



CATARAQUI SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

AGENDA FOR MEETING # 45

Date: Thursday December 8, 2011
 Time: 7:00 PM
 Location: Outdoor Centre, Little Cataraqui Creek Conservation Area
 1655 Perth Road (Division Street), Kingston

#	Topic	Leader	Time (min)	Action Item?
1	Roll Call and Notice of Proxies	John Williamson, Chair	10	
2	Adoption of the Agenda			
3	Declarations of Conflict of Interest			
4	Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes from November 17, 2011 (attached)			
5	Business Arising			
6	Delegations			
7	Correspondence	Rob McRae, Project Manager	5	
8	Sector Updates from the Committee	John Williamson, Chair	15	
9	Business / Reports			
(a)	On-line Demonstration of Ontario Ministry of the Environment Policy Database	Wendy Lavender, Liaison Officer, MOE	15	
(b)	Looking Ahead to 2012 – Source Protection Plan (staff report attached)	Rob McRae, Project Manager	30	Y

#	Topic	Leader	Time (min)	Action Item?
(c)	Approval of Draft Policies for the Source Protection Plan (staff report attached)	Holly Evans, Water Quality Specialist and Christine Woods, Source Protection Planner	60	Y
(d)	Source Protection Plan Development Update (staff report attached)	Christine Woods, Source Protection Planner	15	
10	Announcements or Inquiries	John Williamson, Chair	10	
11	Motions or Notices of Motion			
12	Questions from the Media			
13	IN CAMERA Session (if required)			
14	Next meeting – January 19, 2012 (Kingston)			
15	Adjournment			

Please inform Donna Cellini at (613) 546-4228 ext. 248 or via e-mail at dcellini@cataraquieregion.on.ca if you will not be able to attend the meeting. Members voting by proxy are requested to please communicate their proxy to the Chair prior to the meeting.

Delegations wishing to speak to the Source Protection Committee are asked to contact Rob McRae, Project Manager at (613) 546-4228 ext. 224 or via e-mail at robmcr@cataraquieregion.on.ca.

THE CATARAQUI SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING # 44

Thursday, November 17, 2011 (7:00 PM)

Courtyard by Marriott
1000 Islands Meeting Room
103 Dalton Avenue Kingston, ON

Present: John C. Williamson, Chair Richard Bresee John Conley
Gary Davison Scott Ewart Joan Green (left at 9:50 PM)
Jacques Labelle Kathleen Laird Wendy Lavender
Chris Mangan-Greene Nona Mariotti Allan McPhail
Alex Palionis Jeff Peters Peter Raabe
Kevin Riley Kim Sytsma

Regrets: Rob Cumming Richard Lindgren

Staff Present: Donna Cellini, Project Secretary
Holly Evans, Water Quality Specialist
Steve Knechtel, General Manager/Secretary-Treasurer
Rob McRae, Project Manager, Source Water Protection
Christine Woods, Source Protection Planner

Guests: George Wallace, City of Kingston

Chair John C. Williamson called the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee (SP Committee) meeting to order at 7:04 P.M.

1) Roll Call and Mileage

There were 13 voting members present and 1 voting member sent a proxy.

2) Adoption of Agenda

Moved by: Kim Sytsma
Seconded by: Nona Mariotti

THAT the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee members adopt the meeting agenda as distributed.

Carried

3) Declarations of Conflict of Interest

There were none.

4) Approval of Cataraqui Source Protection Committee Minutes

Approval of September 8, 2011 Cataraqui Region Source Protection Committee Minutes.

Moved by: Kevin Riley
Seconded by: Nona Mariotti

THAT the minutes of the September 8, 2011 meeting of the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee be approved as circulated.

Carried

5) Business Arising

There was none.

6) Delegations

There were none.

7) Correspondence

- a) Letter from Sunbury Outlook to the Township of South Frontenac, copied to the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee, regarding the impact of aggregate extraction on source water, dated October 5, 2011

Rob McRae, Project Manager, advised the members that the SP Committee was copied on this letter from the Sunbury Outlook to the Township of South Frontenac. The residents living around the area of the pit/quarry (MNR Licence No. 3145) are voicing a concern about the “adverse effects” and “negative impacts” they may encounter as a result of the expansion of the pit/quarry. They are asking for some assurances regarding a number of items including the quality and capacity of their wells as well as the quality of the drinking water.

Mr. McRae noted that while the SP Committee does not have a mandate to comment on specific developments, its awareness of local development challenges and trends will inform the development of groundwater policies at the regional scale.

Mayor Gary Davison indicated that this was discussed at a recent Township of South Frontenac Council meeting and it was understood that the pit/quarry matter falls under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources rather than the Township.

Wendy Lavender confirmed that that the aggregate operations are not drinking water threats under the current standards for source protection planning.

Chair John Williamson requested that the Project Manager draft a letter to Sunbury Outlook acknowledging receipt of their letter.

- b) Letter from Heather Malcolmson, Acting Director, Source Protection Programs Branch Ontario Ministry of the Environment, to Robert Morrison, Chair, Cataraqui Source Protection Authority and John C. Williamson, Chair, Cataraqui Source Protection Committee, acknowledging approval of an Amended Proposed Assessment Report: Cataraqui Source Protection Area (June 2011), dated October 6, 2011.

Mr. McRae indicated that this was the official approval of the Assessment Report and congratulated the members on their success. He indicated that the CRCA staff would be sharing related data with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and that the source protection plan would now be the primary focus of the Committee as it is due August 2012. Mr. McRae also highlighted a quote from the letter indicating the Ministry's appreciation for their consultation efforts that had exceeded legislative requirements.

- c) Letter from the Eastern Ontario Warden's Caucus to the Honourable Jim Bradley, Ontario Minister of the Environment, regarding financial costs for implementation of drinking water source protection, dated October 25, 2011.

Mr. McRae advised that this letter was sent by the Eastern Ontario Warden's Caucus to the Ministry calling for provincial funding for source protection plan implementation.

- d) Letter from the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority to Nicole Barbato, Source Protection Liaison, Conservation Ontario, regarding the outcome of their October meeting, dated November 10, 2011.

Mr. McRae indicated that this letter had been prepared to inform Conservation Ontario of the key outcomes of the recent Cataraqui Source Protection Authority (SP Authority) meeting. It offers some suggestions on improving the source protection plan process, funding the drinking water source protection initiative and discretionary roles of the SP Authority, such as hosting a risk management office, and delivering education / outreach and stewardship programs. It indicates that the SP Authority may in-principle be willing to take on these roles providing that there is local support e majority of the municipalities concurred and that it was and adequate provincial funding.

- e) Letter from the Source Protection Authority to the Members of the Source Protection Committee, regarding the approval of the Amended Proposed Assessment Report, dated November 10, 2011.

Mr. McRae indicated that the letter conveys congratulations and thanks to the members of the Source Protection Committee on the development and subsequent provincial approval of the Amended Proposed Assessment Report for the Cataraqui Source Protection Area.

8) Sector Updates from the Committee

Kim Sytsma advised that the agricultural community would like risk management officials and inspectors to have an agricultural background especially when it comes to nutrient management. The agricultural community is also concerned that they will not be able to farm on portions of their own property and it is their hope that they be compensated by the Province through land purchases or leases.

Nona Mariotti advised that upon attending the 10th annual Lake Links Workshop she was pleasantly surprised with the increase in attendance and the degree of care about the lake health. She also advised that some land developers are eager to learn how to work with, and help, the lake associations. She also mentioned that lakefront development is expected to increase by 13 to 20 per cent in the coming years.

Chris Mangan-Greene indicated that she recently provided a presentation on drinking water source protection to a local group; it had been prepared by Karla Maki-Esdon, Communications Coordinator at the CRCA and that the audience she presented to found it useful and enlightening. Ms. Mangan-Greene recommended that other members take advantage of the opportunity to spread the word among their sectors through similar presentations.

9) Business/Reports

- a) Status of Pre-Consultation on Draft Source Protection Plan Policies, Rob McRae, Project Manager

Mr. McRae's presentation to the members provided a status update on the pre-consultation regarding draft source protection plan policies. He indicated that nearly 50% of the expected respondents had responded to the initial distribution, while only 25% had submitted comments about the other two distributions. Although the response rate was lower than expected there was an indication that further responses would be received throughout November.

The members were reminded that all comment letters received by staff to-date were shared either on members' USB data sticks or via electronic mail.

Mr. McRae also updated the members on the level of effort documents and the policy forum events held in September and October as well as the SP Authority meeting that took place at the end of October.

- b) Comparison of Draft Source Protection Plan Policies Across Eastern Ontario Source Protection Areas/Regions, Christine Woods, Source Protection Planner

Christine Woods provided a short presentation on her comparison of draft source protection plan policies for the eastern Ontario source protection areas/regions. Although there are differences each nearby region has focused its efforts on addressing the numerous significant drinking water threats around their municipal water sources. In general the nearby regions propose to prohibit and or manage the same types of activities as the Cataraqui using similar approaches. With that being said there are still some discrepancies that will affect the municipalities that are shared between the Cataraqui and other regions. She also noted that there could be a benefit to the eastern Ontario source protection areas/regions working together on implementation.

- c) Draft Policies for the Source Protection Plan – Proposed Responses to Pre-Consultation Comments and Suggestions, Holly Evans, Water Quality Specialist and Christine Woods, Source Protection Planner

Holly Evans and Ms. Woods led the members through a number of proposed changes to the draft polices, based largely on pre-consultation comments received from municipalities, public health units, provincial ministries and others (see Item 9(a) above). They advised that each comment letter had been carefully considered by staff. Other proposed changes had been inspired by discussions with the policy advisor (French Planning Services Inc.) and other source protection areas/regions. There was considerable discussion regarding a number of the changes, and the members requested that the remaining items be prioritized before the Joint Working Group meeting on November 23rd. There they would continue the review task, prior to endorsing all of the changes at the December 8th Source Protection Committee meeting.

10) Announcements or Inquiries

- a) CTC Source Protection report to Patricia Madill, Regional Clerk, Regional Municipality of Durham, Region Report to Council, dated November 14, 2011.

Mr. McRae advised that this letter announces the Draft CTC Source Protection Plan completion and Mr. McRae encouraged the Members to review it. The announcement will be circulated to the Members as it was not part of the original agenda circulation.

- b) Ontario only province to get an 'A' for water program; Report gives the feds an 'F' for protection efforts – Toronto Star, November 16, 2011.

Nona Mariotti noted this item, and Mr. McRae advised the members that related information would be circulated following the meeting. It was good news as Ontario received the highest grade of 'A' while the Federal Government received an 'F'. He indicated that the SP Committee's efforts are being noticed nationally and their work will lead to helpful outcomes.

Chair John Williamson requested that the Project Manager draft a letter to the Ministry of the Environment to commend the Province on this positive rating from an independent observer.

11) Motions/Notice of Motion

There were none.

12) Opportunity for Questions from the Media

There were no questions.

13) IN CAMERA Session

This was not required.

14) Next Meeting

Next meeting of the SP Committee: December 8, 2011

7:00 PM Regular Meeting

General Purpose Room, Outdoor Centre

Little Cataraqui Creek Conservation Area, Kingston

15) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 P.M. on a motion by Kim Sytsma.

John C. Williamson, Chair

Rob McRae, Project Manager

THE CATARAQUI SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

REPORT

To: Cataraqui Source Protection Committee

Files: SPP 4-0, 8

From: Rob McRae, Project Manager, Source Water Protection

Date: December 1, 2011

RE: LOOKING AHEAD TO 2012 – SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN

This staff report seeks direction from the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee (“SP Committee”) regarding a revised schedule for assembling, consulting on, refining and submitting a proposed source protection plan during 2012. Additional details on related aspects (i.e. meeting dates, municipal council presentations) are also provided for members’ consideration.

Background

Ontario Regulation 287/07 under the *Clean Water Act, 2006* sets parameters for the preparation of source protection plans. Staff have discussed options for the timing of work in 2012 with the SP Committee on previous occasions, most recently at the September 2011 meeting. There is a need to revisit the schedule based on pre-consultation comments and our latest understanding of the required tasks.

Revised Schedule for the Proposed Source Protection Plan

The due date for all source protection authorities to submit proposed plans to the Ontario Minister of the Environment is August 20, 2012. Staff wish to propose a revised schedule to meet that requirement, as shown below (anticipated SP Committee meetings are shown with a ‘C’):

Task	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul
Draft plan	C	C					
First consultation		60 days					
Proposed plan				C	C	C	
Submission to SP Authority							
Second consultation						30 days	
SP Authority discussion							C
Submission to Minister							

The Regulation specifies that there must be two formal consultation periods prior to submission:

1. A [minimum] 35 day period in which comments on a draft version are invited to be submitted to the source protection committee for its consideration in preparing a proposed version; and
2. A subsequent 30 day period in which comments on a proposed version are invited to be submitted to the lead source protection authority (they are subsequently forwarded on to the Minister).

Staff had earlier considered the merits of a minimum (35 day) duration for the first comment period. We now recommend that it be about 60 days in duration. This advice is based on our experience with pre-consultation, and reflects extension requests that have already been received from municipalities. The importance of receiving and addressing comments on the draft plan outweighs the benefit of an early submission in summer 2012. We note that the schedule proposed above continues to include some ‘flex’ time to account for unforeseen events.

Proposed SP Committee Meeting Dates in 2012

As shown above, your meeting schedule for next year will need to follow the course of plan development. The pattern of meeting on the second Thursday evening of the month should be continued as much as possible.

As in past years, the January meeting is proposed during the third week to account for the holiday season. Two meetings will likely be needed in the month between the “draft” and “proposed” versions of the plan (likely May). The frequency of meetings after submission of the proposed plan to the Minister of the Environment is uncertain at this time.

The proposed meeting dates for the first half of the year are as follows:

Proposed Meeting Date	Notes	Purpose
January 19 th	3 rd Thursday	Discuss the internal draft source protection plan
February 9 th		Prepare for consultation (60 days, late February to late April)
(March)	Unless necessary	No meeting – during first consultation period
April 12 th		Reflect on the ongoing consultation, and potential plan revisions
May 10 th		Reflect on comments received, and potential plan revisions
May 31 st	5 th Thursday	Submit a proposed source protection plan to the SP Authority (results in SP Authority consultation for 30 days, mid-June to mid-July)
(June)	Unless necessary	No meeting – during second consultation period
July 12 th		Reflect on comments received, potentially provide clarification / responses to the SP Authority

Presentations to Municipal Councils

Section 22(15) of the *Act* requires that municipalities be consulted as source protection plans are being developed. As part of this effort, your latest Communications Strategy (September 2011) envisions a round of delegations by members and staff to all 12 lower-tier and separated municipal councils between January and March 2012, with the adjacent source protection region(s) as appropriate. A presentation request has been received from the City of Kingston; that municipality would like to meet with Committee representatives prior to your publication of a draft version.

It would also be appropriate to visit the County councils during this period; a presentation request has already been received from the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville.

We suggest that it would be helpful for members to lead the delivery of the presentations, accompanied by staff. All slides and handouts would be prepared by staff in advance, and shared with the presenting member (for final revision) prior to the visit.

This approach would clearly associate the draft source protection plan as a product of the SP Committee, rather than the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority. It would also facilitate direct contact between members and municipal councils.

Staff are working to arrange suitable presentation dates that work around holidays and known events (e.g. the Ontario Good Roads Association conference). We will bring forward a draft schedule for your consideration on December 8th.

Recommendation

THAT the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee adopt a revised schedule for the development of a proposed source protection plan in 2012, as outlined by the report of the Project Manager (dated December 1, 2011).

