this support for local program delivery is acknowledged.

The Upper Thames River SPA continues to lead the SPR efforts including the development of the S. 36 workplan being submitted. The Thames-Sydenham and Region SPC with support by the Upper Thames River SPA will lead the updates to the SPP including ARs, accordingly. The continuation of support by MECP will be necessary to undertake the proposed updates under S. 36 and the required consultation. This includes SPR staff capacity and expertise, SPC meetings, municipal implementation working group meetings, and stakeholder engagement workshops prior to submission of an updated SPP including ARs. The Upper Thames River SPA recommends that current staff levels within the Thames-Sydenham and Region SPR be maintained in order to carry out the proposed updates through March 2021.

4. Conclusion

The overall timeline for completion of all of the proposed updates and submission of the Section 36 updates to MECP is October 2020. The Thames-Sydenham and Region SPC will complete the proposed changes with support from Upper Thames River SPA, St. Clair Region SPA, and Lower Thames Valley SPA staff, and in consultation with MECP, applicable implementing bodies and municipalities. Consultation may also take place with persons engaged in significant drinking water threat activities, if the policy changes affect persons engaged in existing significant threat activities.

5. References

1. Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, December 2016. Source Protection Plan Bulletin - Overview of Requirements for Assessment Report and Source Protection Plan Amendments under S. 36 of the Clean Water Act.
2. Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Committee. Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Plan. Approved September 17, 2015.

Date

Hon. Rod Phillips, Minister
Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks
Ferguson Block 11th Flr, 77 Wellesley St W, Toronto, ON M7A 2T5

Re: Request to streamline approvals to Source Protection Plans for new drinking water systems when new policies are not required

The South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee requests that the Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks streamline the approval process for amendments to Source Protection Plans for new drinking water systems when new policies are not required.

A recently approved Regulation under the *Safe Drinking Water Act* (Reg. 205/18) ensures that new sources of municipal drinking water receive the same protections as those which are already subject to the *Clean Water Act* and Source Protection Plans, by requiring municipalities to ensure that wellhead protection areas and intake protection zones are identified before submitting an application for a municipal drinking water licence. That licence, when provided, will include a condition prohibiting the provision of water until any necessary amendments to the relevant Source Protection Plan have been approved by the Minister.

The South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee is pleased to see this continued recognition of the importance of Source Protection Plans, and clear indication of the need to continue to protect raw sources of municipal drinking water. The committee does have some reservations however about the new prohibition condition included in this Regulation.

Recent experience in amending the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan has demonstrated that receiving Ministerial approval on proposed amendments to Source Protection Plans can be a lengthy process, taking a year or more. Given this reality, Regulation 205/18 as currently structured has the potential to create significant delays in allowing a municipality to provide critical services to their residents.

The development of new drinking water supplies under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process facilitates the identification of vulnerable areas and potential drinking water threats, as well as the assessment of potential impacts. Through the development review process, municipalities work to prevent potential contamination sources from being established near municipal well sites, even before the drinking water works permits are issued by MECP.

With knowledge of the potential implications on the provision of critical services to residents, the Source Protection Committee requests that you consider streamlining the approval process for amendments for

new drinking water systems, particularly in cases where new policies are not required, and where appropriate public consultation on the location of the municipal well or intake has been completed under the *Environmental Assessment Act*. Delegation of approval in such cases to the Director of the Source Protection Programs Branch would greatly reduce approval timelines.

Sincerely,

Lynn Dollin
Chair

July 20, 2018

Hon. Rod Phillips;
Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks
77 Wellesley St. West
11th Floor, Ferguson Block
Toronto, ON M7A 2T5

minister.mecp@ontario.ca

First let me congratulate you on behalf of my colleagues on your appointment as the new Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks.

In your new role we; the nineteen Chairs of Source Protection Committees appointed by the Minister, look forward to continuing to work in partnership with your staff in the Ministry, Ontario municipalities and Conservation Authorities to help deliver the multi-barrier approach to Source Water Protection as recommended by Justice O'Connor in his report on the Inquiry following the Walkerton disaster in 2000. The events left seven people dead, including a two year old child, and thousands severely ill. Many of those people continue to suffer adverse health effects today.

