

SOURCE PROTECTION

ACT FOR CLEAN WATER

Peterborough Munic. Surface Water System

Otonabee-Peterborough
Source Protection Area

Policy Applicability Map



PRODUCED BY Lower Trent Conservation on behalf of the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee, August 2011.

Waterbodies and watercourses located within the extent of an intake protection zone or wellhead protection area are included in that zone.



1,000

Meters

Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Region

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

* Represents the number of existing significant drinking water threats identified in the Amended Proposed Assessment Reports. For a small number of threats, numbers have been updated to reflect new information received after the preparation of the Amended Proposed Assessment Reports.

Livestock Grazing or Pasturing, Outdoor Confinement, or Farm Animal Yard

Waste Disposal Sites (within the meaning of Part V of the EPA)

Maintaining open areas of mown grass for recreational activities that promote the congregation of waterfowl within or near surface water bodies

Snow Storage



This package contains important information about efforts to protect your municipal drinking water supply/supplies:

The enclosed notification letter and its attachments are required to be sent to you for the purposes of Ontario Regulation 287/07 made under the *Clean Water Act*, 2006.

This package includes the following:

- 1. Notice of Pre-Consultation *Draft* Policies
- 2. Fact Sheet Source Protection Toolbox
- 3. Policy Applicability Table
- 4. Draft Policy Text
- 5. Intent and Rationale for *Draft* Policies
- 6. Maps Showing Where *Draft* Policies Apply

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

September 2, 2011

ATTENTION: MUNICIPAL CLERK

RE: NOTICE OF PRE-CONSULTATION - Draft POLICIES

The Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee has begun preparation of the Trent and Ganaraska Source Protection Plans to protect municipal drinking water sources. This letter serves as a Notice for the purposes of Ontario Regulation 287/07 made under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*.

This Notice is being issued because the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee has drafted policies to protect municipal drinking water sources. The *draft* policies have been prepared to manage or eliminate existing and future drinking water threats. The detailed rationale for each policy is included with the *draft* policy document attached to this Notice. Your organization will be responsible for implementing one or more of these policies as identified in the attached table. Drinking water threats are described in the Trent and Ganaraska Assessment Reports which can be found at the following website: www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca.

This is your first formal opportunity to provide comments on these *draft* policies. Between January and March 2012, the Committee will be posting a *draft* source protection plan on the Internet for public review and comment. The Committee will be providing a Notice advising of the opportunity to provide written comments. Further, the proposed source protection plan will be posted in May – June 2012 for a final round of public consultation before being submitted to the Minister of the Environment by August 20, 2012 for final review and approval.

As part of the pre-consultation requirements for these *draft* policies, we ask that you review and provide written comments on the enclosed policies to the Source Protection Committee by October 31st, 2011.

Thank you for your ongoing assistance with the Drinking Water Source Protection Program. Please contact Jennifer Stephens at 613.394.3915 Ext. 246 or jennifer.stephens@ltc.on.ca for any concerns or questions regarding this Notice.

Sincerely,

Jim Hunt, Chairman
Trent Conservation Coalition

Source Protection Committee

Enclosures

Jennifer Stephens, Project Manager Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Region

www.trentsourceprotection.on.ca

The Source Protection Toolbox

The goal of a Source Protection Plan is to manage or eliminate existing activities that are, or could become, significant drinking water threats. In most circumstances, property owners will be able to manage significant threats to reduce the risk and allow the activity to continue.

The Clean Water Act provides several tools to accomplish the goal. The Source Protection Committee will work with municipalities, businesses, landowners and other stakeholders to decide which combination of tools will work best in local circumstances.



Land Use Planning

Municipalities use zoning bylaws and official plans to direct new development to appropriate areas. These planning documents could be changed to prohibit or restrict new development in highly vulnerable areas that would create new significant threats. For example, a municipality might ban new waste disposal sites near municipal wells, or chemical storage facilities just upstream from a river intake. Policies could be general or name specific *Planning Act* tools like zoning by-laws or site plan controls.

Risk Management Plans

A risk management plan is site specific and locally negotiated between the municipal official and the person engaged in the threat after the source protection plan is approved. The plan would impact the current landowner. A new plan would be negotiated with a future owner as long as the activity continues.

Protective or safety measures can reduce the risk posed by a significant threat. For example, a business or farm that stores chemicals or fuel could develop a spill response program or install alternate storage containers. The risk management plan would take into consideration current practices which have been implemented to decrease risk.

Prescribed Instruments

A "prescribed instrument" is a permit or other legal document issued by the provincial government allowing an activity to take place. Some examples include:

- permits under the *Pesticides Act*
- licences under the Aggregate Act
- Nutrient Management Plans under the Nutrient Management Act
- Certificates of Approval for sewage systems under the *Ontario Water Resources Act*

These instruments usually contain provisions to protect human health and the environment. Source protection plan policies could be general or prescriptive. A general policy would require the prescribed instrument to be examined and amended, if necessary, to ensure an activity ceases to be a significant threat. A prescriptive policy could outline specific content in the prescribed instrument.

Prohibition

A Source Protection Plan could prohibit certain activities in vulnerable areas to prevent new significant threats from developing in the future. For existing significant threats, this tool would only be used as a last resort.





Restricted Land Uses

Conditions could be placed on planning applications or building permits in vulnerable areas to limit the establishment or expansion of activities that could create a significant threat in the future. This tool can be used as an administrative tool to help municipalities determine what types of development to allow and which could not take place. It can be seen as an early warning system to avoid inadvertently approving applications or permits for activities that would conflict with other source protection plan policies.

Incentive Programs

Financial incentives could be offered to landowners to address significant threats on their property. Such programs can act as a compliment to all threats or a group of threats, or to address any specific drinking water threat.

Education and Outreach

Programs could educate property owners about how to manage a significant threat on their property. Such programs can act as a compliment to all threats or a group of threats, or to address any specific drinking water threat.

Other Approaches

Some other possible tools that could be included in a source protection plan include stewardship programs, promotion of best management practices, pilot programs to investigate new approaches to protecting water, and research initiatives.