Staff look forward to meeting with you again in December.

Respectfully submitted,

(original signed by)

Rob McRae MCIP, RPP
Project Manager, Source Water Protection

THE CATARAQUI SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

REPORT

To: Cataraqui Source Protection Committee

Date: December 1, 2011

From: Christine Woods, Source Protection Planner
Holly Evans, Water Quality Specialist

Files: SPP 4-0, 8

RE: DRAFT POLICIES FOR THE SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN

The purpose of this report is to present the latest draft policies for the intake protection zones, wellhead protection areas, highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas in the Cataraqui Source Protection Area. Staff seek approval-in-principle of the draft policies from the Source Protection Committee (SP Committee) for the purpose of preparing a draft source protection plan.

Background

The SP Committee members deliberated at meetings on November 17th and 23rd about the policy revisions that were proposed by staff in response to pre-consultation comments and suggestions received prior to those meetings.

Discussion

With reference to the direction provided at the meetings, staff have revised the draft policies so that they will be ready for inclusion in the forthcoming draft plan. Our proposed revisions are highlighted in Attachment # 2 for the SP Committee's consideration; additions are highlighted in grey while deletions are shown with ~~strike through~~. At your next meeting staff will present selected policies for which further policy direction and/or clarification from the SP Committee is required.

Correspondence has been received from the following agencies and municipalities, and is provided in PDF format (saved on your USB data sticks) for members' consideration. The numbering below relates to the file names assigned to each PDF:

25. Township of South Frontenac;
26. Ontario Ministry of Consumer Services;
27. Technical Standards and Safety Authority;
28. City of Brockville staff;
29. Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands staff and planning consultant; and
30. Utilities Kingston staff.

In addition to the highlighting in Attachment 2 (described above), Attachment # 1 includes a summary of the recent comments and how they could affect the draft policies.

For the purpose of this exercise, policies have been combined where similarities exist. Please note that where a specific implementing body, such as a municipality, is identified in the policy it is an example only. The proposed policies would apply to all of the applicable vulnerable areas as identified in the first column by their policy reference numbers.

Recommendation

Staff recommend that the SP Committee grant its approval-in-principle to the draft policies for inclusion in the draft source protection plan.

THAT the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee approve-in-principle draft policies (as discussed at its December 8, 2011 meeting) for the purpose of preparing a draft source protection plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Woods MCIP, RPP
Source Protection Planner

Holly Evans
Water Quality Specialist

Attachments:

- (1) Summary of Recent Comments Received from Implementing Bodies (December 1, 2011)
- (2) Policies for Inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plan (December 1, 2011)

Approved for circulation _____RMC_____

Attachment 1. Summary of recent comments received from implementing bodies

December 1, 2011

This attachment summarizes the comments received from the following agencies and municipalities, and how they could affect the draft policies.

1. Ministry of Consumer Services
2. Technical Standards and Safety Authority
3. City of Brockville staff
4. Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands staff and planning consultant
5. Township of South Frontenac
6. Utilities Kingston staff

1. Ministry of Consumer Services (November 25, 2011)

The Ministry of Consumer Services (MCS) provided the Source Protection Committee with valuable information about the legislative framework in which MCS and the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) operate, as well as how policy Area-wide.11-SA could be implemented. Staff propose that Area-wide.11-SA be revised to reflect this framework.

[Staff note: At the Cana roundtable and the October provincial forum there was mention of an important study commissioned by the Canadian Oil Heat Association – Ontario Chapter. Researchers at the University of Toronto are trying to determine the reasons for steel tank failures. The intent is to share this information with the MCS and TSSA as supportive evidence to update the regulation and Fuel Codes if appropriate. TSSA is also investigating reported storage failures for the same purpose.]

2. Technical Standards and Safety Authority (November 25, 2011)

The Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) provided the Source Protection Committee insight into its role and mandate. Its limited public outreach is focused on areas where user behaviour poses the most significant public safety risk as determined by an evidence-based risk analysis. [Staff note: The Canadian Oil Heat Association – Ontario Chapter may be better positioned to assist with education and outreach work in the Cataraqui Source Protection Area].

The implementing body for the proposed fuel-related education and outreach policies is encouraged by TSSA to keep material up to date by regularly reviewing applicable regulations, codes and standards that are frequently being revised (generally once every five years).

The TSSA generally does not have the authority to refuse approvals or authorizations where equipment is in compliance with applicable codes and standards. It is suggested in the letter that any restrictions or requirements related to fuel oil storage and handling is best addressed by municipal authorities.

3. City of Brockville staff (November 28, 2011)

General

Staff of the City of Brockville requested clarification on information from the Assessment Report, and the wording and intent of a number of the policies. Prior to receiving these comments, CRCA staff had proposed that a number of the affected intake protection zone policies be deleted or incorporated with other policies. The proposed policy revisions and context that will be included in the source protection plan should address their concerns.

On-site Sewage Systems

City staff suggested that as part of any incentive program related to on-site sewage systems, priority should be given to converting private services to municipal services when such municipal servicing is or becomes available.

Based on a follow up conversation with City staff, we recommend the addition of the following area-wide policy for those situations where the option exists to decommission on-site sewage systems and connect to municipal services.

The municipality should require connection to municipal water and sanitary sewer services (capacity permitting) where services are available at the property line, or when they become available, in the following situations:

- **When an existing septic system fails a Phase II Inspection;**
- **When the Principal Authority for Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code has deemed an existing septic system inadequate to service a proposed redevelopment / renovation; or**
- **For new development on existing vacant lots of record.**

Best Management Practices and Risk Management Measures

City staff suggested that there be consistency where municipalities are expected to require best management practices or risk management measures for particular activities. Staff think that reference to the risk management measure catalogue is sufficient to ensure a level of consistency.

Data Management

City staff propose that a database could track on-site sewage systems, brown-fields and contaminated sites. The existing policy wording in HV.SR.21-SA (data management), bullet 'a', is inclusive of these types of activities. The explanatory document and or text surrounding this policy in the plan will include a description of the types of information that could be associated with this policy.

4. Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands

There are no changes needed at this time based on a report from the Township's planning consultant (dated November 28, 2011). It was noted that the Township official plan will undergo a five year update in the spring of 2012 and that it would be appropriate to incorporate many of the policies at that time.

Informal general comments received from the Township's Public Works Director (dated November 25, 2011) indicate that the policies are beyond the community's capabilities. There is also confusion about the potential GUDI designation.

Staff continue to reach out to this Township and hope to schedule a meeting with key Township staff in December to explain source water protection and gather more specific comments.

5. Township of South Frontenac (November 25, 2011)

There are no changes needed at this time based on the Township comments about the draft highly vulnerable aquifer and significant groundwater recharge area policies. The Township is supportive of policies HV.SR-1-HR, SR.4-SA and HV.SR.5-HR. It recognizes the good intent of the remaining policies but is concerned about the impact on available financial and staff resources.

6. Utilities Kingston staff (November 29, 2011)

The most recent memo from Utilities Kingston reiterated previous concerns and indicated satisfaction with some of the proposed policy revisions. Staff think that the policies have been revised as appropriate and will include information in the explanatory document to further justify and explain the policy content.

One particular sticking point related to the Cana Wellhead Protection Area is the potential Groundwater Under the Direct Influence (GUDI) designation of the Cana Well Supply and the resultant WHPA 'E'. We note that the Cana Subdivision Wellhead Protection Area Study (Golder Associates, July 2009) determined that the Cana Supply well was a potential GUIDI well and indicated that a GUDI designation should be recommended if the total coliform counts persist at the same frequency over a period of time. The Assessment Report (June 2011) included WHPA 'E' to account for the potential GUDI designation at the Cana Supply well. CRCA staff are exploring the following to determine if a change in the current approach is warranted:

1. Have the raw water quality samples taken at the Cana Supply well been free of bacteria (total coliform) since the original evaluation for the Assessment Report?
2. Does the hydrogeologist, Dr. Anthony West of Golder Associates, who originally determined the Cana Supply well to be potentially GUIDI believe that this is no longer the case based on raw water bacteriological sample results to date?
3. If Dr. West believes that the potential GUIDI designation is no longer appropriate should the source protection plan mention this and not include any policies for WHPA 'E'?

Once this background research is complete staff will request direction from the Source Protection Committee.

Attachment 2. Draft Policies for Inclusion in the Draft Source Protection Plan (December 1, 2011)

Area-wide Policies

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy
Area-wide.1-SA	<p>All municipalities in the Cataraqui Source Protection Area SHOULD EVALUATE their hazardous waste disposal programs and IMPROVE them as necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to encourage landowners, tenants, and small business operators to properly dispose of waste products; b) to raise awareness of local hazardous waste collection days and opportunities for household products; and c) to provide information to encourage the use of non-toxic (“green”) household products in order to reduce the impacts of improper disposal of wastes such as DNAPLs, organic solvents, fuel and pesticides on waste disposal sites, on-site sewage systems, and wastewater treatment facilities within two years of the source protection plan taking effect. <p>The municipalities should provide the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority with a copy of the program evaluation within 60 days of its completion or after its endorsement by Council, if applicable.</p>
Area-wide.2-SA	<p>All municipal road authorities in the Cataraqui Source Protection Area SHOULD ESTABLISH or REVIEW AND UPDATE the salt management plans applicable to their respective jurisdictions to account for the sensitivity of the vulnerable areas within their jurisdictions and in consideration of the level of risk salt operations (i.e. application, handling and storage) and snow storage pose to the source water where these activities are moderate or low drinking water threats.</p> <p>The plan should be consistent with the Environment Canada <i>Code of Practice for the Environmental Management of Road Salts</i>, as amended from time to time, and the Transport Association of Canada <i>Salt Management Guide</i> and <i>Synthesis of Best Practices for Road Salt Management</i>, as amended from time to time.</p> <p>This update should occur within three years of the Code of Practice being updated, and a copy of the updated salt management plan should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p>
Area-wide.3-SA	<p>Where the application of hauled sewage, on-site sewage treatment systems and wastewater treatment facilities are moderate or low drinking water threats, and there is limited or no capacity at local wastewater treatment facilities in Cataraqui Source Protection Area, municipalities, SHOULD CONSIDER cooperatively:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) managing the treatment or stabilization of hauled sewage at existing wastewater facilities; or b) upgrading existing or constructing new facilities to handle demand; or c) encouraging the use of alternative treatment or stabilization technologies <p>within five years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>The municipalities should provide the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority with timely updates on any deliberations related to the foregoing.</p>
Area-wide.4-M-SA	<p><i>Deleted – reporting requirement incorporated into Area-wide.3-SA.</i></p>
Area-wide.5-SA	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHOULD UPDATE its spill prevention and spill contingency plans and emergency response plans (including procedure cards) to more directly identify source water protection information, such as the location of wellhead protection areas and intake protection zones, and how to use the information in the Ministry’s response to spills to ensure that drinking water sources will be protected. This strategic action should occur within one year of the source protection plan taking effect.</p>
Area-wide.6-SA	<p>The Ontario Ministry of the Environment SHOULD REVISE the <i>Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual</i> (2003) to include specific effluent discharge limits and conditions for stormwater management facilities in wellhead protection areas, highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas that are protective of the sensitive nature of the aquifers and also require that specific performance monitoring be included in certificates of approval. This policy should be implemented at the next review of the design manual or within five years of the source protection plan effective date, whichever comes first, and a copy be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p>
Area-wide.7-SA	<p>The Ontario Ministry of the Environment SHOULD PERFORM a to be determined number of unannounced and announced compliance inspections during well construction or abandonment operations each year to ensure Ontario Regulation 903 requirements are followed as a compliment to their on-going compliance and enforcement strategy.</p> <p>Such inspections should be focused on areas where increased aquifer vulnerability has been identified in the Assessment Report for the Cataraqui Source Protection Area.</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy
	<p>✓ Improperly constructed and unmaintained wells are transport pathways.</p>
Area-wide.8-SA	<p>The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs SHOULD AMEND Ontario Regulation 267/03 - General to require all farms in WHPAs and IPZs where the application, storage and management of agricultural source materials are SIGNIFICANT drinking water threats, to prepare and follow nutrient management strategies and/or nutrient management plans. This amendment should occur within five years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>In the Cataraqui Source Protection Area, these activities are or would be significant drinking water threats in the Brockville, James W. King and Sydenham IPZ 1 and IPZ 2, and in the Cana, Lansdowne and Miller Manor WHPA A and WHPA B.</p>
Area-wide.9-SA	<p>The Ministry of Transportation SHOULD REVIEW AND UPDATE its salt management plan to account for the sensitivity of the vulnerable areas along Provincial highways in the Cataraqui Source Protection Area and in consideration of the level of risk those operations salt operations (i.e. application, handling and storage) and snow storage pose to the source water where these activities are moderate or low drinking water threats.</p> <p>The plan should be consistent with the Environment Canada <i>Code of Practice for the Environmental Management of Road Salts</i>, as amended from time to time, and the Transport Association of Canada <i>Salt Management Guide</i> and <i>Synthesis of Best Practices for Road Salt Management</i>, as amended from time to time.</p> <p>This update should occur within three years of the Code of Practice being updated, and a copy of the updated salt management plan should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p>
Area-wide.10-SA	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHOULD WORK with the Ontario Pesticides Education Program Committee to incorporate drinking water source protection information into the education materials for this program at the next program update. A copy of the new material should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority when it becomes available.</p> <p>Among other matters, the pesticide education materials should inform pesticide applicators of how to find out if their lands are in a wellhead protection area or intake protection zone where the application, handling and/or storage of specific pesticides may be regulated through a risk management plan or prohibited under the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
Area-wide.11-SA	<p>The Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Consumer Services should engage and the Technical Standards and Safety Authority should work together on to undertake a review of the fuel regulations and codes (Ontario Regulation 213/01 and the Ontario Installation Code for Oil Burning Equipment (2006), in accordance with its established evidence-based and consultative process, to reduce risks to drinking water sources from leaks and spills associated with the handling and storage of fuel.</p> <p>An update should include at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Increasing the frequency of inspections conducted by fuel suppliers from once in the previous ten years to a more regular basis (noting that the Ontario Installation Code indicates that home heating oil users are to inspect their systems annually); and b) Requiring the use of fuel handling and storage equipment (i.e. supply tanks, supply pipes, etc.) that research has shown to be resistant to leaks. <p>a) Inspection conducted by fuel suppliers should be more frequent than every ten years. b) TSSA should promote the regular maintenance to be conducted by owners as per Section 13 of the Ontario Installation Code for Oil burning Equipment so property owners are aware of this requirement. e) Phase out indoor and outdoor single-walled steel tanks and replace with a more leak resistant technology.</p> <p>This action should occur at the next review cycle or within five years of the source protection plan taking effect, whichever comes first.</p> <p>✓ Section 26(1)(v) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to set out policies that specify actions to be taken to implement the source protection plan or to achieve the plan's objectives.</p>
Area-wide.12-SA	<p>The Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in cooperation the Ontario Rural Wastewater Centre SHOULD UNDERTAKE a research project to determine the best method for disposing of water softener backwash in the hydrogeologic and climatic setting of the Cataraqui Source Protection Area/Eastern Ontario. A proposal to undertake this strategic action should occur within five years of the source protection plan taking effect, and be shared with the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority at that time.</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy
Area-wide.13-SA	<p>Education and outreach programs are important to the successful implementation of the source protection plan. These programs should increase awareness in the vulnerable areas regarding the importance of protecting sources of drinking water from contamination and over-use.</p> <p>The Cataraqui Source Protection Authority should facilitate the targeted efforts of local partners and communicate with provincial partners via Conservation Ontario to provide education and outreach programs that include drinking water source protection information relevant to their individual programs. The SP Authority should also prepare and deliver content of a more general nature to a broader audience where gaps have been identified in the network of existing programs.</p> <p>The following is a list of local and provincial partners that the SP Authority should approach to help deliver particular source water protection information to various sectors.</p> <p>The list is not exhaustive.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local farm organizations and the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs to include source water protection information in farm education programs and materials. 2. Canadian Oil Heat Association, local fuel distributors and marinas to minimize the risk of fuel contamination in the vulnerable areas in relation to the handling and storage of fuel at marinas, private fuel outlets and heating oil tanks, and to encourage annual inspections. 3. Ontario Marine Operators Association to encourage the marinas in the Cataraqui Source Protection Area to participate in the Clean Marine Program, especially if they are located near a municipal intake. 4. Ministry of Transportation and municipalities to develop a Province-wide public health and safety program (e.g. source water protection signage) to notify the travelling public and emergency/spill response units of the vulnerability of the areas surrounding our sources of drinking water. 5. Health Units related to on-site sewage systems and public health aspects of drinking water 6. Well Aware Program for groundwater basics, proper well maintenance 7. Ontario Groundwater Association, licensed well technicians and water treatment specialists for consideration of structural improvements to wells, drinking water treatment options and proper water treatment system maintenance. 8. Municipalities and their Public Utilities <p>The following is a list of gap areas for the Source Protection Authority to fill:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage business operators that haul septage by barge from island and waterfront properties to develop and circulate/post a pump-out schedule to provide consistent service options for landowners of these properties and to minimize the effort and cost of mobilizing the necessary marine equipment. 2. Encourage existing private and municipal marinas in the intake protection zones to develop new, or update existing, spill prevention and contingency plans that would address spills associated with the handling and storage of fuel and sewage at the marina. 3. Encourage municipalities, private marinas and resident associations to erect signage at their boat ramps and docks in the intake protection zones to make people aware of the nearby intake and to indicate reasonable actions to take to keep the waterbody clean for all water users. 4. Advise individuals of incentive program options that could be used to fund site-specific risk mitigation measures. 5. Make general source protection materials available. <p>An initial meeting of local and provincial partners should occur within six months of the source protection plan taking effect, and programs developed or updated within one year of the plan taking effect.</p> <p>✓ Sections 26(1)(ii) and(v) of Regulation 287/07 allow the source protection plan to specify and promote best management practices and to specify actions to be taken to implement the source protection plan or to achieve the plan's objectives.</p>
Area-wide.14-SA	<i>Policy on farm education programs incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i>
Area-wide.15-CW/SA	<i>Policy on fuel education program incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i>
Area-wide.16-SA	<i>Policy on Clean Marine Program incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i>
Area-wide.17-CW/SA	<i>Policy on road signs incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i>
Area-wide.18-CW	<i>Policy on issues contributing areas deleted.</i>
Area-wide.19-CW	<p>The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation should review options for how the Corporation can more directly identify source water protection information and how to use it in its response to spills on the St. Lawrence River. This strategic action should occur within one year of the source protection plan taking effect, and a copy of any updated materials should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy
Area-wide.20-CW	<i>Policy to advise TSSA about prohibitions deleted.</i>
Area-wide.21-M	<i>Deleted – it does not make sense for the SP Authority to report to itself. However, this should be addressed through the section in Chapter 7 on annual reporting to the Ministry of the Environment.</i>
Area-wide.22-SA	<p><i>Staff recommend that the intent of the policy about collecting effluent sampling records and using the data to improve the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River intake protection zones be incorporated into the Chapter 7 section on overall considerations for future planning cycles:</i></p> <p>The Ministry of the Environment, as the administrator for section 53 of the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> (OWRA), SHOULD COLLECT existing effluent sampling records from those individuals, businesses, and municipalities that have certificates of approval under section 53 of the OWRA to discharge sewage to Lake Ontario or the St. Lawrence River, or a tributary to these waterbodies, within the Cataraqui Source Protection Area, and provide this information to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <p>Where available, the sampling records from 2006 should be obtained as part of this collection.</p> <p>This strategic action should occur within one year of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>The Authority will use the data in the next source protection planning cycle to determine if chemical and pathogen concentrations at discharge points along the shoreline are sufficient to cause issues at the municipal residential drinking water system intakes along the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River shoreline such that they would be significant drinking water threats.</p>
Area-wide.23-SA	<p>The Ministry of the Environment, in conjunction with the industrial sector SHOULD WORK TO DEVELOP a province-wide Wise Water Use Recognition incentive program to officially acknowledge proactive industries and businesses that have made improvements to their processes to protect and conserve the quality and quantity of source water. for industry and businesses to officially recognize proactive industry, improve transparency about water use via a method like water footprint development and to promote continuous improvement for water conservation and protection.</p> <p>This strategic action should occur within five years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Discharge from industrial sewage facilities may be a SIGNIFICANT, MODERATE or LOW drinking water threat depending on the vulnerability score of a particular intake protection zone. ✓ This policy is in accordance with section 26(1) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended.