We have all completed Source Protection Plans for our respective areas which the Ministry has approved and are working in partnership with municipalities to implement risk management plans. This program has been a model that other provinces and countries have adopted. In addition; in some areas, we have had good partnerships with First Nations and need to continue to work with them. In fact, we have accomplished a lot and need to continue the program and it's evolution and have it continue to evolve as an essential component of the multi-barrier system of drinking water protection.

There is still much to do in Ontario to implement the full slate of recommendations from the Inquiry including working with municipalities in parts of Ontario, particularly the North, not represented by Conservation Authorities. As well, we have yet to add protection for the sources of drinking water for small rural hamlets across Southern Ontario with multiple private wells and for those rural facilities where our vulnerable members of society; the elderly and school children, reside or attend school. We have not looked at the sources of drinking water nor provided any additional protection to those sources of drinking water that are used by the roughly 25% of the population of Ontario that are rural residents. Many of these areas

presently have a high percentage of wells that do not meet the standard for drinking water, in our area up to 40% in some places. We have identified large areas of Ontario with highly vulnerable ground water but have more work to do to ensure it is protected. This is very much a public health issue which helps to address one of the Premier's priorities, namely health. We are pleased that climate is included under Conservation in the new Ministry and in a year like this summer quantity becomes an issue in many areas. One only has to sit at one of the popular boat launches in the Cataraqui area to see the number of homeowners and farmers filling tanks and containers with water to augment their wells.

We generally have one of our semi-annual face-to-face meetings in the fall and we invite you to join us at our next one to share your vision with us as well as to hear our recommendations and success stories.

In closing, I quote the Canadian Environmental Law Society in Litigating Canada's Environment" chapter 6 "Tragedy on Tap: Representing Concerned Walkerton Citizens at the Walkerton Inquiry" where they reference the many lessons learned from the Inquiry "including the resilience of a community facing the previously unthinkable fact that water from our taps could be deadly if the legal system doesn't work".

We look forward to working with you to continue helping to protect the citizens of Ontario and the sources of drinking water for future generations of Ontario and to meeting with you.

Sincerely,



John Williamson,

Chair Cataraqui Source Protection Committee
(On behalf of the nineteen Source Protection Chairs)

4145 Holmes Rd. RR#1 Inverary, ON K0H 1X0

willj@kos.net

Cc. Heather Malcomson, Director, Source Protection Programs Branch.

Pat Kinch, Manager, Source Protection Programs Branch

Kim Gavine, General Manager Conservation Ontario

www.ontariofarmer.com



There's Metal, and then there's Havelock Metal.

The only roofing and siding system you'll ever need
— you can bet the farm on it. HavelockMetal.com



Roofing & Siding Manufactured with Pride in Ontario.

Residential, Commercial, Recreational and Agriculture.

656 Salmoni 11th Line, Havelock, Ontario / 1-888-556-7623



Why Rely On A Forecast? MAKE YOUR OWN RAIN

MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT	SUN
Hot & Dry with Rain when you need it	Hot & Dry with Rain when you need it	Hot & Dry with Rain when you need it	Hot & Dry with Rain when you need it	Hot & Dry with Rain when you need it	Hot & Dry with Rain when you need it	Hot & Dry with Rain when you need it
33°C	30°C	32°C	30°C	36°C	38°C	34°C

Contact Us Today to be in Control of Your Own Weather Forecast



38 Main Street P.O. Box 100
Courtland, ON
N0J1E0
519-688-2222
cadmanpower.com



HAYING equipment

CHI DC102, 9 ft. disc mower..... Just In
MH 88940A baler, 2007, packer cutter, auto acid..... \$49,000
MH 166 inverter..... \$5,200

SEEDING & tillage

JD 915 7 shank ripper..... \$12,900
Kuhn Krause 4800, couter chisel, 17 shank, '13..... \$49,900
Lenken Rubin 9, 4 meter, 2013..... \$39,000
Landoll 1200-9 couter chisel, buster bar harrow..... \$12,900
Salford 870, 28' disc, rolling harrow..... \$24,900

USED tractors

Agco RT140A 50kms, front hitch..... Call
MF 7620, CVT 50km, loader, GPS, 150 hp, 2015..... \$175,000
MF 8650 2014, 580 hrs, 50km, 710/42 duals..... \$230,000
MF 5455 85 hp, new loader, 425 hrs..... \$85,000
Fendt 924, 2005, 7700 hrs, reversing station, rebuilt trans POA
Fendt 918, 2005, 50km, front hitch & pto..... \$74,900
CHI Puma 140, 2500 hrs, 120 hp..... \$86,000