Developing policies to address threats to municipal drinking water supplies ...

The Province has identified a list of activities that can be considered drinking water threats. The Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee has begun to develop draft source protection policies to address these threats as they were identified in the Assessment Reports. They include:

- General Policies
- Sewage Threat Policies
- Agriculture Threat Policies (including use of pesticides and fertilizers, pasture grazing/outdoor confinement areas, agricultural source material)
- Non-Agricultural Source Material Threat Policies
- Road Salt Threat Policies
- Fuel Threat Policies
- Dense Non-Aqueous Liquid & Ogranic Solvents Threat Policies
- Management of Runoff from Aircraft De-icing Threat Policies
- Waste Disposal Threat Policies
- Snow Storage Threat Policies
- Local Threat Policies (Congregation of Waterfowl, Pipeline Rupture)

During Fall 2011, the Source Protection Committee will be gathering feedback from municipalities and agencies who have been identified as having a role in implementing the proposed policies. To obtain broader public input, two consultation periods will occur early in 2012. The Source Protection Plan must be completed by August 20, 2012.



Pre-Consultation Document

Intent and Rationale for Draft Policy Text

September 1st, 2011

Table of Contents

Preface	3
General Policies	4
Sewage Threat Policies	8
Agriculture Threat Policies	12
Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Threat Policies	14
Road Salt Threat Policies	14
Fuel Threat Policies	16
Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL) and Organic Solvent Threat Policies	17
Management of Runoff from Aircraft De-icing Threat Policies	17
Waste Disposal Threat Policies	18
Snow Storage Threat Policies	18
Local Threat Policies (Congregation of Waterfowl, Pipeline Rupture	19

PREFACE

For each *draft* policy prepared by the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee, corresponding intent and rationale text has been prepared. This document is intended to be read in conjunction with the policy text (in tabular format) and with the mapping products provided.

The Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Committee prepared the *draft* policies that are included in this pre-consultation package with input from the five municipal working groups which exist in the source protection region. Each of the municipalities within the source protection area are included in these working groups.

The enclosed *draft* policies evolved through the following process:

				2011			
	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.
Waste Disposal Sites	PC	PC	DP	DP			DP
Sewage Threats	PC	PC	DP	DP			DP
Fuel – Storage and Handling	PC	PC	DP			DP	DP
Agriculture – Pasturing / Grazing / Confinement Area	PC	PC	DP	DP	DP		DP
Pesticides – Storage and Handling	PC	PC	DP	DP	DP		DP
Commercial Fertilizer – Storage, Handling, and Application		PC	PC	DP	DP		DP
Agricultural Source Material – Storage, Handling, and Application		PC	PC	DP	DP		DP
Non-Agricultural Source Material – Storage, Handling, and Application		PC	PC		DP	DP	DP
Road Salt – Storage, Handling, and Application		PC	PC		DP	DP	DP
Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquids – Handling and Storage		PC	PC		DP	DP	DP
Organic Solvents – Handling and Storage		PC	PC		DP	DP	DP
Management of Runoff from Aircraft Deicing						DP	DP
Snow – Storage						DP	DP
Agricultural Source Material (Aquaculture) – Management						DP	DP
Local Threats (Waterfowl congregation, Pipeline rupture)						DP	DP
General policies				DP	DP	DP	DP

Threats discussed at Municipal Working Group meetings

DP = *draft* policies

Threats discussed at Source Protection Committee meetings

PC = policy concept

GENERAL POLICIES

G-1: Land Acquisition

Intent: Encourage municipalities to purchase land where there are or would be significant drinking

water threats.

Rationale: This policy was expanded from a similar policy concept discussed for the handling and storage of

non-agricultural source material. It was suggested that the most effective means to prevent significant drinking water threats would be to purchase the property. It was also pointed out that this approach would be a good idea for all areas where activities could be significant drinking water threats. It was acknowledged that a policy requiring the purchase of lands where threats could be significant would be cost prohibitive. Rather than eliminate the concept of land acquisition, the policy was "softened" to the form of an ongoing consideration for municipalities,

subject to the availability of funding.

G-2: Support of Incentive Programs

Intent: Require Source Protection Authorities to promote existing incentive programs that reduce risk

by managing the threat and to seek out other incentive programs applicable to activities that are

significant drinking water threats.

Rationale: This policy was expanded from a similar policy concept discussed for various agricultural threats.

It was suggested that the ongoing support of incentive programs be applied as a general policy

for all areas where there are significant drinking water threats.

G-3: Risk Management Plans - General Provisions

Intent: List the requirements common to all policies that require a Risk Management Plan in a single

location.

Rationale: Risk Management Plan policies were originally developed separately for different activities. It

was found that the same clauses were being repeated for each policy. To minimize this

duplication, policies G-3 and G-4 were created to include the statements that apply to all policies

that require a Risk Management Plan.

G-4: Risk Management Plans - Reporting

Re-iterate the reporting requirements for the Risk Management Official with respect to Risk Intent:

Management Plans.

Rationale: Early policy concepts that made use of the Risk Management Plan tool independently for each

activity included similar wordings regarding the requirement for the Risk Management Official to

report annually to the Source Protection Authority on the progress in negotiating Risk

Management Plans and on any orders issued by the Risk Management Official with respect to a particular property. Preliminary comments from the Ministry of the Environment indicated that these reporting requirements (among others) are already mandated by Section 65 of the Clean Water Act and that these reporting requirements are sufficient to serve as the "monitoring" component of a Risk Management Plan policy. As a result, these requirements were added to all draft Risk Management Plan policies. Further, as repeated text within Risk Management Plan policies was consolidated into a single policy, so too this reporting clause is now included as a

"general" policy that is applicable to all Risk Management Plan policies.

G-5: Risk Management Plans - Multiple Threats

Intent: Allow a single Risk Management Plan to be developed to address multiple threats.

Rationale: This policy was developed to address the case where more than one activity is identified as a

> significant drinking water threat on a property. This policy allows the Risk Management Official and landowner the option of developing a single Risk Management Plan for the property, rather

than a separate Plan for each activity that is a significant drinking water threat.