Policies for Intake Protection Zones and Wellhead Protection Areas

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
Part IV Tools	
BR.1-CW	<p>The following activity, which would be a significant drinking water threat if established, IS PROHIBITED from occurring in the Brockville IPZ 1 under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>:</p> <p>a) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kg of the pesticides MCPA or Mecoprop associated with retail sales and extermination.</p>
BR.2-CW	<p>In accordance with section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, a risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in Brockville IPZ 2 for the application of MCPA to land areas greater than ten (10) hectares. This activity is a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>MCPA is an herbicide registered for use in Ontario to control weeds in grass-type crops, such as cereal and turf grass.</p> <p>The risk management plan is to be negotiated between the risk management official and the person engaged in the activity listed above, and may recognize existing pesticide management plans such as those completed through the legislated IPM Accreditation Program for golf courses.</p> <p>If this activity is engaged in immediately before the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan SHALL be agreed to within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>If this activity is to be engaged in after the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan shall be agreed to before the activity becomes established.</p>
BR.3-CW	<p>All lands uses in the former Township of Elizabethtown Zoning By-law 1712, as amended, and in the City of Brockville Comprehensive Zoning By-law 194-94, as amended, except residential, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Brockville IPZ 1 where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>a) The handling and storage of pesticides.</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>All lands uses in the former Township of Elizabethtown Zoning By-law 1712, as amended, and in the City of Brockville Comprehensive Zoning By-law 194-94, as amended, except residential and commercial, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Brockville IPZ 2 where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>a) The application of pesticides.</p> <p>This means that the Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley and the City of Brockville SHALL NOT process an application for any development made under the <i>Planning Act</i> or the Ontario Building Code in the specified areas of the Brockville Intake Protection Zone within their respective jurisdiction, unless the Risk Management Official issues a notice to the applicant stating that either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed activity for which the land is to be used is neither prohibited under section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> nor is a risk management plan required under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>, or 2. That a risk management plan under section 58 of the <i>Act</i> is required for the proposed activity, and that the plan has been agreed to or established under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>.
JK.1-CW	<p>The following activity, which would be a significant drinking water threat if established, IS PROHIBITED from occurring in the James W. King IPZ 1 under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>:</p> <p>a) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kg of the pesticides MCPA or Mecoprop associated with retail sales and extermination.</p>
JK.2-CW	<p>In accordance with section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, a risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in James W. King IPZ 2 for the following activities that are significant drinking water threats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the storage of agricultural source material; b) land application of agricultural source material; and c) livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards <p>in the event that these activities are not phased-in and managed under Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General. The risk management plan is to be negotiated between the risk management official and the person engaged in the activity listed above, and be consistent with the requirements of Ontario Regulation 267/03 and/or agriculture best management practices as appropriate.</p> <p>If this activity is engaged in immediately before the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan SHALL be agreed to within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>If this activity is to be engaged in after the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan shall be agreed to before the activity becomes established.</p>
JK.3-CW	<p>All lands uses in the Town of Gananoque Zoning By-law 91-37, as amended, except residential, open space and floodplain, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in James W. King IPZ 1 where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>a) The handling and storage of pesticides.</p> <p>All lands uses in the Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands Zoning By-law 07-79, as amended, except residential, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in James W. King IPZ 2 where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the storage of agricultural source material; b) land application of agricultural source material; and c) livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards. <p>This means that the Town of Gananoque and the Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands SHALL NOT process an application for any development made under the <i>Planning Act</i> or the Ontario Building Code in the specified areas of the James W. King Intake Protection Zone within their respective jurisdiction, unless the Risk Management Official issues a notice to the applicant stating that either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed activity for which the land is to be used is neither prohibited under section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> nor is a risk management plan required under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>, or 2. That a risk management plan under section 58 of the <i>Act</i> is required for the proposed activity, and that the plan has been agreed to or established under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>.

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
SD.1-CW	<p>The following activity, which would be a significant drinking water threat if established, IS PROHIBITED from occurring in the James W. King IPZ 1 under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>:</p> <p>a) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kg of the pesticides MCPA or Mecoprop associated with retail sales and extermination.</p>
SD.2-CW	<p>In accordance with section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, a risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in Sydenham IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 for the following activities that are significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>a) the storage of agricultural source material; b) land application of agricultural source material; and c) livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards</p> <p>in the event that these activities are not phased-in and managed under Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General. The risk management plan is to be negotiated between the risk management official and the person engaged in the activity listed above, and be consistent with the requirements of Ontario Regulation 267/03 and/or agriculture best management practices as appropriate.</p> <p>If this activity is engaged in immediately before the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan SHALL be agreed to within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>If this activity is to be engaged in after the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan shall be agreed to before the activity becomes established.</p>
SD.3-CW	<p>All lands uses in the Township of South Frontenac Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2003-75, as amended, except residential and community facilities, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Sydenham IPZ 1 where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>a) The handling and storage of pesticides.</p> <p>All lands uses in the Township of South Frontenac Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2003-75, as amended, except residential, community facilities and urban commercial, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Sydenham IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>a) the storage of agricultural source material; b) land application of agricultural source material; and c) livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards.</p> <p>This means that the Township of South Frontenac SHALL NOT process an application for any development made under the <i>Planning Act</i> or the Ontario Building Code in the specified areas of the Sydenham Intake Protection Zone, unless the Risk Management Official issues a notice to the applicant stating that either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed activity for which the land is to be used is neither prohibited under section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> nor is a risk management plan required under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>, or 2. That a risk management plan under section 58 of the <i>Act</i> is required for the proposed activity, and that the plan has been agreed to or established under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>.
CS.1-CW	<p>The following activities, which would be significant drinking water threats if established, ARE PROHIBITED from occurring in the specified areas of the Cana Wellhead Protection Area under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>:</p> <p>In WHPA ‘A’:</p> <p>a) The application of agricultural source material b) The application of the pesticides MCPA and Mecoprop on at least 1 hectare of land c) Livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards</p> <p>In WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the vulnerability score of 10:</p> <p>a) The storage of agricultural source material b) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kilograms of commercial fertilizer for the purpose of retail sale or application</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>c) The handling and storage of the following pesticides for retail sale or application, in the mass specified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) More than 250 kilograms of MCPA or Mecoprop ii) More than 2,500 kilograms of Dicamba, 2,4-D, 1,3 Dichloropropene, MCPA, Metalaxyl, Metolachlor or s-Metolachlor <p>d) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kilograms of MCPA or Mecoprop in facilities where pesticide is manufactured or processed</p> <p>e) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 litres of fuel oil above or below grade, excluding handling and storage at bulk plants and facilities that manufacture or refine fuel where fuel storage is above grade</p> <p>f) the handling and storage of the following pure-phase organic solvents in the volume specified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) More than 25 litres of carbon tetrachloride ii) More than 250 litres of chloroform or methylene chloride iii) More than 2,500 litres of pentachlorophenol <p>g) Snow storage areas that are more than 0.01 ha in area below grade or more than 1 ha above grade</p> <p>In WHPA ‘A’, WHPA ‘B’ and WHPA ‘C’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of more than 25 litres of pure phase dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs)
CS.2-CW	<p>In accordance with section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, a risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in Cana WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the vulnerability score is 10 for the following circumstances related to the handling and storage of fuel that are significant drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The existing and future below grade storage of more than 250 litres of fuel b) The existing storage of more than 2,500 litres storage at any grade excluding bulk plants and facilities that manufacture or refine fuel where fuel storage is above grade <p>The risk management plan is to be negotiated between the risk management official and the person engaged in the activity listed above, and at a minimum would require annual inspections by a certified Fuel Oil Burning Appliance Technician, the repair of any deficiencies any best management practices to reduce the risk of a spill or leak, and that any replacement would consist of equipment known to reduce the risk to the groundwater that supplies the Cana drinking water system.</p> <p>If this activity is engaged in immediately before the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan SHALL be agreed to within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>If this activity is to be engaged in after the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan shall be agreed to before the activity becomes established.</p>
CS.3-CW	<p>All lands uses in Pittsburgh Township Zoning By-law 32-74, as amended are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Cana WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of fuel <p>All lands uses in Zoning By-law 32-74, as amended, except residential, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Cana WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer c) The handling and storage of pesticides d) The handling and storage of organic solvents <p>All lands uses in Zoning By-law 32-74, as amended, except residential, are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Cana WHPA ‘A’, WHPA ‘B’, and WHPA ‘C’ where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) <p>This means that the City of Kingston SHALL NOT process an application for any development made under the <i>Planning Act</i> or the Ontario Building Code in the specified areas of the Cana Wellhead Protection Area unless the Risk Management Official issues a notice to the applicant stating that</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed activity for which the land is to be used is neither prohibited under section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> nor is a risk management plan required under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>, or 2. That a risk management plan under section 58 of the <i>Act</i> is required for the proposed activity, and that the plan has been agreed to or established under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>.
LD.1-CW	<p>The following activities, which are significant drinking water threats, ARE PROHIBITED from occurring in the specified areas of the Lansdowne Wellhead Protection Area under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>:</p> <p>In WHPA ‘A’:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The application of agricultural source material b) The application of commercial fertilizer (this applies only to WHPA ‘A’ for Supply Well 2) c) The application of the following pesticides on the specified land area: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) MCPA or Mecoprop on at least 1 hectare ii) Atrazine, Dicamba, 2,4-D, 1,3 Dichloropropene, MCPB, Metalaxyl, Metolachlor or s-Metolachlor on at least 10 hectares <p>In WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The storage of agricultural source material b) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kilograms of commercial fertilizer for the purpose of retail sale or application c) The handling and storage of the following pesticides for retail sale or application, in the mass specified: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) More than 250 kilograms of MCPA or Mecoprop ii) More than 2,500 kilograms of Dicamba, 2,4-D, 1,3 Dichloropropene, MCPA, Metalaxyl, Metolachlor or s-Metolachlor d) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kilograms of MCPA or Mecoprop in facilities where pesticide is manufactured or processed e) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 litres of fuel oil above or below grade, excluding handling and storage at bulk plants and facilities that manufacture or refine fuel where fuel storage is above grade f) the handling and storage of the following pure-phase organic solvents in the volume specified: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) More than 25 litres of carbon tetrachloride ii) More than 250 litres of chloroform or methylene chloride iii) More than 2,500 litres of pentachlorophenol g) Snow storage areas that are more than 0.01 ha in area below grade or more than 1 ha above grade <p>In WHPA ‘A’, WHPA ‘B’ and WHPA ‘C’:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of more than 25 litres of pure phase dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs)
LD.2-CW	<p>In accordance with section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, a risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in Lansdowne WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ for the following circumstances related to the handling and storage of fuel that are significant drinking water threats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The existing and future below grade storage of more than 250 litres of fuel b) The existing storage of more than 2,500 litres storage at any grade excluding bulk plants and facilities that manufacture or refine fuel where fuel storage is above grade <p>The risk management plan is to be negotiated between the risk management official and the person engaged in the activity listed above, and at a minimum would require annual inspections by a certified Fuel Oil Burning Appliance Technician, the repair of any deficiencies any best management practices to reduce the risk of a spill or leak, and that any replacement would consist of equipment known to reduce the risk to the groundwater that supplies the Lansdowne drinking water system.</p> <p>A risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in Lansdowne WHPA ‘A’ for</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the existing storage of agricultural source material; and