USED combines

Gleaner R62, 1996, 2wd, setting as is..... Call



Eastern Limits

STORIES FROM EASTERN ONTARIO

Reasonable bias



BY TOM VAN DUSEN
The writer lives in Russel County
tomvandusen99@yahoo.com

Source Protection Committees across the province are taking some comfort in the fact that, under the new Progressive Conservative government, they're reporting to the newly minted Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks and its minister Rod Phillips.

At least the word 'Conservation' appears in the title! That might help get them an extended lease on life. The committees hope their new political masters will see Source Protection as much more than a green environmental scheme to be considered for the chopping block, but as a public health issue.

New Premier Doug Ford is giving off a clear vibe he doesn't support high-priced environmental programs with questionable results to the same extent as his predecessor. The change isn't hard to miss because Ford and his minions are already running roughshod among so-called Green programs, cancelling the likes of the costly Green Ontario Fund itself and Cap & Trade which sustained it.

At a meeting of the Raisin-South Nation Source Protection Committee July 12, chair Ray Beauregard referred to concerns about the future of the decade-old Source Protection Program given cuts already announced. Concerns revolve around future funding, timely approval of amendments for new municipal well permits, and downloading administration costs on municipalities.

By way of full disclosure, I've been a public sector representative on the Raisin-South Nation committee almost from its inception. Many of the members I started with are still there, meet-

ing occasionally to keep the process in play years after much of the original grunt work was completed and a workable system put in place.

That system is intended to guard precious communal drinking water resources after the Walkerton tragedy of 2000 killed seven residents and sickened 2,300 from E. coli bacteria. As Ray noted, the Walkerton crisis was largely due to the misconception municipal drinking water supplies were safe. "That misconception led to a reduced level of oversight determined to be a major contributing cause to the deaths and illnesses at Walkerton. Those who don't learn from history are destined to repeat it."

Oversight has been bumped up in spades. The province is now blanketed by SPCs and the resources that go with them. All communal water systems have been identified, potential threats highlighted, and steps taken to keep vulnerable zones segregated.

Ray passed on worries raised by himself and other chairs of the province's SPCs established under the Ontario Clean Water Act... a creation of the previous Liberal government, no doubt making it vulnerable. However, it was pointed out that the previous PC government — 15 years ago — committed to implementing recommendations of the Walkerton inquiry which gave birth to the system we have today. Will the revived PCs honour that commitment?

Ray went on to describe how members of other committees plan to lobby representatives of the new government according to their contacts and discretion in order to emphasize the necessity for the SPC program con-

tinuing and evolving as an "essential component of the multi-barrier system of drinking water protection."

Raisin South-Nation decided to introduce itself to the minister through correspondence and offer a meeting to discuss the future. In the meantime, Raisin-South Nation SPC, like others across the province, will continue with routine business such as annual reporting, developing an ongoing workplan, and engaging with the agricultural community on such issues as nutrient management.

I can't see the new government coming up with a more efficient, economical system to oversee necessary clean water protection in Ontario than the one in place. As I mentioned, over the past decade almost all the heavy lifting has been done and the bugs worked out... and you certainly can't do away with clean water protection altogether and leave it to the fates like before Walkerton.

The current system is managed at the regional level by people who know the territory, drinking water sources and inherent risks. SPC members represent area agriculture, aggregates, relevant agencies, municipalities, the commercial-industrial sector and the general public. For the most part, cooperative enforcement has been turned over to conservation authorities, which have the expertise and manpower to do the job.

Yes, I admit to a bias... but I believe it's a reasonable one.



[Subscribe](#)[Past Issues](#)[Translate](#) ▼[View this email in your browser](#)

Second Binational Poll Reaffirms that Citizens Feel Great Lakes Protection is Critical

*Lakes Seen as Valuable for Recreation, Drinking Water and Essential
to Region's Economy*

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

July 10, 2018

Eighty eight percent of respondents believe protecting the Great Lakes is highly important and are willing to pay more to ensure their restoration, according to the second large survey conducted on public perception of the world's largest freshwater system. The International Joint Commission (IJC) sponsored the survey, which was completed by its Great Lakes Water Quality Board in January 2018 and is summarized in the [poll report](#) released today. The [first survey](#) was completed in late 2015. The 4,250 respondents to the 2018 poll live in the eight Great Lakes states (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin) and in the Canadian Province of Ontario, and also include members from the region's First Nations, Tribes and Métis.