G-6: Education and Outreach Programs

Require the development of an education and outreach program that targets persons engaging Intent:

in significant drinking water threats.

Rationale: Education and outreach programs were originally discussed separately for individual drinking

> water threats. It was found that the same requirements were being repeated for each education and outreach policy. To minimize duplication, this single policy wording was developed to list all of the activities for which it was decided that education and outreach should be used as a policy

approach.

G-7: Education and Outreach Programs – Alternate Delivery Agent

Intent:

Allow municipalities with the option of having an alternate party undertake the requirements of the education and outreach programs required by policy G-6.

Rationale:

The appropriate delivery agent for education and outreach policies was debated considerably. It was agreed by the Source Protection Committee that the municipality should be the "default" delivery agent because municipalities would have a greater understanding of the affected areas and may be in a better position to identify the required level of education and outreach. However, it was also agreed that municipalities should be provided with the option of having an alternate party, such as the Conservation Authority, undertake the education and outreach programs where it would be more effective to do so.

G-8: Existing Education and Outreach Programs

Intent:

Clarify that education and outreach programs do not need to be developed "from scratch", but rather that they can be harmonized with existing programs.

Rationale:

It was felt by the Source Protection Committee that if an existing education and outreach program for a particular activity exists that it should be an option for the delivery agent of the education and outreach program (subject to policy G-7) to harmonize the program with existing programs where this would result in an increase in efficiency or effectiveness.

G-9: Specific Requirements for Fuel Storage Education & Outreach Program

Intent:

List specific requirements for education and outreach programs developed for the storage of fuel in a tank.

Rationale:

When education and outreach programs were discussed for residential home heating oil tanks, it was felt that specific provisions should be included in the policy given the large number of threats identified for this activity. Specifically, it was felt by the Source Protection Committee that the education and outreach program for this activity should re-iterate the mandatory requirements for tank maintenance (*i.e.* what tank owners are already required to do under existing legislation), best management practices that could be adopted to further minimize the chances of a tank failure (*i.e.* above and beyond existing legislation), and include the placement of a sticker on oil tanks and fill pipes to serve as a visual reminder that the tank is located in a vulnerable area.

G-10: Specific Requirements for Fuel Handling Education & Outreach Program

Intent:

List specific requirements for education and outreach programs developed for the handling of fuel

Rationale:

When education and outreach programs were discussed for the handling of fuel (referring in most cases to gas stations), it was felt that individuals that handle fuel as a matter of their employment are sufficiently trained in their duties. The knowledge gap that exists, it was felt, was that persons undertaking this activity may not be aware of the location of vulnerable areas or of the importance of source protection. Further, it was felt that education programs for this activity should also refer specifically to emergency response as it relates to the drinking water system (i.e. notification of the affected water treatment plant in the event of a contamination event). Thus, it was felt that additional training should be provided specifically in these areas.

G-11: Restricted Land Uses

Intent:

Designate all land uses in areas where activities could be significant drinking water threats as Restricted Land Uses under Section 59 of the *Clean Water Act*, 2006.

Rationale:

Designation of Restricted Land Uses under Section 59 was discussed separately for a variety of activities where it would be prudent to have the Risk Management Official review applications under the *Planning Act* in areas where activities can be significant drinking water threats.

However, it was felt by the Source Protection Committee that the designation of restricted land uses under Section 59 of the *Clean Water Act* was not an adequate trigger for some threats because it is limited to applications (*i.e.* many of the prescribed drinking water threats are activities that could proceed without an application). Further, in light of the requirement to name specific land uses where Section 59 designation is used, it was felt that to include all of the land uses associated with activities for which it would be desirable to name a Restricted Land Use (*i.e.* residential, commercial, industrial, etc.) would essentially have the effect of naming "all" land uses in areas where activities could be significant threats.

To address these limitations and to generally simplify the wording, the policy was redeveloped to require that all applications under the *Planning Act* and *Building Code Act* for areas where activities could be significant drinking water threats be reviewed by the Risk Management Official, who would then advise the applicant if Section 57 (prohibition) or Section 58 (Risk Management Plans) of the *Clean Water Act* apply (*i.e.* without specifically naming any Restricted Land Uses under Section 59 of the *Act*).

Preliminary comments on the *draft* policy from the Ministry of the Environment recommended that the *draft* policy be again redeveloped to designate land uses under Section 59, but noted that the policy could in fact refer to "all land uses in areas where activities could be significant drinking water threats". The policy was thus changed to its current form in light of these comments.

SEWAGE THREAT POLICIES

S-1: Reporting on Mandatory Septic Maintenance Inspections

Intent: Support the mandatory sewage maintenance inspection program required by the recent Building

Code amendment by requiring the Principal Authority for that program to report annually to the

Source Protection Committee on its progress.

Rationale: Inspection of on-site sewage systems regulated under the Ontario Building Code (O. Reg.

350/06) (i.e. daily flow of 10,000 L/day or less) that are located where they are significant threats

is now a legislated requirement of the Principal Authority (municipality, Health Unit,

Conservation Authority, planning board, or Crown, as applicable). Inspections must be carried

out within five years of the approval of the Source Protection Plan and every five years thereafter. The inspector has authority under the *Building Code Act* to issue orders for the maintenance, replacement, or upgrading of a system that is not functioning as designed. It was

felt that this program is sufficient to address the threat, but that an additional "checking" step is warranted. Thus, it was agreed that the policy should require the Principal Authority for the

mandatory septic maintenance inspections to report to the Source Protection Committee on a regular basis. This provides the Committee with documentation to track the ongoing

implementation of the inspection program.

S-2: Existing Certificates of Approval for Sewage Systems

Intent: Require the Ministry of the Environment to review existing Certificates of Approval for sewage

systems that are regulated by the *Ontario Water Resources Act* (i.e. flow of 10,000L/day or greater) to ensure that they are adequate to manage systems that are significant drinking water

threats.

Rationale: Sewage systems regulated under the Ontario Water Resources Act are managed by the existing

approvals process (i.e. they require Certificates of Approval from the Ministry of the

Environment). Requiring the Ministry to review existing Certificates of Approval in light of the circumstances that make the activity a significant drinking water threat will serve to ensure that

additional conditions are added to Certificates of Approval where necessary.