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>b) livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards</p> <p>in the event that these activities are not phased-in and managed under Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General or addressed through municipal by-law 06-056. A risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in Lansdowne WHPA ‘B’ for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the existing and future application of agricultural source material b) the existing and future application of commercial fertilizer c) existing and future livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards <p>in the event that these activities are not phased-in and managed under Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General or addressed through municipal by-law 06-056.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The existing and future application of the following pesticides on the specified land area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) MCPA or Mecoprop on at least 1 hectare ii) Atrazine, Dicamba, 2,4-D, 1,3 Dichloropropene, MCPB, Metalaxyl, Metolachlor or s-Metolachlor on at least 10 hectares <p>The risk management plan is to be negotiated between the risk management official and the person engaged in the activity listed above, and be consistent with the requirements of Ontario Regulation 267/03 and/or agriculture best management practices as appropriate.</p> <p>If one or more of these activities is engaged in immediately before the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan SHALL be agreed to within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>If one or more of these activities is to be engaged in after the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan shall be agreed to before the activity becomes established.</p>
LD.3-CW	<p>The following land uses in the Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands Zoning By-law No. 07-079, as amended are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Lansdowne WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>Agricultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The storage of agricultural source material b) Outdoor confinement areas and barnyards c) The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer d) The handling and storage of pesticide e) The handling and storage of fuel <p>Industrial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of pesticide b) The handling and storage of organic solvent c) The handling and storage of fuel <p>Residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of fuel <p>Industrial land uses in the Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands Zoning By-law No. 07-079, as amended are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Lansdowne WHPA ‘A’, WHPA ‘B’, and WHPA ‘C’ where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of DNAPLs <p>This means that the Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands SHALL NOT process an application for any development made under the <i>Planning Act</i> or the Ontario Building Code in the specified areas of the Lansdowne Wellhead Protection Area unless the Risk Management Official issues a notice to the applicant stating that either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed activity for which the land is to be used is neither prohibited under section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> nor is a risk management plan required under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>, or 2. That a risk management plan under section 58 of the <i>Act</i> is required for the proposed activity, and that the plan has been agreed to or established under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>.

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
MM.1-CW	<p>The following activities, which are significant drinking water threats, ARE PROHIBITED from occurring in the specified areas of the Cana Wellhead Protection Area under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>:</p> <p>In WHPA ‘A’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The application of agricultural source material b) The application of commercial fertilizer c) The application of the following pesticides on the specified land area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) MCPA or Mecoprop on at least 1 hectare d) Livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards <p>In WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the vulnerability score of 10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The storage of agricultural source material b) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kilograms of commercial fertilizer for the purpose of retail sale or application c) The handling and storage of the following pesticides for retail sale or application, in the mass specified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) More than 250 kilograms of MCPA or Mecoprop ii) More than 2,500 kilograms of Dicamba, 2,4-D, 1,3 Dichloropropene, MCPA, Metalaxyl, Metolachlor or s-Metolachlor d) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kilograms of MCPA or Mecoprop in facilities where pesticide is manufactured or processed e) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 litres of fuel oil above or below grade, excluding handling and storage at bulk plants and facilities that manufacture or refine fuel where fuel storage is above grade f) the handling and storage of the following pure-phase organic solvents in the volume specified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) More than 25 litres of carbon tetrachloride ii) More than 250 litres of chloroform or methylene chloride iii) More than 2,500 litres of pentachlorophenol g) Snow storage areas that are more than 0.01 ha in area below grade or more than 1 ha above grade <p>In WHPA ‘A’, WHPA ‘B’ and WHPA ‘C’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of more than 25 litres of pure phase dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs)
MM.2-CW	<p>In accordance with section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, a risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in Miller Manor WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ for the following circumstances related to the handling and storage of fuel that are significant drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The existing and future below grade storage of more than 250 litres of fuel <p>The risk management plan is to be negotiated between the risk management official and the person engaged in the activity listed above, and at a minimum would require annual inspections by a certified Fuel Oil Burning Appliance Technician, the repair of any deficiencies any best management practices to reduce the risk of a spill or leak, and that any replacement would consist of equipment known to reduce the risk to the groundwater that supplies the Miller Manor Apartments drinking water system.</p> <p>A risk management plan SHALL BE REQUIRED in Miller Manor WHPA ‘A’ for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the existing handling and storage of agricultural source material b) the application of commercial fertilizer c) existing livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas and barnyards <p>and in WHPA ‘B’ for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the existing and future application of agricultural source material

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>b) the existing and future application of commercial fertilizer</p> <p>in the event that these activities are not phased-in and managed under Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General.</p> <p>The risk management plan is to be negotiated between the risk management official and the person engaged in the activity listed above, and be consistent with the requirements of Ontario Regulation 267/03 and/or agriculture best management practices as appropriate.</p> <p>If one or more of these activities is engaged in immediately before the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan SHALL be agreed to within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>If one or more of these activities is to be engaged in after the source protection plan takes effect, the risk management plan shall be agreed to before the activity becomes established.</p>
MM.3-CW	<p>The following lands uses in the Township of Front of Yonge Zoning By-law No. 20-08, as amended are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Miller Manor WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <p>Agricultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The storage of agricultural source material b) Outdoor confinement areas and barnyards c) The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer d) The handling and storage of pesticide e) The handling and storage of fuel <p>Industrial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of pesticide b) The handling and storage of organic solvent c) The handling and storage of fuel <p>Residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of fuel <p>Industrial land uses in the Township of Front of Yonge Zoning By-law No. 20-08, as amended are designated for the purpose of Section 59 – Restricted Land Uses under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> in Lansdowne WHPA ‘A’, WHPA ‘B’, and WHPA ‘C’ where the following activities are or would be significant drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of DNAPLs <p>This means that the Township of Front of Yonge SHALL NOT process an application for any development made under the <i>Planning Act</i> or the Ontario Building Code in the specified areas of the Lansdowne Wellhead Protection Area unless the Risk Management Official issues a notice to the applicant stating that either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed activity for which the land is to be used is neither prohibited under section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> nor is a risk management plan required under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>, or 2. That a risk management plan under section 58 of the <i>Act</i> is required for the proposed activity, and that the plan has been agreed to or established under section 58 of the <i>Act</i>.
Land Use Planning	
BR.4-CW JK.4-CW SD.4-CW CS.4-CW LD.4-CW MM.4-CW	<i>Deleted – the plan will include a statement about the requirement to incorporate land use planning-related policies into municipal planning documents.</i>
BR.5-CW JK.5-CW SD.5-CW	<p>Development that would include the following land uses, which would be associated with activities that are significant drinking water threats if established, shall be prohibited by the City of Brockville and the Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley within their respective jurisdictions for the specified areas of the Brockville Intake Protection Zone:</p> <p>In IPZ 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Waste disposal sites of the following types: the application of hauled sewage to land, mine

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>tailing impoundment structures; municipal, industrial, commercial, or petroleum refining waste landfills; and storage of PCB, hazardous or liquid industrial wastes</p> <p>b) Wastewater treatment facilities, including sewage treatment tanks or sewage storage tanks, and that discharge with or without designed by-passes.</p> <p>c) Agricultural operations that could involve the application and/or storage of agricultural source material or non-agricultural source material, and/or livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas or barnyards</p> <p>d) Snow removal contractor’s yards and public works / maintenance yards where road salt is handled and stored.</p> <p>e) Airports at which aircraft de-icing chemicals are managed.</p> <p>In IPZ 2:</p> <p>a) Waste disposal sites for the application of hauled sewage to land</p> <p>b) Wastewater treatment facilities that discharge with or without designed by-passes</p> <p>c) Agricultural operations that could involve the application and/or storage of agricultural source material or non-agricultural source material, and/or livestock grazing and pasturing, outdoor confinement areas or barnyards</p> <p>✓ The City of Brockville and Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley must conform to this policy as per sections 39(1)(a), 40 and 42 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
CS.5-CW LD.5-CW MM.5-CW	<p>Development that would include the following land uses, which would be associated with activities that are significant drinking water threats if established, shall be prohibited by the City of Kingston for the specified areas of the Cana Wellhead Protection Area:</p> <p>In WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the vulnerability score is 10:</p> <p>a) Waste disposal sites of the following types: the application of hauled sewage to land, mine tailing pits or impoundment structures; municipal, industrial, commercial, or petroleum refining waste landfills; land disposal of liquid industrial waste, and storage of PCB, hazardous or liquid industrial wastes.</p> <p>b) Wastewater treatment facilities, excluding the replacement or upgrade of established facilities;</p> <p>c) Snow removal contractor’s yards and public works / maintenance yards where road salt is handled and stored, and where snow may be stored.</p> <p>d) Airports at which aircraft de-icing chemicals are managed.</p> <p>In WHPA ‘B’ and WHPA ‘C’ where the vulnerability score is 8:</p> <p>a) Waste disposal sites of the following types: municipal, industrial, commercial waste landfills; land disposal of liquid industrial waste.</p>
BR.6-CW JK.6-CW SD.6-CW	<i>Deleted – industrial land uses should be addressed in BR.5-CW (e.g.).</i>
CS.6-CW	<i>All land use planning policies related to prohibition incorporated into CS.5-CW.</i>
MM.6-CW	<i>All land use planning policies related to prohibition incorporated into MM.5-CW.</i>
LD.6-CW	<i>Deleted – industrial land uses should be addressed in LD.5-CW.</i>
CS.7-CW LD.7-CW MM.7-CW	<i>Deleted – municipalities must have regard for the Provincial Policy Statement.</i>
BR.7-M-CW JK.7-M-CW SD.7-M-CW CS.9-HR LD.9-M-CW/SA MM.9-M-CW/SA	<p>The City of Brockville SHALL PROVIDE the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority with a copy of the Notice of Decision under the <i>Planning Act</i> for the following actions when the notices are issued:</p> <p>a) the official plan amendment that implements the above policies, and</p> <p>b) any applications made under the <i>Planning Act</i> for properties in Brockville IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 that relate to the activities listed in the above policies.</p>
BR.8-HR JK.8-HR SD.8-HR	<p>The City of Brockville and the Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley should require a “disclosure report” as one of the requirements for a complete application under the <i>Planning Act</i> for proposals, other than those involving residential development, in that portion of the Brockville Intake Protection Zone within their jurisdiction.</p> <p>A similar requirement should be required for applications made under a change of use by-law, if such a by-law exists in the municipality.</p> <p>The report would require proponents to disclose whether any of the following activities or land uses that can pose moderate threats to drinking water would occur on the property as a result of the application:</p> <p>In IPZ 1:</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>a) The handling and storage of more than 2500 kg of commercial fertilizer b) The handling and storage of more than 2500 L of fuel at or above grade c) The handling and storage of more than 25 L dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) and/or organic solvents</p> <p>In IPZ 2:</p> <p>a) The handling and storage of more than 2500 kg of pesticides b) The handling and storage of more than 2500 kg of commercial fertilizer c) The handling and storage of more than 2500 L of fuel at or above grade d) The handling and storage of more than 250 L dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) and/or organic solvents e) The handling and storage of greater than 5000 tonnes of road salt that would not be protected from exposure to precipitation and runoff</p> <p>Upon receipt of a “disclosure report” with a <i>Planning Act</i> application, if the report indicates one or more of the listed land uses or activities, the City should require the proponent to provide a report detailing the risk management measures or best management practices that would be incorporated into the development to protect the City’s source of drinking water.</p> <p>Examples of risk management measures that can be implemented through site plan control agreements and/or development agreements include, but are not limited to, the appropriate siting of storage facilities, physical spill containment features, and stormwater management facilities.</p> <p>✓ The City of Brockville and Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley must have regard for this policy as per section 39(1)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
<p>CS.10-HR LD.10-HR MM.10-HR</p>	<p>The City of Kingston should require a “disclosure report” as one of the requirements for a complete application under the <i>Planning Act</i> for proposals, other than those involving residential development, in the Cana Wellhead Protection Area.</p> <p>A similar requirement should be required for applications made under a change of use by-law, if such a by-law exists in the municipality.</p> <p>The report would require proponents to disclose whether any of the following activities or land uses that can pose moderate or low threats to drinking water would occur on the property as a result of the application:</p> <p>In WHPA ‘B’ where the vulnerability score is 8 (in Cana only), in WHPA ‘C’ and WHPA ‘D’ where the vulnerability score is a minimum of 6, and in WHPA ‘E’ where it does not overlap with WHPA ‘A’ (in Cana only):</p> <p>a) Mine tailings stored in a pit or an impoundment structure; b) The storage of PCBs; c) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 kilograms of commercial fertilizer d) The handling and storage of more than 250 kilograms of pesticide; e) The handling and storage of more than 5000 tonnes of road salt that would not be protected from exposure to precipitation and runoff; f) Snow storage areas that are more than 0.01 ha in area below grade or more than 1 ha above grade; g) The handling and storage of more than 2,500 litres of fuel below or above grade h) The handling and storage of more than 25 L of organic solvents</p> <p>In WHPA ‘D’ where the vulnerability score is a minimum of 6, and in WHPA ‘E’ where it does not overlap with WHPA ‘A’ (in Cana only):</p> <p>i) The handling and storage of more than 25 L of pure-phase DNAPLs</p> <p>Upon receipt of a “disclosure report” with a <i>Planning Act</i> application, if the report indicates one or more of the listed land uses or activities, the City should require the proponent to provide a report detailing the risk management measures or best management practices that would be incorporated into the development to protect the City’s source of drinking water.</p> <p>Examples of risk management measures that can be implemented through site plan control agreements and/or development agreements include, but are not limited to, the appropriate siting of storage facilities, physical spill containment features, and stormwater management facilities.</p> <p>✓ The City must have regard for this policy as per section 39(1)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
BA.1-HR FF.1-HR CK.1-HR NP.1-HR	<p>Loyalist Township and the Town of Greater Napanee SHOULD REQUIRE a “disclosure report” as one of the requirements for a complete application under the <i>Planning Act</i> for proposals, other than those involving residential development, in the portion of the Bath Intake Protection Zone within their jurisdiction.</p> <p>A similar requirement should be required for applications made under a change of use by-law, if such a by-law exists in the municipality.</p> <p>The report would require proponents to disclose whether any of the following activities or land uses that can pose moderate or low threats to drinking water would occur on the property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The handling and storage of more than 2500 kg of pesticides b) The handling and storage of more than 2500 kg of commercial fertilizer c) The handling and storage of more than 2500 L of fuel at or above grade d) The handling and storage of more than 25 L of dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) and/or organic solvents e) The handling and storage of greater than 5000 tonnes of road salt that would not be protected from exposure to precipitation and runoff f) Snow storage areas (>1 ha) on properties g) Snow storage facilities <p>Upon receipt of a “disclosure report” with a <i>Planning Act</i> application, if the report indicates one or more of the listed land uses or activities, the City should require the proponent to provide a report detailing the risk management measures or best management practices that would be incorporated into the development to protect the City’s source of drinking water.</p> <p>Examples of risk management measures that can be implemented through site plan control agreements and/or development agreements include, but are not limited to, the appropriate siting of storage facilities, physical spill containment features, and stormwater management facilities.</p> <p>✓ Loyalist Township and the Town of Greater Napanee must have regard for this policy as per the Section 39(1)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
BA.2-HR FF.2-HR CK.2-HR NP.2-HR	<i>Combined with BA.1-HR (e.g.) and deleted.</i>
BR.9-HR JK.9-HR SD.9-HR	<i>Deleted – snow storage should be addressed in appropriate situations as a component of BR.8-HR (e.g.).</i>
CS.8-CW/HR LD.8-CW/HR MM.8-CW/HR	<i>Deleted – snow storage should be addressed in appropriate situations as a component of CS.11-HR (e.g.).</i>
CS.11-HR LD.11-HR MM.11-HR	<p>When reviewing applications made under the <i>Planning Act</i>, the City of Kingston SHOULD ENCOURAGE any new fuel outlets (gasoline stations) in the Cana Subdivision WHPA where the activity would be a moderate or low drinking water threat, to have above ground storage tanks, oil grit separators and other measures deemed appropriate to improve runoff and adequately protect the underlying aquifer from petroleum spills and leaks.</p> <p>✓ The City of Kingston must have regard for this policy as per section 39(1)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
BR.10-HR JK.10-HR SD.10-HR	<i>Deleted – stormwater management should be addressed in appropriate situations as a component of BR.8-HR (e.g.).</i>
CS.12-HR LD.12-HR MM.12-HR	<p>Through development approvals under the <i>Planning Act</i>, municipality “X” SHOULD REQUIRE a stormwater management plan for commercial, industrial and multiple residential developments in the wellhead protection area to ensure that swales, ditches and ponds are lined such that runoff is only permitted to infiltrate post quality control.</p> <p>✓ Discharge from a stormwater management facility is a MODERATE or LOW drinking water threat.</p> <p>✓ The City of Kingston must have regard for this policy as per section 39(1)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
BA.3-HR FF.3-HR CK.3-HR	<p><i>Staff propose that the following policy be applied to all of the intake protection zones. It replaces the policy about low impact development.</i></p> <p>Through its review of applications for development and redevelopment under the <i>Planning Act</i>, Loyalist Township SHOULD REQUIRE proponents to incorporate features into building and site plans that reduce the volume of contaminants entering storm sewer systems draining to the Bath IPZ, in accordance with accepted best practice. This requirement SHOULD BE REFLECTED in the</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	municipal official plan, site plan control by-law and development guidance documents.
BR.11-M-SA JK.11-M-SA SD.11-M-SA BA.4-M-SA FF.4-M-SA CK.4-M-SA NP.3-M-SA CS.13-M-CW/SA LD.13-M-SA MM.13-M-CW/SA	<p>The City of Brockville SHOULD PROVIDE the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority with a copy of the Notice of Decision under the <i>Planning Act</i> for the following actions when the notices are issued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the official plan amendment that implements the above policies, and b) any applications made under the <i>Planning Act</i> for properties in Brockville IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 that relate to the activities listed in the above policies.
BR.12-SA JK.12-SA SD.12-SA	<i>Deleted – a disclosure report for DNAPLs and organic solvents is addressed in BR.8-HR.</i>
Sewage system maintenance inspection program	
BR.13-SA JK.13-SA SD.13-SA	<p>The City of Brockville and the Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley, in conjunction with their principal authority for Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code, Leeds, Grenville and Lanark District Health Unit, SHOULD ESTABLISH a discretionary sewage system maintenance inspection program consistent with the Ontario Building Code and the Appendix Note to the Building Code in areas that are considered to be vulnerable based on the assessment report and need, starting with the Brockville Intake Protection Zone (IPZ 1 and IPZ 2). The program should be established by October 6, 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ On-site sewage systems pose a MODERATE or LOW drinking water threat. ✓ This policy can be implemented through the Ontario Building Code (as amended O. Reg. 315/10).
BR.14-SA JK.14-SA SD.14-SA BA.5-SA FF.5-SA CK.5-SA NP.4-SA	<p>If the City of Brockville and the Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley, in conjunction with the Leeds, Grenville and Lanark District Health Unit, decide to establish a discretionary sewage system maintenance inspection program for the Brockville Intake Protection Zone, they SHOULD DEVELOP an education and awareness program that would be established prior to the discretionary sewage system maintenance inspection program.</p> <p>The program should assist landowners to understand the proper operation and maintenance of their on-site sewage systems, and to inform them of the benefits of well maintained systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ On-site sewage systems pose MODERATE or LOW drinking water threats.
BR.16-SA JK.16-SA SD.16-SA	<i>Policy on hauled sewage pump-out schedules incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i>
CS.14-CW LD.14-CW MM.14-CW	<p>The City of Kingston, in conjunction with its principal authority for Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code, KFL&A Public Health, SHALL ESTABLISH a mandatory sewage system maintenance inspection program in Cana WHPA ‘A’ and WHPA ‘B’ where the vulnerability score is 10, consistent with the Ontario Building Code and the Appendix Note to the Building Code. The program must be established by October 6, 2016. Together they should consider extending this program to the balance of the wellhead protection area where the vulnerability score is 6 or higher, and on-site sewage systems are moderate or low drinking water threats.</p>
CS.15-CW LD.15-CW MM.15-CW	<p>The City of Kingston, in conjunction with its principal authority for Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code, KFL&A Public Health, SHALL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT an education and awareness program for the landowners in Cana WHPA ‘A’ and ‘B’ where the vulnerability score is 10 to commence coincident with the sewage system maintenance inspection program. On-site sewage systems are significant drinking water threats in these areas.</p> <p>The program should assist landowners to understand the proper operation and maintenance of their on-site sewage systems, and to inform them of the benefits of well maintained systems.</p> <p>This program SHOULD be extended to the balance of the wellhead protection areas where the vulnerability score is 6 or higher, and on-site sewage systems are moderate or low drinking water threats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy is in accordance with section 38 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
CS.17-M-CW LD.17-M-CW MM.17-M-CW/SA	<p>The City of Kingston, in conjunction with its principal authority under Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code, KFL&A Public Health, SHALL PROVIDE the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority with the following information related to the implementation of the above policies (CS.14-CW and CS.15-CW):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A summary of the results from the mandatory sewage system maintenance inspection program, including a copy of any orders or recommendations identifying any corrective actions that must or should be implemented to ensure proper system function as well as copies of the educational materials used. 2) Notice of whether or not a discretionary sewage system maintenance inspection program will