Key survey responses include:

- **A whopping 88 percent feel it is essential to protect the Great Lakes** from a variety of threats, including pollution and aquatic invasive species, up three percent from the 2015 poll. While 39 percent believe all sectors of society can play a role in these efforts, 23 percent and 18 percent list federal and state/provincial governments, respectively, as responsible for the lakes' health.
- **An even higher 89 percent feel it is important to protect the lakes for recreational purposes**, even if they personally do not use them, up three percent from the 2015 poll. Thirty five percent of those who use the lakes for recreational purposes have enjoyed swimming or beach visits, while 27

[Subscribe](#)[Past Issues](#)[Translate ▼](#)

by lakes Ontario, Erie, Superior and Huron.

- **More than half of respondents believe there are too few regulations to protect the lakes, compared with 46 percent in the 2015 poll, and 55 percent said they would be willing to have greater protection of the lakes through regulation even if it meant an increase in the cost of some consumer products.** Fifty three percent feel these additional protections would have either no impact (30 percent) or a positive impact (23 percent) on jobs and the economy, while 27 percent felt there would be negative implications and 20 percent were undecided.
- A large majority of residents believe **the Great Lakes should be protected for the benefit of fish and wildlife (79 percent) as well as their economic significance to the region (78 percent), and their importance to human health now and for future generations (74 and 77 percent, respectively).**
- The importance of **individual responsibility for protecting the health of the lakes** is cited by 80 percent of respondents, up two percent from the 2015 poll, including such actions as being careful of what they dispose down the drain (83 percent), conserving water (74 percent), engaging in online forums and interest groups who address Great Lakes issues (37 percent) and contacting elected and government officials to express their concerns (32 percent). While 30 percent were unsure what steps they could take in 2015, 25 percent were unsure in the 2018 poll.
- **A large majority, 80 percent, feel it is important that an organization like the IJC exists to facilitate cooperation in Canada and the United States on issues impacting the Great Lakes,** and to ensure that the goals and programs outlined in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement are accomplished. This majority increased from 74 percent in the 2015 poll.

“It is clear that the Great Lakes community cares deeply about the resource, is prepared to accept increased costs to protect it, and recognizes personal responsibility to be part of the solution,” said Great Lakes Water Quality Board US Co-Chair David Ullrich. Rob de Loë, Canadian co-chair of the board, said, “This second poll shows that water quality is a top-of-mind issue for citizens in the basin, and serves as a reminder of the enormous shared obligation to protect and enhance the lakes.”

Two members of the IJC’s Great Lakes Water Quality Board and its Engagement Work Group – Mark Mattson, Lake Ontario Waterkeeper and Kelsey Leonard of the Shinnecock Indian Nation – will host a **webinar** at 1:30 p.m. today to discuss the poll’s findings further. [Register here](#) to participate and contribute your thoughts and questions to the discussion.

[Subscribe](#)[Past Issues](#)[Translate](#) ▼

The IJC was established by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 to help the Governments of Canada and the United States prevent and resolve disputes over the use of the waters they share. The Great Lakes Water Quality Board assists the IJC in monitoring progress by both countries to achieve the goals set out in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and provides opportunities for public consultation and participation throughout the Great Lakes region. More information can be found at IJC.org.

###

For more information:

Sally Cole-Misch, IJC Great Lakes Regional Office 519-257-6733 colemischs@windsor.ijc.org

Raj Bejankiwar, IJC Great Lakes Regional Office 519-257-6711 bejankiwarr@windsor.ijc.org



This email was sent to info@conservationontario.ca
[why did I get this?](#) [unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)
International Joint Commission · 100 Ouellette Ave, 8th Floor · Windsor, MI N9A 6T3 · Canada

The Walkerton Tragedy: Lessons Learned and Unfinished Business

Posted by *Richard D. Lindgren, CELA Counsel on May 22, 2018*



In May 2000, seven people died, and thousands of people fell seriously ill, after consuming contaminated drinking water supplied by a municipal drinking water system in Walkerton, Ontario.