S-3: Future Certificates of Approval

Intent: Prevent the Ministry of the Environment from issuing new Certificates of Approval for sewage

systems that are regulated by the Ontario Water Resources Act (i.e. >10,000/day).

Rationale: It was agreed by the Source Protection Committee that no new sewage systems should be

permitted in vulnerable areas where they would be significant drinking water threats. Part IV tools of the *Clean Water Act* cannot be used to prohibit sewage threats, so it was decided that the best approach to prevent future sewage systems of this size would be to prevent the

issuance of future Certificates of Approval.

Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Region – Intent and Rationale – September 1st, 2011

S-4: Connection of Existing On-site Sewage Systems to Municipal Collection System

Intent:

Through municipal planning require that properties with existing on-site systems that are significant drinking water threats connect to a municipal sewage collection system where it would be feasible to do so. Where it would not be feasible, this policy requires that future construction of on-site sewage systems that would be significant drinking water threats are constructed to an enhanced treatment standard.

Rationale:

It was felt by the Source Protection Committee that existing on-site sewage systems should be connected to municipal collection systems where servicing is available. It was acknowledged that sewage mains are also significant drinking water threats; it was agreed, however, that because centralized sewage systems are centrally managed that the overall degree of risk to source water would be less if existing systems were to connect to a municipal sewage collection system. Where connection to a municipal collection system is not feasible, it was felt that any systems constructed in the future should be constructed to a standard that reflects the circumstances that would make the activity a significant drinking water threat (as described in the Tables of Drinking Water Threats). Refer to

http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@ene/@resources/documents/resource/std01 079852.pdf for the Tables of Drinking Water Threats.

S-5: Requirements for Future On-site Sewage Systems

Intent:

Require that new lots and new construction on existing lots of record located in areas where sewage systems would be a significant drinking water threat to connect to a municipal sewage collection system where feasible. Where this is not feasible, any sewage system constructed on these properties must be serviced by a sewage systems constructed to enhanced standards.

Rationale:

It was felt that the outright prohibition of future on-site sewage systems may restrict development in some communities. It was originally proposed that any new on-site sewage systems should require tertiary treatment. However, in consideration of the circumstances that make on-site sewage systems a significant drinking water threat (*i.e.* systems that result in the presence of pathogens, acetone, chloride, and nitrate, sodium, etc.) it was agreed by the Source Protection Committee that any future on-site sewage systems permitted on properties where they would be significant drinking water threats should be constructed to a treatment standard that reflect the circumstances that would make the activity a significant drinking water threat.

S-6: Existing Sewage Collection Infrastructure (Excluding Tanks - i.e. sewage pipes)

Intent:

Ensure that sewage collection systems that are located in areas where they are significant drinking water threats are prioritized for maintenance and there are sufficient emergency response measures in place to respond to a system failure that could result in a contamination event.

Rationale:

It would not be feasible to remove existing infrastructure. It was felt by the Source Protection Committee that sewage infrastructure is already well regulated through the existing approvals process (i.e. Certificates of Approval). It was agreed that existing occurrences of this threat could be adequately managed by ensuring that sewage collection infrastructure in vulnerable areas is given priority in asset management activities and that sufficient emergency response measures are in place to respond to a system failure.

S-7: Future Sewage Distribution Infrastructure (Excluding Tanks – i.e. sewage pipes)

Intent: Require that future sewage collection infrastructure located in areas where the activity is a

significant drinking water threat is constructed to enhanced standards.

Rationale: It was agreed by the Source Protection Committee that it would not be appropriate to prevent

the construction of future sewage collection infrastructure (especially given policies S-4 and S-5 that refer to the connection of systems to municipal sewage collection systems). However, it was felt that where these systems are constructed in the future that they should be constructed to standards that reflect the circumstances that would make the activity a significant drinking water

threat.

S-8: Existing Stormwater Management Facilities

Intent: Require the Ministry of the Environment to review existing Certificates of Approval for

stormwater management facilities that discharge untreated stormwater that are significant

drinking water threats to ensure that they are adequate to manage these facilities.

Rationale: Stormwater management facilities are managed by the existing approvals process. Requiring the

issuer to review the existing Certificate of Approval (only was identified in the threats

assessment) will serve to ensure that this activity is no longer a significant drinking water threat.

Further, it was felt that given a potential lack of enforcement of the requirements of the Certificates of Approval that the municipality in which the existing system is located should develop an inspection and maintenance program to ensure that the system being adequately maintained and is operating properly. Note that future stormwater management facilities are

prohibited through the approvals process (Policy S-9).

S-9: Prohibition of Future Sewage Infrastructure

Intent: Prevent the issuing of Certificates of Approval for future sewage activities that would be

significant drinking water threats in the future.

Rationale: It was felt by the Source Protection Committee that, given the magnitude of the potential effects

on source water, sewage infrastructure should not be constructed in the future where it would be a significant drinking water threat. Part IV tools (*i.e.* Section 57 prohibition) cannot be used

for these activities. Preventing the issuing of Certificates of Approval for new sewage infrastructure will achieve the same outcome (i.e. no new sewage infrastructure will be permitted that is a significant threat). Note that this policy excludes sewage collection

infrastructure (excluding tanks & designed bypasses), which are discussed separately in policies

S-6 and S-7.

AGRICULTURE (INCLUDES PESTICIDE, FERTILIZER, PASTURE GRAZING /OUTDOOR CONFINEMENT AREA, AND AGRICULTURAL SOURCE MATERIAL) THREAT POLICIES

A-1 and A-2: Existing Agricultural Activities <u>not</u> subject to Prescribed Instruments and Existing Agricultural Activities subject to Prescribed Instruments

Intent:

Require the review of existing Nutrient Management Plans and Strategies, as well as Pesticide Permits in vulnerable areas to ensure that they are adequate for managing activities that are significant drinking water threats. Additional conditions must be added to an instrument if it is deemed inadequate for managing the activity. The review of the instruments is to be carried out by the issuer (Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs or Ministry of the Environment).