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>be established, including the applicable areas and a rationale for the decision.</p> <p>✓ The municipality must comply with this policy as per section 45 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
Other Policies	
BR.17-CW JK.17-CW SD.17-CW CS.24-CW LD.18-CW MM.18-CW BA.6-SA FF.6-SA CK.6-SA NP.5-SA	<p>The City of Brockville, Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley, and the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville SHALL update their Emergency Management Plan and/or department supplementary plans, as appropriate, identify the location of the Intake Protection Zone / Wellhead Protection Area, and to update the procedures in order to manage the risk to the City's drinking water source in the event of an emergency or spill. The update must occur within one year of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>✓ Depending on the source of discharge or spills, the activity would be a SIGNIFICANT, MODERATE or LOW drinking water threat.</p> <p>✓ This policy is in accordance with section 26(6) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended.</p>
BR.18-SA JK.18-SA BA.8-SA CK.9-SA	<p><i>Policy about marina and boat ramp signage incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i></p>
BR.20-SA	<p>The municipalities in which intake protection zones are located SHOULD DEVELOP strategies to address local water quality issues that have been linked to untreated stormwater runoff or inadequate treatment in IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 within their respective jurisdictions, within two years of the source protection plan taking effect. The strategies should be implemented as funding is available.</p> <p>Such a strategy could include matters such as mapping existing storm sewers, catchbasins and outfalls, and monitoring water quality, so that treatment can be incorporate at the right location(s); and ensuring that road reconstruction projects include appropriate storm runoff controls.</p> <p>✓ Discharge from stormwater management facilities is a MODERATE or LOW drinking water threat.</p>
JK.20-SA	<p><i>See BR.20-SA.</i></p>
BR.21-SA JK.21-SA SD.19-SA	<p><i>As discussed, this policy will be deleted for the Brockville and James W. King Intake Protection Zones.</i></p> <p>The Township of South Frontenac SHOULD ESTABLISH fertilizer-free buffer zones between the sports fields in IPZ 1 and Sydenham Lake within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>✓ Fertilizer runoff or release is a MODERATE drinking water threat.</p>
CS.25-SA LD.19-CW MM.19-CW	<p><i>As discussed, the policy about establishing fertilizer-free buffer zones will be deleted for the Wellhead Protection Areas.</i></p>
BR.22-SA JK.22-SA SD.20-SA	<p><i>Deleted - The intent of the policy on reducing road salt was incorporated into Area-wide.2-SA.</i></p>
CS.26-SA LD.26-SA MM.21-SA	<p><i>Deleted - The intent of the policy on reducing road salt was incorporated into Area-wide.2-SA.</i></p>
BR.23-SA JK.23-SA SD.21-SA	<p><i>Policy about marina and boat ramp signage was incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i></p>
BA.9-SA CK.10-SA	<p><i>Policy about marina and boat ramp signage was incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i></p>
NP.7-SA	<p><i>Policy about marina and boat ramp signage was incorporated into Area-wide.13-SA.</i></p>
BR.24-M-CW JK.24-M-CW SD.24-M-CW BA.12-M-SA FF.9-M-SA CK.12-M-SA NP.8-M-SA CS.27-M-CW/SA LD.27-M-CW/SA MM.22-M-CW/SA	<p><i>Reporting requirements will be incorporated into the subject policies in the plan.</i></p>
BA.10-SA FF.8-SA CK.8-SA	<p>Loyalist Township SHOULD WORK WITH landowners of existing businesses that involve the handling and storage of fuel, DNAPLs and/or organic solvents in the Bath IPZ to ensure that they have proper disposal practices, stormwater runoff control, and spill prevention and contingency plans are in place to protect source water.</p> <p>✓ The handling and storage of fuel, DNAPLs, and organic solvents would be LOW drinking water</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>threats.</p> <p>✓ This policy is in accordance with section 26(1) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended.</p>
BA.11-SA	<p>Loyalist Township SHOULD WORK WITH landowners and tenants of properties along Bath Creek to reduce incidents and volumes of sedimentation in the creek through the implementation of appropriate best management practices, since this is an issue for the Bath water treatment plant. Sediment can carry contaminants associated with activities that are drinking water threats, such as the application, handling and storage of agricultural source material, non-agricultural source material, commercial fertilizer and pesticides, and the outdoor confinement of livestock.</p> <p>✓ This policy is in accordance with section 26(1) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended.</p>
BA.13-SA FF.10-SA CK.13-SA NP.9-SA	<p>The creation of new transport pathways and the modification of existing transport pathways may change (the vulnerability score of a wellhead protection area, or) the delineation and vulnerability score of an intake protection zone. Additional landowners and business owners may become subject to source protection policies (significant threat policies?) as a result of this change.</p> <p>Transport pathways to surface water intakes include new and modified storm sewers, roadside ditches, sanitary sewers, and tile drainage. Transport pathways to wellhead include wells (poorly constructed and improperly abandoned), ditches, and service trenches.</p> <p>Municipalities SHALL notify the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority and the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee of any proposals to engage in an activity in an intake protection zone, on the periphery of an intake protection zone, or in a wellhead protection area where significant drinking water threats can or do exist, that may result in the creation of a new transport pathway or the modification of an existing transport pathway, as per Section 27(3) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended. This notice shall include a description of the proposal, the identity of the person responsible for the proposal and a description of the approvals the person requires to engage in the proposed activity.</p> <p>Municipalities with intake protection zones on Lake Ontario SHALL notify the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority and the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee by February 15 of each year of any activities that were established or took place in the intake protection zone or on its periphery during the previous year, and that may have resulted in the creation of a new transport pathway or the modification of an existing transport pathway.</p> <p>The Authority would then conduct an assessment to determine the potential impact of the proposal on the vulnerability score of a wellhead protection area (or the delineation and vulnerability score of an intake protection zone), and may make recommendations to the municipality, or propose an amendment to the source protection plan that relates to the implementation of the proposal, as per Section 48(2) of the Regulation.</p>
Incentive Programs	
CS.16-CW LD.16-CW MM.16-CW	<p>The Cataraqui Source Protection Authority, municipalities and the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, in cooperation with local stakeholder groups SHOULD advocate for the extension and expansion of the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program and/or consider ESTABLISHING an incentive program that includes funding to off-set the cost of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Making improvements to fuel storages replacing underground storage tanks with above ground storage tanks for heating oil and private fuel outlets, and to construct/add secondary containment for vulnerable groundwater areas; b) replacements and repairs suggested as a result of the on-site sewage system maintenance inspection or other priorities as defined by the implementation bodies; and c) properly decommissioning unused wells and upgrading wells with sub-standard construction for vulnerable groundwater areas. <p>An outline of any developed incentive program should be prepare by or submitted to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <p>✓ This policy should be implemented within two years of the source protection plan effective date.</p> <p>✓ This policy applies to these SIGNIFICANT, MODERATE and LOW existing drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The storage and handling of fuel; and ○ On-site sewage systems <p>✓ This policy also applies to existing un-used or improperly constructed wells which are TRANSPORT PATHWAYS.</p> <p>✓ Section 26(4) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to contain policies about incentive programs.</p>
BR.15-SA	<i>Incentive program for septic systems incorporated into CS.16-CW (now an area-wide strategic action</i>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
JK.15-SA SD.15-SA	<i>policy).</i>
BR.19-SA JK.19-SA SD.18-SA BA.7-SA FF.7-SA CK.7-SA NP.6-SA	<i>Incentive program for the handling and storage of fuel incorporated into CS.16-CW (now an area-wide strategic action policy).</i>
CS.28-CW LD.28-CW MM.23-CW	<i>Incentive program for the handling and storage of fuel incorporated into CS.16-CW (now an area-wide strategic action policy).</i>
CS.29-SA LD.29-SA MM.24-SA	<i>Incentive program for the private wells incorporated into CS.16-CW (now an area-wide strategic action policy).</i>
CS.30-M-SA LD.30-M-CW/SA MM.25-M-SA	<i>Deleted – a reporting requirement for the proposed incentive program was added to CS.16-CW.</i>
Vulnerable Area Specific Policies for Municipalities: Sydenham	
SD.22-SA	<p>The Township of South Frontenac and the Sydenham Lake Association should develop a terms of reference to undertake a lakeshore capacity assessment for Sydenham Lake using the Ministry of the Environment Lakeshore Capacity Model within two years of the source protection plan taking effect. The Township should implement any assessment that is completed with through appropriate land use planning and the promotion of best management practices.</p> <p>✓ On-site sewage systems pose MODERATE or LOW drinking water threats.</p>
SD.23-SA	<p>The Ontario Ministry of the Environment SHOULD amend licenses under the Section 44 of the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act</i> for municipal residential drinking water systems within the Cataraqui Source Protection Area to increase the frequency and parameter list for raw water quality sampling to at least include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) each season for the surface water intakes; b) low water and high groundwater conditions for the supply wells; and c) parameters associated with established drinking water threats within in the intake protection zones and wellhead protection areas. <p>✓ The Ontario Ministry of the Environment must have regard for this policy as per section 39(7)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
Vulnerable Area Specific Policies for Municipalities: Kingston	
CK.11-SA	<p>The City of Kingston is ENCOURAGED to implement the program and policy recommendations of the <u>Pollution Control Plan Update for the City of Kingston</u> (July 2010) and the <u>Sewage Infrastructure Master Plan for the City of Kingston Urban Area</u> (September 2010), and particularly to continue work to separate the downtown combined sewers, as these actions would help protect the quality of Kingston Central’s source water.</p> <p>✓ Discharge from combined sewers is a MODERATE drinking water threat in IPZ 1 and a LOW drinking water threat in IPZ 2.</p> <p>✓ This policy is in accordance with section 26(1) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended.</p>
Vulnerable Area Specific Policies for Municipalities: Cana	
CS.18-CW	<p>The City of Kingston, in cooperation with Utilities Kingston, SHALL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT an education and outreach program to work with landowners in Cana WHPA ‘A’ that are connected to the Cana sanitary sewer network to identify any cracks or misalignments of the sewer laterals, within two years of the source protection plan taking effect. The City and Utilities Kingston should consider extending this program to the balance of the area that is connected to this sewer network.</p> <p>A copy of any educational materials distributed should identify the wellhead protection area and indicate that in order to ensure protection of the groundwater and to optimize function and effluent quality at the sewage treatment plant, it is necessary to repair any identified deficiencies.</p> <p>A copy of any developed materials as well as a summary of inspections and any resultant repairs should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p>
CS.19-CW	<i>Deleted – the manhole identified in the policy is scheduled to be modified in the near future.</i>
CS.20-CW	<p>The City of Kingston, in cooperation with Utilities Kingston SHALL implement the Cana Wastewater Treatment Plant Annual Cleaning and Inspection Standard Operating Procedure (WWT4-S-01), as amended from time to time, in relation to the sewage tank located in wellhead protection area ‘A’ of the Cana Wellhead Protection Area and ensure that if a problem with the tank is identified that prioritization of corrective action takes into consideration the risk posed by the tank’s proximity to the Cana Supply Well.</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This is a SIGNIFICANT drinking water threat. ✓ The City of Kingston must comply with this policy as per sections 38 and 39(6) of the Clean Water Act. <p>A copy of the record of inspection and any resultant repairs should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p>
CS.21-CW	<p>The Ontario Ministry of the Environment SHALL consider source water protection when reviewing application(s) made under Section 53 of the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> for sewage works related to the upgrade or replacement of the Cana Sewage Treatment Plant located in Cana Wellhead Protection Area 'A'.</p> <p>A copy of the certificate of approval SHALL be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Sewage works associated with sanitary sewer and related pipes, sewage treatment plant effluent discharge and sewage storage are SIGNIFICANT drinking water threats in Cana Wellhead Protection Area 'A' and 'B' where the vulnerability score is 10. ✓ The Ministry of the Environment must conform to this policy as per section 39(7)(a) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
CS.22-SA	<p>The City of Kingston in cooperation with Utilities Kingston SHOULD REVISE the Standard Operating Procedure for routine checks so that the drainage swale located approximately 20 metres south of the Cana Well Supply is checked for any blockages. If any blockages are observed, Utilities Kingston SHOULD ADVISE City of Kingston Public Works and REQUEST that the positive drainage be restored as soon as practical so that localized ponding does not occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The drainage swale is a transport pathway. ✓ This policy is in accordance with sections 27(1) and 27(2) of Ontario Regulation 287/07 made pursuant to the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
CS.23-M-CW/SA	<i>Deleted – the reporting requirements were incorporated into the above policies.</i>
Vulnerable Area Specific Policies for Municipalities: Lansdowne	
LD.20-CW	<p>The Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands SHALL PREPARE Standard Operating Procedures that outlines sewer network evaluation and repair requirements such that the entire sewer network in at least WHPA 'A' and WHPA 'B' is evaluated and repaired as necessary at least every five years in order to prevent sewage losses to the source water since the sewers are a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>A copy of the Standard Operating Procedure and sewer network evaluations SHALL be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands must comply with this policy as per Sections 38 and 39(6) of the Clean Water Act.
LD.21-CW	<p>The Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands SHALL MAINTAIN the By-law 06-056 agreement regarding the timely removal of agricultural source material from the path leading from the horse barns to the race track and the track itself and SHALL PERFORM monthly compliance inspections.</p> <p>A record of the monthly compliance inspections SHALL be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ These activities are SIGNIFICANT drinking water threats. ✓ The Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands must comply with this policy as per section 38 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
LD.22.SA	<p>The Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands SHOULD develop a monitoring plan for the Lansdowne Sewage Lagoons at King Street East located in wellhead protection areas 'C' and 'D' of the Lansdowne Wellhead Protection Area to identify any sewage losses to the sub-surface and take corrective action to remedy any identified concerns.</p> <p>A copy of the monitoring plan SHALL be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This is a MODERATE drinking water threat.
LD.23-SA	<p>The Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands SHOULD PREPARE and IMPLEMENT a master drainage plan to evaluate drainage in the Lansdowne Wellhead Protection Area, especially the existing drainage ditch east and north of supply Well #2 and runoff from the recreational fields to the west. The drainage plan will consider an alternate route for the drainage ditch and will address the historical water ponding observed in the vicinity of the supply wells within one year of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>A copy of the plan SHOULD be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The drainage ditch is a transport pathway located in WHPA 'A'. ✓ This policy is in accordance with sections 27(1) and 27(2) of Ontario Regulation 287/07 made pursuant to the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
LD.24-SA	<p>The Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands SHOULD DEVELOP and IMPLEMENT a water quality monitoring program to track runoff from the municipal buildings and parking lot(s) located in WHPA 'B' to determine if additional measures are required to limit migration of road salt from the salt storage building and parking lots.</p> <p>A copy of the monitoring plan and the water quality results SHOULD be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The existing salt storage is a LOW drinking water threat.
LD.25-SA	<i>Deleted because it was confirmed that there are no municipal pesticide storages within the WHPA.</i>
Vulnerable Area Specific Policies for Municipalities: Miller Manor	
MM.20-SA	<p>The United Counties of Leeds and Grenville SHOULD ENSURE that the ditch along County Road 2 south of the Miller Manor Apartments supply well is properly conveying water and perform any necessary improvements to prevent water from pooling in this location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The ditch is a transport pathway. ✓ This policy is in accordance with sections 27(1) and 27(2) of Ontario Regulation 287/07 made pursuant to the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
Environmental Protection Act	
BR.25-CW JK.25-CW SD.25-CW	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHALL NOT APPROVE applications under Section 39 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> for the establishment of new waste disposal sites (as defined by Part V of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i>) for the following significant drinking water threats, except where an exemption applies.</p> <p>In Brockville, James W. King and Sydenham IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 where the vulnerability score is 8.1 or greater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The application of non-agricultural source material to land; and b) The application of hauled sewage to land. <p>In Brockville, James W. King and Sydenham IPZ 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Land farming of petroleum refining waste (more than ten hectares); b) Land filling of hazardous waste (more than ten hectares); c) Landfilling of municipal waste (more than ten hectares); d) Land disposal of commercial or industrial waste (more than ten hectares); and e) Storage of hazardous or liquid industrial wastes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The Ministry of the Environment must conform to this policy as per section 39(7)(a) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
CS.31-CW LD.31-CW MM.26-CW	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHALL NOT APPROVE applications under Section 39 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> for the establishment of new waste disposal sites (as defined by Part V of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i>) for the following significant drinking water threats, except where an exemption applies.</p> <p>In Cana, Lansdowne and Miller Manor WHPA 'A' and 'B' where the vulnerability score is ten:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The application of non-agricultural source material to land; b) Application of hauled sewage to land; c) Land farming of petroleum refining waste (more than ten hectares); d) Land filling of hazardous waste (less than one hectare); e) Landfilling of municipal waste (less than one hectare); f) Land disposal of commercial or industrial waste (less than one hectare); g) Land disposal of liquid industrial waste where the combined rate of discharge of all wells located at the site is more than 380 cubic meters per year; and h) Storage of hazardous or liquid industrial wastes; i) A site that is not approved to accept hazardous waste or liquid industrial waste but accepts it. <p>AND in Cana, Lansdowne and Miller Manor WHPA 'B' and C where the vulnerability score is eight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Land filling of municipal waste (more than ten hectares); b) Land disposal of commercial or industrial waste (more than ten hectares); and c) Land disposal of liquid industrial waste where the combined rate of discharge of all wells located at the site is more than 38,000,000 cubic metres per year)