On the 18th anniversary of this tragedy, it is appropriate to reflect upon some of the lessons learned from this public health catastrophe, and to identify further steps that are necessary to prevent a recurrence of this event elsewhere in the province.

First and foremost, the Walkerton disaster confirms the ongoing need for a robust “multi-barrier” approach to drinking water safety. In the two-volume Walkerton Inquiry [report](#), Mr. Justice O’Connor strongly endorsed this approach, which consists of five key components:

- preventing contaminants from entering water that is used for drinking water purposes;
- treating and disinfecting drinking water through effective methods;
- securing the distribution system and ensuring the delivery of safe water to consumers;
- performing appropriate monitoring and testing programs; and
- implementing timely responses to adverse test results or upset conditions.

Second, the necessity of strictly enforcing drinking water rules is another lesson learned from the Walkerton Tragedy. In this regard, Mr. Justice O’Connor recommended greater provincial use of mandatory legal tools (e.g. orders,

prosecutions, etc.) to enforce “all regulations and provisions related to the safety of drinking water.”

The third lesson that emerged from the Walkerton Tragedy is that laws, regulations and standards aimed at protecting public health should not be characterized – or cut – as wasteful “red tape”. On this point, Justice O’Connor was highly critical of the Ontario government for creating a “regulatory culture” that discouraged new environmental regulations, including those needed to safeguard public health. This view was recently – and correctly – endorsed by the [Toronto Star editorial board](#).

After the Walkerton Tragedy occurred, the Ontario Legislature enacted three key laws intended to implement the multi-barrier approach: the *Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002*, *Nutrient Management Act, 2002*, and *Clean Water Act, 2006* (CWA).

Under the [CWA](#), for example, multi-stakeholder Source Protection Committees (SPC’s) were established to develop comprehensive Source Protection Plans to safeguard drinking water sources from degradation or depletion. At the present time, there are 22 provincially approved Source Protection Plans, and these Plans are now being implemented by various public authorities.

However, the mandatory policies in these Source Protection Plans are essentially limited to protecting water used by municipal residential drinking water systems, which serve about 80% of Ontario’s population. This means that private well clusters in rural areas, and source water used by other non-municipal systems across Ontario, receive no direct protection from the new legal tools under the CWA.

This alarming discrepancy prompted the Auditor General of Ontario to recommend that “to strengthen source water protection, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change should consider the feasibility of requiring source protection plans to identify and address threats to sources of water that supply private wells and intakes.” However, in her [2016 report](#), the Auditor General found that the provincial government has made “little or no progress” on this recommendation.

Similarly, it is well-documented that drinking water supplies in many First Nations communities in Ontario are contaminated and/or subject to lengthy boil water advisories. While the province has committed to provide “in-kind technical assistance” to First Nations in relation to drinking water, CELA submits that Ontario should work collaboratively with these communities to develop and fund effective source water protection plans, as recommended by Mr. Justice O’Connor.

Almost two decades after the Walkerton Tragedy, CELA submits that it is highly unacceptable that the CWA regime has been selectively applied in a manner that only protects source water for some – but not all – residents of Ontario.

Accordingly, CELA has consistently requested the provincial government to take all necessary steps to expand the next round of the CWA source protection planning process to include wells and intakes which supply water to certain non-municipal systems.

A [similar request](#) has recently been made by four SPC’s in eastern Ontario, which advised the provincial government that “it is the concern of many [SPC] Chairs that

the multiple barrier concept implemented in southern Ontario capturing municipal water supplies, has not been extended to vulnerable populations in other situations.”

However, the Ontario government is refusing to act upon such requests, and instead claims that it is open to municipalities to use their discretionary *Planning Act* powers to protect groundwater or surface water resources that supply non-municipal systems. In CELA’s view, this claim is unpersuasive for various reasons (e.g. cost and complexity of source protection planning, inherent limitations on the efficacy of *Planning Act* instruments, etc.), and potentially leaves non-municipal drinking water sources at risk.

In short, this is not the time for complacency about drinking water safety throughout Ontario. CELA therefore submits that the Ontario government must immediately address this important unfinished business under the CWA.