Require the development of a Risk Management Plan for existing and future agricultural activities that are significant drinking water threats where a Prescribed Instrument (Nutrient Management Plan or Nutrient Management Strategy, or Pesticide Permit) is <u>not</u> required.

Rationale:

Only farms generating greater than 300 nutrient units (NU) annually <u>or</u> those generating between 5 and 300 NU annually and are required to apply for a building permit to construct a building used to hold farm animals or manure are captured under the *Nutrient Management Act* and Ontario Regulation 267/03. The *Nutrient Management Act*, Ontario Regulation 267/03, and the *Pesticides Act* will be used to manage existing and future significant drinking water threats. For those properties not captured under the prescribed instrument, the risk management plan (RMP) tool will be used to manage the significant drinking water threat.

As of the March 2011 meeting, the Source Protection Committee:

- Agreed that the Risk Management Plan should apply <u>only</u> to the portion of property, where the significant threat occurs, as opposed to the entire parcel.
- Agreed that the Risk Management Plan should not specifically mirror the Nutrient Management Plan design.
- Agreed that the Risk Management Inspector / Official should have the flexibility to determine the content of the RMP for this threat.
- Recognized that there would be costs not only to the landowner to prepare and implement the plan, but also to the municipality to employ the Risk Management Inspector / Official.
 - At the June 2011 Source Protection Committee meeting, the Committee made the decision to group all agricultural related threats into a single set of policies. At this same meeting it was determined that the emergency response measures requirement would apply only to risk management plans prepared for the application and storage/handling of commercial fertilizers.

A-3: Prohibition of Future Agricultural Activities

Intent: Prohibit future occurrences of agricultural activities that would be significant drinking water

threats using Section 57 of the Clean Water Act.

Rationale: It was felt that agricultural activities should not be established in the future where they

would be significant drinking water threats. Section 57 Prohibition was considered the most

efficient means to achieve this outcome.

A-4: Agrichemical Warehousing Standards Association (AWSA) Certification

Intent: Require existing facilities that have significant threats related to the handling and storage of

pesticides to obtain certification from the Agrichemical Warehousing Association.

Rationale: The Agrichemical Warehousing Standards Association has an existing set of standards for

the storage of agricultural chemicals. It was felt that these existing standards should be made mandatory where the handling and storage of pesticides is a significant drinking water threat. It was noted that in most cases distributors of agricultural chemicals will not ship to a

facility that is not certified.

A-5: Prohibition of Future Aquaculture Facilities

Intent: Prohibit future occurrences of the management of agricultural source material under

Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, 2006.

Rationale: There are currently no significant threats related to the management of agricultural source

material identified in the Source Protection Region. The activity could only be a significant threat in the future for one municipal drinking water system in the Source Protection Region. The Source Protection Committee felt that since there are no existing threats that

it would be appropriate to prohibit the activity in the future.

NON-AGRICULTURAL SOURCE MATERIAL (NASM) THREAT POLICIES

N-1 and N-2: Existing NASM Activities Subject to Prescribed Instruments and Prohibition of Future NASM **Activities**

Intent: To manage existing application, handling, or storage of NASM threats using the prescribed

instrument tool.

Rationale: The application, handling, and storage of NASMs are subject to a NASM plan. Requiring a

> review of this plan would ensure that the application, storage, and handling of NASM do not result in significant drinking water threats. Future occurrences of the activity would be

prohibited.

ROAD SALT THREAT POLICIES

R-1: Development of Salt Management Plan for Existing and Future Road Salt Application

Require the development of a salt management plan to manage existing and future road salt Intent:

> application where it is a significant drinking water threat. The contents of the plan will be at the discretion of the road authority operating in the area in consultation with other road

authorities.

Rationale: Many municipalities already have salt management plans. Where a plan exists, this policy

> requires them to review their existing plans to ensure that they are sufficient to manage the application of salt with respect to the requirement of the Clean Water Act, 2006. Where no plan exists, municipalities are required to create a salt management plan to address salt

application where the activity is a significant threat.

R-2: Monitoring of Sodium and Chloride

Require the collection and assessment of raw water quality data taken at drinking water Intent:

systems where road salt is or would be a significant drinking water threat.

Rationale: Limited raw water quality data was available when compiling the Trent and Ganaraska

Assessment Reports. It is suggested that with the monitoring required through the Safe Drinking Water Act, municipalities could collect some additional data to augment the

dataset of sodium and chloride levels in raw drinking water taken from municipal systems.

R-3: Recommended Research for Road Salt Alternatives

Intent: Require that provincial ministries research alternatives to road salt.

Rationale: With the impact of road salt on source water quality, the Source Protection Committee felt

that using salt to manage road safety is unsustainable. The Committee is recommending that provincial ministries with a research mandate explore options for replacing road salt to

assist with winter road maintenance.

R-4: Future Construction of Roads and Impervious Surfaces

Intent: The policy is intended to have road authorities consider vulnerable areas during the

planning stage of impervious surfaces (highways, and other impervious land surfaces used

for vehicular traffic and parking, as well as all pedestrian paths).

Rationale: The threat circumstances for road salt application refer to the percent impervious surface

area. Construction of new impervious surfaces in a vulnerable area would increase the impervious surface area that requires de-icing, which could increase the number of significant threats. This policy is a "reminder" to the responsible authorities to consider

vulnerable areas in the construction of impervious surfaces.

R-5: Prohibition of Future Salt Storage

Intent: The following policy is intended to prohibit the handling and storage of road salt in

vulnerable areas where the activity would be a significant drinking water threat. This includes all facilities regardless of ownership. There are currently no salt storage threats

identified.

Rationale: There are currently no handling and storage threats associated with road salt identified in

the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Region. It was felt that since there are

no existing threats that it would be appropriate to prohibit the activity.

FUEL THREAT POLICIES

F-1: Support of Existing TSSA Requirements

Intent: Supplement the existing inspection process implemented by the Technical Standards and

Safety Authority by requiring regular reporting to the SPC regarding the inspections carried

out within vulnerable areas.