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>✓ The Ontario Ministry of the Environment must comply with this policy as per section 39(7)(a) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
<p>BR.26-HR JK.26-HR SD.26-HR</p>	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHOULD REVIEW options about how to more directly identify source protection information for application of specific types of approvals and INCORPORATE this information into decision making about applications made under Section 39 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> for the establishment of new waste disposal sites that would be moderate or low drinking water threats.</p> <p>This policy applies to the following types of waste disposal sites where they would be a moderate or low drinking water threat as identified in the Assessment Report, except where exempt under the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i>:</p> <p>For the Brockville and James W. King Intake Protection Zones 1 and 2 and Sydenham Intake Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3a this policy applies to the following types of waste disposal sites, except where exempt under the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> municipal, industrial, commercial, or petroleum refining waste landfills; landfills or injection into wells for hazardous or liquid industrial waste; and hazardous or liquid industrial wastes. <p>For the Sandhurst Shores, A.L. Dafoe, Bath, Fairfield, Point Pleasant and Kingston Central Intake Protection Zones 1 and 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the application of hauled sewage to land; the application of non-agricultural source material to land; land farming of petroleum refining waste; municipal, industrial, commercial, or petroleum refining waste landfills; and storage hazardous or liquid industrial wastes. <p>For the Cana, Lansdowne and Miller Manor Wellhead Protection Areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the application of hauled sewage to land; the application of non-agricultural source material; land farming of petroleum refining waste; municipal, industrial, commercial, or petroleum refining waste landfills; Landfills or injection into wells for hazardous or liquid industrial waste; storage hazardous or liquid industrial wastes; and sites that are not approved to accept hazardous waste or liquid industrial waste but do.
<p>CS.32-HR LD.32-HR MM.27-HR</p>	<p><i>Developed one Environmental Protection Act prescribed instrument policy for all IPZs and one policy for all WHPAs. See BR.26-HR.</i></p>
<p>BA.14-HR NP.10-HR</p>	<p><i>Developed one Environmental Protection Act prescribed instrument policy for all IPZs and one policy for all WHPAs. See BR.26-HR.</i></p>
<p>FF.11-HR CK.14-HR</p>	<p><i>Developed one Environmental Protection Act prescribed instrument policy for all IPZs and one policy for all WHPAs. See BR.26-HR.</i></p>
<p>CK.15-HR</p>	<p><i>Deleted – the transportation of septage should be addressed through CK.20-SA.</i></p>
<p>BR.27-SA JK. 27-SA SD.27-SA</p>	<p>The MOE SHOULD REQUIRE businesses that haul septage on the St. Lawrence River in IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 to prepare or update spill contingency plans as part of their licenses/certificates of approval under section 39 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> to ensure that source water is protected. This strategic action should take place within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>✓ This policy is in accordance with section 26(6) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended.</p>
<p>BR.28-M-CW/SA JK.28-M-CW/SA SD.28-M-CW/SA CS.33-M-CW/SA LD.33-M-CW/SA MM.28-M-CW/SA BA.15-M-SA FF.12-M-SA CK.16-M-SA NP.11-M-SA</p>	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHALL PROVIDE the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority with a copy of the Notice of Decision for any application made under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 39 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> Section 53 of the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> <p>Relating to policy #s.</p> <p>✓ The MOE must comply with this policy as per section 45 of the Clean Water Act.</p>
<p>Ontario Water Resources Act</p>	
<p>BR.29-CW JK.29-CW SD.29-CW</p>	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHALL NOT APPROVE applications under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act for the establishment of new sewage works that collects, stores, treats or disposes of sewage in Brockville, James W. King and Sydenham IPZ 1 and IPZ 2 for the following:</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>a) Combined sewers; b) Wastewater treatment facilities; and c) Industrial sewage treatment facilities and outfalls.</p> <p>✓ Discharge from these facilities would be SIGNIFICANT drinking water threats. ✓ The Ministry of the Environment must conform to this policy as per section 39(7)(a) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
CS.34-CW LD.34-CW MM.29-CW	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHALL NOT APPROVE applications under Section 53 of the <i>Ontario Water Resource Act</i> for the establishment of a new sewage works that collects, stores, treats or disposes of sewage for the following significant drinking water threats in Cana, Lansdowne and Miller Manor WHPA 'A' and WHPA 'B' where the vulnerability score is ten unless the approval relates to improvement or replacement of an existing facility and further that all sewer pipes are designed with leak protection measures:</p> <p>a) wastewater treatment facility and/or outfall; or b) an on-site sewage treatment system.</p> <p>✓ The Ontario Ministry of the Environment must comply with this policy as per section 39(7)(a) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
BR.30-HR JK.30-HR SD.30-HR	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHOULD REVIEW options about how to more directly identify source protection information for application of specific types of approvals and INCORPORATE this information into decision making about applications made under Section 53 of the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> for the establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.</p> <p>This policy applies to the following types of sewage works where they would be a moderate or low drinking water threat as identified in the Assessment Report:</p> <p>For the Cana, Lansdowne and Miller Manor Wellhead Protection Areas, unless the approval relates to improvement or replacement of an existing facility and further that all sewer pipes are designed with leak protection measures:</p> <p>a) wastewater treatment facility and/or outfall; or b) an on-site sewage treatment system</p> <p>For the Brockville, James W. King and Sydenham Intake Protection Zones:</p> <p>a) Industrial sewage treatment facilities and outfalls; b) Stormwater management facilities; c) Sewage works associated with new land-based fish farms;</p> <p>For the Sandhurst Shores, A.L. Dafoe, Bath, Fairfield, Point Pleasant and Kingston Central Intake Protection Zones:</p> <p>a) Wastewater treatment facilities; b) Industrial sewage treatment facilities and outfalls; c) Stormwater management facilities; d) Combined sewers; and e) Sewage works associated with new land-based fish farms.</p> <p>✓ The Ontario Ministry of the Environment must have regard for this policy as per section 39(7)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
CS.35-HR LD.35-HR MM.30-HR	<p><i>Developed one Ontario Water Resources Act prescribed instrument policy for all IPZs and one policy for all WHPAs. See BR.30-HR.</i></p>
BA.16-HR FF.13-HR NP.12-HR CK.17-HR	<p><i>Developed one Ontario Water Resources Act prescribed instrument policy for all IPZs and one policy for all WHPAs. See BR.30-HR.</i></p>
BR.31-M-CW/SA JK.31-M-CW/SA SD.31-M-CW/SA BA.17-M-SA FF.14-M-SA CK.18-M-SA NP.13-M-SA CS.36-M-CW/SA LD.36-M-CW/SA MM.31-M-CW/SA	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHALL PROVIDE the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority with a copy of the Notice of Decision for any application made under:</p> <p>a) Section 39 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> b) Section 53 of the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i></p> <p>Relating to policy #s.</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
<i>Safe Drinking Water Act</i>	
BA.18-HR FF.15-HR CK.19-HR NP.14-HR	<p>Loyalist Township IS ENCOURAGED to use the Bath Intake Protection Zone data and mapping to update Elements 7 and 8 (Risk Assessment and Risk Assessment Outcomes) of its Drinking Water Quality Management System Operational Plan for the Bath water treatment plant. The update should occur within one year of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <p>✓ A spill or discharge could be associated with all of the prescribed water quality drinking water threats, and would pose a MODERATE or LOW risk to the source water.</p>
<i>Nutrient Management Act and Ontario Regulation 267/03</i>	
BR.32-CW JK.32-CW SD.32-CW	<p>The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs SHALL NOT APPROVE non-agricultural source material (NASM) Plans for the future application, handling and storage of NASM under Sections 15.2 and 28 of Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General for sites in Brockville, James W. King and Sydenham IPZ 1 and IPZ 2.</p> <p>✓ These activities would be SIGNIFICANT drinking water threats. ✓ OMAFRA must conform to this policy as per section 39(7)(a) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
CS.37-CW LD.37-CW MM.32-CW	<p>The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs SHALL NOT APPROVE non-agricultural source material (NASM) plans for the application, handling and storage of NASM under Sections 15.2 and 28 of Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General for sites in Cana Subdivision WHPA ‘A’ and ‘B’ where the vulnerability score is ten.</p> <p>✓ These activities would be SIGNIFICANT drinking water threats. ✓ The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food must comply with this policy as per section 39(7)(a) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
BR.33-HR JK.33-HR SD.33-HR	<i>Deleted – policies can only be applied within the intake protection zone.</i>
CS.38-HR LD.38-HR MM.33-HR	<p>The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs SHOULD CONSIDER the potential impact of proposed NASM plans on properties in the following areas on drinking water sources through their review under Sections 15.2 and 28 of Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General, where the application, handling and storage of NASM would be moderate or low drinking water threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cana Subdivision WHPA where the activity would be a moderate or low drinking water threat; and • For properties immediately adjacent to the Cana Subdivision WHPA. <p>✓ These activities are MODERATE AND LOW drinking water threats. ✓ The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs must have regard for this policy as per section 39(7)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
BA.20-HR FF.17-HR NP.16-HR	<p>The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, through its review of proposed new and/or revised NASM plans under Sections 15.2 and 28 of Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General, for properties in and immediately adjacent to the Bath IPZ</p> <p>a) SHOULD CONFIRM that risk management measures and/or best management practices are in place to manage the risk to these sources of drinking water from the application and/or handling and storage of non-agricultural source material; and</p> <p>b) As part of any approval, OMAFRA SHOULD INCLUDE conditions related to these measures.</p> <p>✓ The application, handling and storage of non-agricultural source material are MODERATE drinking water threats. OMAFRA must have regard for this policy as per the Section 39(7)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
BR.34-M-CW/SA JK.34-M-CW/SA SD.34-M-CW/SA BA.21-M-SA FF.18-M-SA NP.17-M-SA CS.39-M-CW/SA LD.39-M-CW/SA MM.34-M-CW/SA	<p>The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs SHALL PROVIDE the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority with a copy of the Notice of Decision for any application made under sections 10, 14, 15.2, and 28 of Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General, relating to policies #.</p>
BA.19-HR FF.16-HR NP.15-HR	<p>The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, through its review of proposed new and/or revised nutrient management strategies and/or plans under Sections 10, 14 and 28 of Ontario Regulation 267/03 – General, for properties in and immediately adjacent to the Bath IPZ</p> <p>a) SHOULD CONFIRM that risk management measures and/or best management practices are in place to manage the risk to these sources of drinking water from the application and/or storage</p>

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>of agricultural source material; and</p> <p>b) As part of any approval, OMAFRA SHOULD INCLUDE conditions related to these measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The application and storage of agricultural source material are MODERATE drinking water threats. ✓ OMAFRA must have regard for this policy as per the Section 39(7)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
Various legislation not prescribed under <i>Clean Water Act</i>	
BR.35-SA JK.35-SA SD.35-SA	<p>When making decisions on applications under Ontario Regulation 664/98 (Fish Licensing) of the <i>Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act</i> for the establishment of new caged aquaculture operations in Brockville IPZ 1, the Ministry of Natural Resources SHOULD ENSURE that appropriate risk management measures are included in the facility design to manage the risk of this activity to Brockville's source of drinking water.</p>
BA.22-SA FF.19-SA CK.21-SA NP.18-SA	<p>The Ministry of the Environment SHOULD ENCOURAGE industry that is located in and adjacent to the Bath IPZ to identify the IPZ in all applicable operational plans, spill prevention and contingency plans and pollution prevention plans; and to include practices and actions in those plans to address potential effects on the IPZ.</p> <p>This strategic action should occur within two years of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Industrial land uses that have independent sewage works that discharge to surface water and/or store large quantities of fuel, DNAPLs, organic solvents, fertilizer or pesticides would be MODERATE or LOW drinking water threats. Spills associated with the transportation of fuel, DNAPLs, organic solvents and pesticides would be MODERATE or LOW drinking water threats. ✓ This policy is in accordance with section 26(1) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended.
CK.20-SA	<p>The Ministry of Transportation SHOULD update its spill contingency plan and emergency response plan for the Wolfe Island Ferry to incorporate the Point Pleasant and Kingston Central IPZs data and mapping to ensure that drinking water sources will be protected in the event of a spill. This strategic action should occur within one year of the source protection plan taking effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ A spill could be associated with all of the water quality drinking water threats, and would pose a LOW risk to the source water. ✓ This policy is in accordance with section 26(6) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended.
Cataraqui Source Protection Authority	
BR.36-CW	<p><i>Deleted – the provision of information to the New York Department of Environmental Conservation will be part of the plan implementation, and is addressed in another part of the plan.</i></p>
BA.23-SA FF.20-SA NP.19-SA	<p>The Cataraqui Source Protection Authority SHOULD REQUIRE that the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority SHOULD notify the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority and the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee of any proposals under Ontario Regulation 148/06 for new drainage works in an intake protection zone, on the periphery of an intake protection zone, or in a wellhead protection area where significant drinking water threats can or do exist since this activity would create a transport pathway, as per Section 27(3) of Ontario Regulation 287/07, as amended. This notice shall include a description of the proposal, the identity of the person responsible for the proposal and a description of the approvals the person requires to engage in the proposed activity.</p> <p>Similarly, the CRCA SHOULD notify the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority and the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee by February 15 of each year of any activities that were established or took place in the Lake Ontario intake protection zones or on their peripheries during the previous year, and that may have resulted in the creation of a new transport pathway or the modification of an existing transport pathway.</p> <p>The Cataraqui Source Protection Authority would then conduct an assessment to determine the potential impact of the proposal on the delineation and or the vulnerability score of the intake protection zone, and may make recommendations to the municipality, or propose an amendment to the source protection plan that relates to the implementation of the proposal, as per Section 48(2) of the Regulation.</p>
New Policies for WHPAs (from October 2011)	
	<p>The Ontario Ministry of the Environment SHOULD AMEND Ontario Regulation 903 (Wells) to require well decommissioning when a replacement well is installed in a wellhead protection area, to prevent the creation of transport pathways from improperly abandoned or maintained wells. This would apply unless a specific exemption has been granted whereby the existing well is in good condition and will continue to be used or maintained for future use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Improperly abandoned and/or maintained wells are transport pathways. ✓ This policy is a strategic action since no part of Ontario Regulation 903 is considered a prescribed instrument under the Clean Water Act. ✓ Section 27(1) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> allows the source protection plan to contain polices about transport pathways in wellhead protection areas.

Policy Reference Number(s)	Proposed Policy Revision
	<p>Municipalities SHALL CONSIDER developing a land purchase strategy, as appropriate, to secure lands in wellhead protection area 'A' so that municipalities have direct control over the land in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. eliminate prevent the occurrence of all prescribed drinking water threats, especially those rated as significant, and b. prevent the establishment of transport pathways. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy shall be implemented immediately following the source protection plan effective date. ✓ This policy applies to all prescribed drinking water threats as well as transport pathways. ✓ Section 26(1)(v) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to set out policies that specify actions to be taken to implement the source protection plan or to achieve the plan's objectives. ✓ Section 27(1) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> allows the source protection plan to contain polices about transport pathways in wellhead protection areas.

Policies for Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas

Policy Reference Number	Proposed Policy Revisions
<i>Planning Act and Condominium Act (land use planning and development)</i>	
HV.SR.1-HR	<p>Municipalities SHOULD REQUIRE a “disclosure report” as one of the requirements for a complete application under the <i>Planning Act</i> for proposals, other than those involving residential development, in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas within their jurisdiction.</p> <p>A similar requirement should be required for applications made under a change of use by-law, if such a by-law exists in the municipality.</p> <p>The report would require proponents to disclose whether any of the following activities or land uses that can pose a moderate or low drinking water threat to the highly vulnerable aquifers or significant groundwater recharge areas would occur on the property:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Mine tailings stored in a pit or an impoundment structure; b) The storage of PCBs; c) the handling and storage of more than 2,500 kilograms of commercial fertilizer d) the handling and storage of more than 250 kilograms of pesticide, e) the handling and storage of more than 2,500 litres of fuel, f) the handling and storage of more than 5,000 tonnes of road salt that would not be protected from exposure to precipitation and runoff,; g) Snow storage areas that are more than 0.01 ha in area below grade or more than 1 ha above grade; h) the handling and storage of more than 25 litres of pure-phase dense non-aqueous-phase liquids (DNAPLs) i) the handling and storage of more than 25 litres of pure-phase organic solvents. <p>Upon receipt of a “disclosure report” with a <i>Planning Act</i> application, if the report indicates one or more of the listed land uses or activities, the municipality should require the proponent to provide a report detailing the risk management measures or best management practices that would be incorporated into the development to protect the highly vulnerable aquifer and/or significant groundwater area.</p> <p>Examples of risk management measures that can be implemented through site plan control agreements and/or development agreements include, but are not limited to, the appropriate siting of storage facilities, physical spill containment features, and stormwater management facilities.</p> <p>This requirement could be waived if the proponent can demonstrate through a site specific investigation that a property is not located in a highly vulnerable aquifer and/or significant groundwater recharge area.</p> <p>A copy of the notice of decision made under the <i>Planning Act</i> should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy should be the next review of the official plan or within five years of the source protection plan effective date, whichever comes first. ✓ The municipalities must have regard for this policy as per section 39(1)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.

Policy Reference Number	Proposed Policy Revisions
HV.SR.2-SA	<i>Deleted - Based on further review it appears that policy HV.SR.-1-HR and HV.SR.3-SA in combination with education and outreach (policy area-wide.13-SA) would adequately address the intent of this policy and it could be removed.</i>
HV.SR.3-SA	<p>Municipalities SHOULD PROMOTE best management practices for drinking water well construction, including providing the following information on application forms for development in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Drinking water wells are to be located the furthest practical distance from the road or be at least: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. greater than 15 metres from roads for wells with casings that are at least six metres into the ground and b. 30 m for any other well to protect against road salt contamination. 2) Drinking water wells are to be located the furthest practical distance from the underground fuel storage tanks or at least: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 15 metres from drilled wells; and b. 30 metres from dug wells to protect against fuel contamination. 3) Chipped or blasted wells are discouraged. 4) Consideration should be given to increasing the minimum separation distances between wells and on-site sewage systems. <p>A copy of revised development application forms should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy should be implemented within two years of the source protection plan effective date. ✓ This policy applies to the existing and future application of road salt, existing underground fuel storage tanks and future on-site sewage systems which are LOW drinking water threats as well as future improperly constructed well which are TRANSPORT PATHWAYS. ✓ Section 26(1)(ii) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to specify and promote best management practices.
SR.4-SA	<p>The Cataraqui Source Protection Authority, in cooperation with municipalities, SHOULD SPECIFICALLY DELINEATE the location and extent of areas that provide drinking water to hamlets and villages that are not currently serviced by municipal water supplies.</p> <p>AND FURTHER that these delineated areas be DESIGNATED AND ZONED by the municipality in planning documents to protect them from development associated with prescribed drinking water threats that could be a risk to the potential future water supply as per policy HV.SR.1-HR by mitigating potential risks through implementation of best management practices and or measures included in the Ontario Ministry of the Environment Risk Management Measures Catalogue.</p> <p>Notice of official plan revisions should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority when completed.</p> <p>This policy should be implemented within ten years of the source protection plan effective date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy relates to the following drinking water threats: waste disposal sites, wastewater treatment facilities, the handling and storage of pesticides, commercial fertilizer, fuel, road salt, DNAPLs and organic solvents, and snow storage. ✓ The municipalities must have regard for this policy as per section 39(1)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
HV.SR.5-HR	<p>The official plans for the Town of Greater Napanee, Loyalist Township, the City of Kingston, the Township of South Frontenac, and the Township of Frontenac Islands SHOULD reference the Geological Survey of Canada (GSC) karst mapping (Brunton, 2008), which identifies the location and extent of karst formations in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas. They should also account for local knowledge of the location and extent of additional karst formations that are not identified on the GSC mapping.</p> <p>These municipalities SHOULD CONSIDER restricting development related to moderate and low drinking water threats on and adjacent to the karst formations since they are natural conduits for contamination from activities that are drinking water threats to reach the underlying aquifers in a very short period of time.</p> <p>Notice of official plan revision and any related development restrictions should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority when completed.</p> <p>This policy should be implemented at the next review of the official plan or within five years of the source protection plan taking effect, whichever comes first.</p>

Policy Reference Number	Proposed Policy Revisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy applies to all existing prescribed drinking water threats which are rated as LOW threats in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas except for those associated with dense non-aqueous phase liquids or vinyl chloride which are MODERATE threats. ✓ The municipalities must have regard for this policy as per section 39(1)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.
HV.SR.6-M-SA	<i>Deleted – the reporting requirement was incorporated with the applicable policies.</i>
Other Policies	
HV.SR.7-SA	<p>Where on-site sewage systems and holding tanks are a low drinking water threats municipalities, in conjunction with their principle authorities under Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code, SHOULD CONSIDER establishing a sewage system maintenance inspection program as per the <i>Ontario Building Code Act</i> to apply in situations where there is an increased risk of groundwater contamination from on-site sewage systems by January 31, 2016.</p> <p>Notice of any discretionary sewage maintenance inspection program including the applicable area, rationale and a summary of inspection results should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority by February 15th of the year that follows implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Section 26(1)(v) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to set out policies that specify actions to be taken to implement the source protection plan or to achieve the plan's objectives. ✓ This policy can be implemented through the Ontario Building Code (as amended O. Reg. 315/10).
HV.SR.8-M-SA	<i>Deleted – the reporting requirement was incorporated with the applicable policies.</i>
Environmental Protection Act	
HV.SR.9-HR	<p>When making decisions under Section 39 of the Environmental Protection Act about amending existing certificates, conducting site assessments or when prioritizing the development and implementation of closure plans for waste disposal sites where waste disposal sites would be a moderate or low drinking water threat, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment SHOULD CONSIDER the probable elevated risk of contamination from active, inactive and closed waste disposal sites in highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas and provide a copy of the decision to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy should be implemented immediately following the source protection plan effective date. ✓ This policy applies to existing and future waste disposal sites which can be a MODERATE or LOW drinking water threat. ✓ The Ontario Ministry of the Environment must have regard for this policy as per section 39(7)(b) of the Clean Water Act.
HV.SR.10-M-SA	<i>Deleted – the reporting requirement was incorporated with the above policy.</i>
Ontario Water Resources Act	
HV.SR.11-HR	<p>When making decisions under Section 53 of the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> about proposals for the establishment, operation and maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage within the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Wastewater treatment facilities; b) Stormwater management facilities; and c) On-site sewage systems would be a low drinking water threat <p>The Ministry of the Environment SHOULD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) CONSIDER the potential impact to drinking water sources of the proposed system; and b) As part of any approval, the MOE SHOULD INCLUDE terms and conditions that ensure that the drinking water threat is managed appropriately and that the underlying aquifer is protected. Items to consider include enhanced level of quality control for stormwater, strict monitoring requirements and annual reporting. <p>A copy of the decision should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy should be implemented immediately following the source protection plan effective date. ✓ Discharge or spill from these facilities LOW drinking water threats <p>The Ontario Ministry of the Environment must have regard for this policy as per section 39(7)(b) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p>
HV.SR.12-M-SA	<i>Deleted – the reporting requirement was incorporated with the applicable policies.</i>