Rationale: This policy provides the Source Protection Committee with documentation to confirm that

inspections of fuel tanks within vulnerable areas are taking place at an appropriate

frequency. Further, increasing the frequency of inspections is included in the policy because

it was felt that a 10-year interval is too great.

F-2: Prohibition of future facilities regulated under O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil)

Intent: Use planning tools to ensure that no fuel facilities regulated under O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil)

are installed on new lots and existing lots of record. This regulation includes above ground and underground tanks, furnaces, boilers, water & vehicle heaters, power supplies for buildings, and both portable and stationary oil-burning equipment and piping, but excludes

facilities regulated under O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels).

Rationale: The Source Protection Committee felt that new construction that requires fuel storage

should not be permitted where the threat would be significant.

F-3: Risk Management Plans for Existing Fuel Storage

Intent: Require the development of Risk Management Plans for existing fuel storage facilities

regulated under O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels) and O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil).

Rationale: It was felt that the existing fuel storage activities regulated under both the Liquid Fuels

(particularly gas stations) and Fuel Oil regulations required additional management than just inspection (*i.e.* Policy F-1). This policy ensures that these activities are adequately managed. Note that future occurrences of these activities are prohibited under Policies F-2 and F-4.

The Source Protection Committee had considerable dialogue about the impact of the

following policy on the implementing body, mainly since the fuel oil storage is one of the most prevalent threats in the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Region. It was decided that although the policy would result in costs to the implementing body, the use of risk management plans to manage existing fuel storage threats was the best option. The end result of considerable deliberation was the use of risk management plans would be proposed to implementing bodies as the preferred approach to managing the threat.

F-4: Prohibition of future facilities regulated under O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels)

Intent: Prohibit future occurrences of fuel refineries and fuel storage and handling that is regulated

under O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels). This regulation includes retail outlets, bulk plants, marinas, cardlocks/keylocks, private outlets, or farms where fuel is handled other than in portable containers. This definition does not include oil used as fuel (i.e. residential oil

tanks), which is regulated under O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil).

Rationale: The risks presented by these types of facilities warrant prohibition of future occurrences.

Existing facilities will be managed through a Risk Management Plan (see Policy F-3).

DENSE NON-AQUEOUS PHASE LIQUID (DNAPLS) AND ORGANIC SOLVENT THREAT POLICIES

C-1 and C-2: Risk Management Plans for Existing DNAPL and Organic Solvent Threats, Prohibition of Future DNAPL and Organic Solvent Threats

Intent: Require the development of a Risk Management Plan for all properties with existing

significant threats related to the handling and storage of DNAPLs and/or organic solvents. Prohibit future occurrences of the handling and storage of DNAPLs and organic solvents

under Section 57 of the Clean Water Act, 2006.

Rationale: Prohibiting existing activities may be a significant hardship to the affected landowners. The

development of a Risk Management Plan is considered to be sufficient to address existing DNAPL and organic solvent threats. Prohibition of future instances of these activities is considered the most appropriate option due to the severity of the impacts that they may

have on the drinking water systems.

MANAGEMENT OF RUNOFF FROM AIRCRAFT DE-ICING THREAT POLICIES

P-1: Prohibition of Future Aircraft De-icing

Intent: Prohibit future occurrences of aircraft de-icing under Section 57 of the *Clean Water Act*,

2006. (Note that the threat is officially "the management of runoff that contains chemicals

used in the de-icing of aircraft.)

Rationale: There are currently no significant threats related to aircraft de-icing identified in the Source

Protection Region. The Source Protection Committee felt that since there are no existing

threats that it would be appropriate to prohibit the activity in the future.

WASTE DISPOSAL THREAT POLICIES

W-1 and W-2: Certificates of Approval

Intent: Ensure that Certificates of Approval for existing waste disposal sites are reviewed by the

Ministry of the Environment.

Rationale: Waste disposal sites are managed by an existing approvals process. Requiring a review of

existing approvals will ensure that waste disposal sites are operated such that they do not result in significant drinking water threats. Further, the Part IV tools of the *Clean Water Act*

cannot be used to address this threat.

SNOW STORAGE THREAT POLICIES

O-1: Relocation of Existing Snow Storage

Intent: Where relocation of the existing storage facility is feasible, this is the preferred approach to

management of the threat. If relocation is not an option, a risk management plan will be

used as the means to manage the threat.

Rationale: Moving the snow storage facility will remove the significant drinking water threat from the

vulnerable area where it could potentially impact the drinking water system. If removal of the threat is not an option, a Risk Management Plan will ensure that the site is managed appropriately as to prevent runoff that could affect groundwater or surface water.

O-2: Prohibition of Future Snow Storage

Intent: To prohibit future occurrences of snow storage that would be significant drinking water

threats.

Rationale: It was felt that snow storage facilities should not be constructed in the future where they would

be a significant drinking water threat. Section 57 was used to prohibit this activity.

LOCAL THREAT POLICIES: LANDSCAPING THAT PROMOTE THE CONGREGATION OF WATERFOWL

L-1: Landscaping that Promotes the Congregation of Waterfowl

Intent:

Require the development and implementation of a plan to minimize the congregation of waterfowl on municipal properties within the Intake Protection Zone 1 for the Lakefield and Peterborough drinking water intakes.

Rationale:

This drinking water threat refers to the maintenance of open areas of mown grass for recreational activities that promote the congregation of waterfowl within or near surface water bodies. This activity is considered a drinking water threat where (per the Director's approval) "congregation of waterfowl results in discharge of pathogens to surface water in an area where there are known drinking water quality impacts from waterfowl within an intake protection zone." This activity was approved as a local drinking water threat specifically for the Lakefield and Peterborough drinking water intakes. Data collected by the Peterborough Utilities Commission suggests that waterfowl are a significant source of pathogens in the vicinity of these intakes (i.e. the ratio of *E. coli* to fecal streptococcus in water samples).