Policy Reference Number	Proposed Policy Revisions
Aggregate Resources Act	
HV.SR.13-HR	<p>When making decisions under Section 8 of the Aggregate Resources Act about applications for aggregate extraction the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources SHOULD INCLUDE risk management measures to protect highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas from spills or leaks associated with the storage and handling of fuel that would be low drinking water threats.</p> <p>A copy of the decision should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy should be implemented immediately following the source protection plan effective date. ✓ This policy applies to existing and future waste aggregate extraction sites which can be a LOW drinking water threat. ✓ The Ontario Ministry of the Environment must have regard for this policy as per section 39(7)(b) of the Clean Water Act.
HV.SR.14-M-SA	<i>Deleted – the reporting requirement was incorporated with the applicable policies.</i>
Various legislation not prescribed under Clean Water Act	
HV.SR.16-SA	<p>The Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing SHOULD DEVELOP a framework for information sessions directed at municipal councils and staff on the importance and practical implementation of groundwater protection through municipal planning.</p> <p>This program should be developed in place within one year of the source protection plan taking effect and be delivered to all municipalities within the Cataraqui Source Protection Area within five years.</p> <p>A copy of the framework and a record of program delivery should be provided to the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Section 26(4) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to set out policies governing education and outreach.
HV.SR.17-M-SA	<i>Deleted – the reporting requirement was incorporated with the applicable policies.</i>
HV.SR.18-SA	<p>Public Health Ontario (Public Health Laboratories) SHOULD CONTINUE to support the local Health Units in reaching out to landowners with private wells and the municipalities in which they are located by providing the water quality data from well testing to the Health Units. Local Health Unit staff will use this data to identify clusters of water quality problems and contact landowners and the applicable municipality(ies) to advise of the problem that could be a result of drinking water threats in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas so that mitigation measures can be implemented to resolve the problem.</p> <p>If any clusters of water quality problems are found the Health Unit should advise the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy should be implemented within two years of the source protection plan effective date. ✓ This policy applies to all existing prescribed drinking water threats which are rated as LOW threats in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas except for those associated with dense non-aqueous phase liquids or vinyl chloride which are MODERATE and also applies to existing TRANSPORT PATHWAYS including un-used or improperly constructed wells. <p>Section 26(1)(v) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to set out policies that specify actions to be taken to implement the source protection plan or to achieve the plan's objectives.</p>
HV.SR.19-M-SA	<i>Deleted – the reporting requirement was incorporated with the above policy.</i>
Education and Outreach	
HV.SR.20-SA	<i>The policy about providing information to private well owners was incorporated into policy Area-wide.13-SA.</i>
Research and Monitoring	
HV.SR.21-SA	<p>The Cataraqui Source Protection Authority in cooperation with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, municipalities and health units SHOULD COORDINATE a monitoring program for groundwater data that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Establishes means by which databases may be collated, and data shared; b) Updates aquifer vulnerability maps as additional site specific information becomes available; and c) Aides in the identification of gaps in current groundwater monitoring programs <p>in order to track the impact that moderate and low drinking water threats have on the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas, and to improve the overall understanding of regionally sensitive groundwater resources in the Cataraqui Source Protection Area. The program would be used to improve source protection policies in future planning cycles.</p>

Policy Reference Number	Proposed Policy Revisions
	<p>This implementation of this policy should commence within one year of the source protection plan effective date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy applies to all existing prescribed drinking water threats which are rated as LOW threats in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas except for those associated with dense non-aqueous phase liquids or vinyl chloride which are MODERATE. ✓ Section 26(1)(v) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to set out policies that specify actions to be taken to implement the source protection plan or to achieve the plan's objectives.
HV.SR.22-SA	<p>The Cataraqui Source Protection Authority SHOULD WORK with the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority in cooperation with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment SHOULD EXPAND the existing Provincial Groundwater Monitoring Network in the jurisdiction of the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority to include wells in at least the following main bedrock units as originally included in the monitoring network plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Gull River Formation: Member D (City of Kingston) b) March Formation (Township of Front of Yonge) c) Precambrian Shield (coarse-grained in Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands) <p>in order to provide more comprehensive baseline ambient water quality data that can be compared to information from locations that may be experiencing impacts from drinking water threats in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas.</p> <p>This implementation of this policy should commence within one year of the source protection plan effective date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy applies to all existing prescribed drinking water threats which are rated as LOW threats in the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas except for those associated with dense non-aqueous phase liquids or vinyl chloride which are MODERATE. ✓ Section 26(1)(v) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to set out policies that specify actions to be taken to implement the source protection plan or to achieve the plan's objectives.
HV.SR.23-SA	<p>The Cataraqui Source Protection Authority, in collaboration with academic institutions and other stakeholder groups, SHOULD CONDUCT a RESEARCH STUDY to determine whether minimum separation distances between wells and on-site sewage systems should be greater in highly vulnerable aquifers in order to reduce the risk of aquifer contamination (i.e. provide adequate sewage system effluent attenuation);</p> <p>AND FURTHER that the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) share the results of this study with local stakeholders and the Ontario Ministry of the Environment; and b) use the study results to identify appropriate minimum lot sizes and frontages for consents on private services; <p>AND FURTHER that the Ontario Ministry of the Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) use the study results to consider amendments to the <u>Ontario Ministry of the Environment Procedure D-5-4: Technical Guideline for Individual On-site Sewage Systems: Water Quality Impact Assessment, August 1996</u>, as amended from time to time. <p>This implementation of this policy should commence within one year of the source protection plan effective date and aim to be completed within ten years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This policy applies to future on-site sewage systems which are LOW drinking water threats and also to future wells that can be TRANSPORT PATHWAYS. ✓ Section 26(1)(iv) of Regulation 287/07 allows the source protection plan to set out policies that govern research.
Incentives	
HV.SR.24-SA	<i>This incentive policy was incorporated with CS.16-CW.</i>
Reporting	
HV.SR.25-M-SA	<i>Deleted – it does not make sense for the SP Authority to report to itself. However, this should be addressed through the section in Chapter 7 on annual reporting to the Ministry of the Environment.</i>

THE CATARAQUI SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE
REPORT

To: Cataraqui Source Protection Committee

Files: SPP 4-0, 8

From: Christine Woods, Source Protection Planner

Date: December 1, 2011

RE: SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

This report has been prepared for the information of the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee (SP Committee). It describes the progress made by staff to develop the internal draft source protection plan and explanatory document that will be distributed to the SP Committee in early January for review.

Source Protection Plan

Staff have refined the draft table of contents for the source protection plan (attached). We have prepared text for the introductory chapters and the overview for each vulnerable area. Given the evolving nature of plan development, the format of the document is expected to evolve over time.

The draft table of contents differs slightly from the one that the SP Committee endorsed in-principle at its October 2010 meeting. The changes include:

- adding a clear language summary of the plan;
- avoiding duplication with the Assessment Report;
- adding a chapter for policies that apply to all vulnerable areas across the Cataraqui area;
- removing the chapter on climate change since no policies are proposed that specifically address that topic; and
- integrating maps into the plan instead of placing them in a separate volume.

Explanatory Document

An explanatory document must be prepared in parallel with the plan as a stand-alone item that is accessible to the public. The minimum contents of the document are dictated by Section 40 of Ontario Regulation 287/07 – General, as amended. Ideally the explanatory document will be a user-friendly companion piece that helps the reader to interpret the plan.

Staff envision that the document will describe:

- the framework used to develop the source protection plan;
- how the policies are organized;
- the financial considerations made;
- consideration for climate change;
- the reasons for the inclusion of policies or groups of policies, including consideration of comments received, and specifically why certain activities would be prohibited in the future within specific portions of vulnerable areas; and
- how the policies might be implemented in the Cataraqui area over the coming years.

The use of a unique reference code for each policy (and a short title) will remove the need for the full policy text to be repeated in both documents.

Staff look forward to discussing our progress with you at the December 8th meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

(original signed by)

Christine Woods MCIP, RPP
Source Protection Planner

Attachment: Draft Table of Contents - Source Protection Plan: Cataraqui Source Protection Area (2012) (dated December 1, 2011)

Approved for circulation RM

Draft Table of Contents

Source Protection Plan: Cataraqui Source Protection Area (2012)

The source protection plan is intended to provide a clear and concise listing of locally-developed policies to address drinking water threats and other matters. Detailed content requirements for the plan are spelled out in the *Clean Water Act, 2006* and Ontario Regulation 287/07. The main Volume I document (estimated at over 250 pages in length) will be supported by detailed appendices, Volume II (Assessment Report), and Volume III (Explanatory Document).

Requirement Ref	Section	Title / Description	Est. Pages
Volume I: Source Protection Plan			
Introductory Items			15
		Summary	5
		Explanatory Note	1
		<i>Summary of Approvals</i>	
		<i>For More Information</i>	
		Acknowledgements	1
		Table of Contents	3
		List of Maps	1
		List of Figures	1
		List of Tables	1
		List of Appendices	1
		List of Acronyms	1
Chapter 1 – Overview			2
	1.1	How to Read This Plan	1
	1.2	End Users of the Source Protection Plan	
	1.3	Review and Amendment	1
Chapter 2 – Introduction			21
	2.1	Drinking Water Source Protection in Ontario	1
	2.2	The Source Protection Planning Process	3
		<i>Source protection authorities and committees</i>	
		<i>Terms of reference, assessment reports, and source protection plans</i>	
		<i>Consultation with local communities - see also Appendix 'A'</i>	
	2.3	Cataraqui Source Protection Area	5
	2.3.1	<i>Our Watersheds</i>	
	2.3.2	<i>Fractured Bedrock and Shallow Overburden</i>	
	2.3.3	<i>Drinking Water Sources and Vulnerable Areas</i>	
	2.4	Scope and Purpose of the Source Protection Plan	4
O. Reg. 287/07 (s.22)	2.4.1	<i>Plan Objectives</i>	
	2.4.2	<i>Activities to be Addressed in the Plan</i>	
	2.5	Development of the Source Protection Plan	6
	2.5.1	<i>Policy Context for Protecting Water</i>	
		<i>Federal and provincial approaches</i>	
		<i>Local approaches</i>	
		<i>Available Policy Tools</i>	
	2.5.2	<i>Policy evaluation</i>	
	2.5.3	<i>Approach to Plan Development</i>	
	2.5.4	<i>Explanatory document</i>	
	2.6	Matters Shared with Neighbouring Jurisdictions	2
	2.6.1	<i>Adjacent Source Protection Regions</i>	
	2.6.2	<i>New York State</i>	
Chapter 3 – Policies for all Vulnerable Areas			14
	3.1	Policies for Implementation by Municipalities - municipal operations, other	
O. Reg. 287/07 (s.26(4))		<i>Education and Outreach Programs</i>	5
		<i>Stewardship Programs</i>	5
O. Reg. 287/07 (s.26(6))		<i>Spill Prevention and Contingency Plans</i>	2
O. Reg. 287/07 (s.26(1))		<i>Research</i>	2
	3.2	Policies for Implementation by Provincial Ministries	
	3.3	Policies for Implementation by the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority	
Chapter 4 – Policies for Regional Groundwater Sources			15
	4.1	Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas	15
	4.1.1	<i>Overview (Drinking Water System, Context, Vulnerable Area, Issues, and Threats)</i>	
	4.1.2	<i>Policies for Implementation by Municipalities</i>	
	4.1.3	<i>Policies for Implementation by Provincial Ministries</i>	
	4.1.4	<i>Policies for Implementation by the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority</i>	
Chapter 5 – Policies for Wellhead Protection Areas			47
	5.1	Policies that apply to all Wellhead Protection Areas	2
	5.2	Cana Wellhead Protection Area	15
	5.2.1	<i>Overview (Drinking Water System, Context, Vulnerable Area, Issues, and Threats)</i>	
	5.2.2	<i>Policies made under Part IV of the Clean Water Act</i>	
	5.2.3	<i>Policies for Implementation by Municipalities</i>	
	5.2.4	<i>Policies for Implementation by Provincial Ministries</i>	
	5.3	Lansdowne Wellhead Protection Area	15
	5.4	Miller Manor Apartments Wellhead Protection Area	15

Requirement Ref	Section	Title / Description	Est. Pages
Chapter 6 – Policies for Surface Water Intake Protection Zones			87
	6.1	Policies that apply to all Intake Protection Zones	2
	6.2	Brockville Intake Protection Zone	15
	6.2.1	<i>Overview (Drinking Water System, Context, Vulnerable Area, Issues, and Threats)</i>	
	6.2.2	<i>Policies made under Part IV of the Clean Water Act</i>	
	6.2.3	<i>Policies for Implementation by Municipalities</i>	
	6.2.4	<i>Policies for Implementation by Provincial Ministries</i>	
	6.3	James W. Kingston Intake Protection Zone	15
	6.4	Sydenham Intake Protection Zone	15
	6.5	Point Pleasant and Kingston Central Intake Protection Zones	10
	6.6	Fairfield Intake Protection Zone	10
	6.7	Bath Intake Protection Zone	10
	6.8	Sandhurst Shores and A.L. Dafoe Intake Protection Zones	10
Chapter 7 – Implementation			7
	7.1	Legal Effect of the Policies	
	7.2	Who Does What (General Responsibility for Implementation) - see also	3
	7.3	Implementation Schedule - see also Appendix 'D'	2
	7.4	Annual Reporting to the Ministry of the Environment	
	7.5	Overall Considerations for Future Planning Cycles	2
Maps			15
		Source Protection Areas and Regions of Southeastern Ontario	1
		Cataraqui Source Protection Area	1
		Vulnerable Areas	13
References			2
Glossary			10
PAGE COUNT			233

Appendices			
From Chapter 1	A	Summary of Consultation	13
From Chapter 7	B	Summary of Roles and Responsibilities [sorted by specific organization]	10
	C	Applicable Legal Provisions of Policies	5
		List A Significant Threat Policies that Affect Decisions under the <i>Planning Act</i> and <i>Condominium Act, 1998</i>	
		List B Moderate and Low Threat Policies that Affect Decisions under the <i>Planning Act</i> and <i>Condominium Act, 1998</i>	
		List C Significant Threat Policies that Affect Prescribed Instrument Decisions	
		List D Moderate and Low Threat Policies that Affect Prescribed Instrument Decisions	
		List E Significant Threat Policies that Impose obligations on municipalities, source protection authorities and local boards	
		List F Monitoring Policies referred to in Subsection 22(2) of the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i>	
From Chapter 7	D	Overall Implementation Schedule [Gantt chart]	2
PAGE COUNT			30

Volume II: Assessment Report: Cataraqui Source Protection Area (June 2011)(DVD) (required by CWA s.22(2)(1))

Volume III: Explanatory Document (DVD)