The presence of waterfowl on parkland is encouraged by the maintenance of manicured lawns and by human behavior (i.e. feeding). Waterfowl management is a difficult undertaking that has been approached in many jurisdictions; literature suggests that waterfowl management plans must be adaptive to changing conditions and include a variety of management strategies to be effective. Requiring the development and implementation of a waterfowl management plan (requirement 1) will allow the affected municipalities to develop plans that are appropriate to local conditions without being restricted to the contents of a Section 58 Risk Management Plan. The Risk Management Official would not have a direct role in implementation of the policy. Rather, development and implementation of the plan would be self-directed by the affected municipalities, subject to the submission of an annual report to the Source Protection Authority. The policy refers specifically to municipal properties because it was felt by the Source Protection Committee that, although the approved threat refers generally to "areas of mown grass", that it would not be feasible to require private landowners to develop waterfowl management plans for their properties (note that this activity is further addressed through a public education program, *i.e.* policy G-6).

The posting of signage (requirement 2) and the adoption of a waterfowl feeding by-law (requirement 4) will help to minimize the presence of waterfowl related to human feeding. These approaches may also serve to decrease waterfowl populations outside of the intake protection zone.

LOCAL THREAT POLICIES: CONVEYANCE OF OIL BY WAY OF A PIPELINE

L-2: Conveyance of Oil by Way of a Pipeline

Intent: Require the affected municipalities and the owner of the pipeline to review their emergency

response procedures to ensure that they are adequate to respond to the rupture of a pipeline in

an area where the pipeline crosses a body of open water.

Rationale: This drinking water threat refers to the rupture of a pipeline in an area where the pipeline crosses

a body of open water that could contaminate surface water. A modeling study undertaken by the Lake Ontario Collaborative showed that a rupture of the 12" Trans-Northern gasoline pipeline that crosses through the Ganaraska Source Protection Area could cause high concentrations of benzene

at the Port Hope, Cobourg, and Newcastle drinking water intakes.

Municipalities have existing emergency plans to address large scale spills. Rather than developing a separate emergency plan to specifically address a pipeline rupture, it was felt by the Source Protection Committee that would be more appropriate to review the existing plans in light of the pipe rupture scenario and amend them to address any deficiencies and to exercise them regularly.



Pre-Consultation Document

Draft Policy Text

Table of Contents

General Policies	3
Sewage Threat Policies	8
Agriculture Threat Policies	13
Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Threat Policies	16
Road Salt Threat Policies	17
Fuel Threat Policies	19
Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL) and Organic Solvent Threat Policies	21
Management of Runoff from Aircraft De-icing Threat Policies	21
Waste Disposal Threat Policies	22
Snow Storage Threat Policies	2 3
Local Threat Policies (Congregation of Waterfowl, Pipeline Rupture)	24

GENERAL POLICIES: CONSIDERATION FOR LAND ACQUISITION AND INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements		
		Where an activity listed in Section 1.1 of O. Reg. 287/07			Ongoing	1	Consider the purchase of the affected properties on an ongoing basis, subject to availability of funding.		
G-1	Land Acquisition	made under the Clean Water Act, 2006 is a significant drinking water threat:	Municipality	Specify Actions	As required	2	Report to the Source Protection Authority on any land purchases within a vulnerable area, and how significant drinking water threats were eliminated as a result of the purchase.		
	Cuppert of	Where an activity listed in Section 1.1 of O. Reg. 287/07					Ongoing	1	Support and facilitate the implementation of existing incentive programs, such as the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program (ODWSP), that promote the use of best management practices for activities that are significant drinking water threats;
G-2	Support of Incentive Programs	made under the Clean Water Act, 2006 is a significant drinking water threat:				Specify Actions	Ongoing	2	Seek out incentive programs that promote the implementation of best management practices for activities that are significant drinking water threats; and
		diffixing water tiffeat.			As required	3	Report to the Source Protection Committee on the number and nature of significant drinking water threats that have been addressed using funding from an incentive program.		

GENERAL POLICIES: RISK MANAGEMENT PLANS

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements	
	Risk	Where a policy in this Source Protection Plan requires the				1	Address the portion of the property where the activity is a significant drinking water threat;	
G-3	Management Plans - General	development of a Risk Management Plan, the Risk	NA	Support	NA	2	Consider existing risk management measures being undertaken on the subject property; and	
	Provisions	Management Plan must:				3	Be initiated within one year and completed within three years, unless stated otherwise.	
G-4	Risk Management Plans - Reporting		Risk Management Official	Specify Actions	As required	deve Mar requ	Where a policy in this Source Protection Plan requires the development of a Risk Management Plan, the Risk Management Official will undertake the reporting requirements specified in Section 65 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006.	
G-5	Risk Management Plans - Multiple Threats		NA	Support	NA	Where policies in this Source Protection Plan require the development of Risk Management Plans for more than one type of significant drinking water threat, a single Risk Management Plan may be developed to address all of the threats.		

GENERAL POLICIES: EDUCATION AND OUTREACH PROGRAMS

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Complianc e Date	Requirements
	Education	Where any of the following activities is a significant drinking water threat: a. The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage; b. The application of agricultural source material to land; c. The storage of agricultural source material; d. The application of commercial fertilizer to land; e. The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer; f. The application of pesticide to land; g. The handling and storage of pesticide; h. The use of land as livestock grazing or		Education	Within one year	Develop and implement an education and outreach program. The program will target anyone engaging in an activity that is a significant drinking water threat and may include, but is not limited to: a. The location of vulnerable areas; b. Best management practices that can minimize or eliminate the impacts of the subject activities on the drinking water source; and c. Information regarding the applicability of the property for funding under the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program (ODWSP) or other applicable incentive programs.
G-6	and Outreach Programs	pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area, or a farm-animal yard; i. The application of non-agricultural source material to land; j. The application of road salt; k. The handling and storage of road salt; l. The handling and storage of fuel; m. The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid; n. The handling and storage of an organic solvent; o. The storage of snow; and p. Maintaining open areas of mown grass for recreational activities that promote the congregation of waterfowl within or near surface water bodies:	Municipality	and Outreach	Annually	Report on the activities undertaken as part of the education and outreach program to the Source Protection Authority.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
G-7	Education and Outreach - General Provisions	NA - Support clause for policy G-6	NA	Support	NA	1	Notwithstanding G-6, the municipality may enter into an agreement with a Conservation Authority or other third party that identifies the third party as the implementing body for the education and outreach program required by G-6 and/or any related reporting.
G-8	Existing Education and Outreach Programs	NA - Support clause for policy G-6	Per G-6	Support	NA	2	The education and outreach program required by G-6 can be harmonized with existing education and outreach programs, such as the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program (ODWSP), where this would result in an increase in efficiency or cost-effectiveness.
G-9	Specific Requirements for Fuel Storage Education Program	NA - Support clause for policy G-6	Per G-6	Support	NA	3	Where an education and outreach program required by G-6 is developed to address the storage of liquid fuel in a tank at a facility as defined in section 1 of O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil) made under the <i>Technical Standards and Safety Act</i> , 2000, the program will include, at a minimum: a. The mandatory requirements for fuel tank usage and maintenance; b. Best management practices for fuel tank usage and maintenance; c. Distribution of a sticker to be placed on oil tanks and fill pipes that indicates that the tank is located in a vulnerable area and provides a procedure to follow in the event of a fuel spill or leak, a spill response contact number.
G-10	Specific Requirements for Fuel Handling Education Program	NA - Support clause for policy G-6	Per G-6	Support	NA	4	Where an education and outreach program required by G-6 is developed to address the handling of liquid fuel in relation to its storage at a facility as defined in section 1 of O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil) made under the <i>Technical Standards and Safety Act</i> , 2000 or a facility as defined in section 1 of O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels) made under the <i>Technical Standards and Safety Act</i> , 2000, the program will focus on source water protection and emergency response.

GENERAL POLICIES: RESTRICTED LAND USES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
G-11	Restricted Land Uses	Where an activity listed in Section 1.1 of O. Reg. 287/07 made under the Clean Water Act, 2006 is a significant drinking water threat:	Crown / Municipality	Section 59	Immediate	All land uses located in areas where an activity would be a significant drinking water threat are designated as Restricted Land Uses under Section 59 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> .

SEWAGE THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
S-1	Reporting on Mandatory Septic Maintenance Inspections	Where a sewage system as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg. 350/06 (Building Code) made under the <i>Building Code Act,</i> 1992 is and would be a significant drinking water threat:	Principal Authority as defined in Section 1 of the Building Code Act, 1992	Specify Actions	Annually	Report to the Source Protection Authority on the implementation of the mandatory maintenance inspection program. The report must include the following minimum information: a. The number of inspections carried out under the maintenance inspection program during the reporting year; b. The number of inspections that were not compliant with the septic inspection guideline; and c. For the properties identified in (ii), a description of the deficiencies in the system, the orders issued by the inspector, and any follow-up with the system owner.
S-2	Existing Certificates of Approval for Sewage Systems	Where a sewage works as defined in Section 1(1) of the Ontario Water Resources Act that requires a Certificate of Approval is a significant drinking water threat:	Ministry of the Environment	Prescribed Instrument Specify Actions	Within one year Annually	Review any existing Certificate of Approval to determine if it is adequate to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat. If the Certificate of Approval is deemed to be inadequate for this purpose, it will be amended to include additional conditions that will ensure that the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat. In addition, ensure that all existing Certificates of Approval include requirements for regular inspection of the system, and a requirement to report to the Source Protection Authority on the number of inspections and their results. Report to the Source Protection Authority on the status of the review of the Certificate of Approval and any orders issued as a result of an inspection during the reporting year.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
S-3	Future Certificates of Approval	Where a sewage works as defined in Section 1 of the Ontario Water Resources Act that requires a Certificate of Approval would be a significant drinking water threat:	Ministry of the Environment	Prescribed Instrument	Immediate	Not issue any new Certificate of Approval for the activity.
S-4	Connection of Existing Onsite Sewage Systems to Municipal Collection System	Where a sewage system as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg. 350/06 (Building Code) made under the <i>Building Code Act</i> , 1992 is a significant drinking water threat:	Municipality	Planning	Within one year	Require that the affected properties connect to a municipal sewage collection system where feasible.
S-5	Requirements for Future On- site Sewage Systems	Where a sewage system as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg. 350/06 (Building Code) made under the <i>Building Code Act</i> , 1992 would be a significant drinking water threat:	Municipality	Planning	Within one year	Require the following: a. Where connection to a municipal sewage collection system is feasible, new lots and construction on existing lots of record will be serviced by a municipal sewage collection system; or b. Where connection to a municipal sewage collection system is not feasible, new lots and construction on existing lots of record will be serviced by a sewage system constructed to standards that will ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
	l w	Where a wastewater	Municipality	Specify Actions	Within two years.	1	Ensure that there is an emergency response plan in place that is suitable to respond to a system failure that could result in the introduction of pathogens into surface water.
S-6	Existing Sewage Collection Infrastructure (Excluding Tanks)	collection facility that collects or transmits sewage containing human waste, excluding any part of the facility that is a sewage storage tank or works used to carry out a designed bypass is a significant		Specify Actions	Annually	2	Report to the Source Protection Authority on activities related to the emergency response plan. Reporting can include, but is not limited to: a. Updates or amendments to the plan b. Summary of training undertaken in support of the plan c. Summary of incidents that required the use of the emergency response plan
		drinking water threat:		Specify Actions	Within one year	3	Prioritize any maintenance and asset management activities to ensure that facilities located in vulnerable areas are given adequate priority.
S-7	Future Sewage Collection Infrastructure (Excluding Tanks)	Where a wastewater collection facility that collects or transmits sewage containing human waste, excluding any part of the facility that is a sewage storage tank or works used to carry out a designed bypass would be a significant drinking water:	Municipality	Planning	Within one year	with	lire that any future sewage infrastructure complies construction standards that will ensure that the ity is not a significant drinking water threat.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
	Existing	Where the discharge of untreated stormwater from a stormwater management	Ministry of the Environment	Prescribed Instrument	Within one year	Review the Certificate of Approval for the stormwater management facility to determine if is adequate to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat. If the Certificate of Approval is deemed to be inadequate for this purpose, it will be amended to include additiona conditions that will ensure that the activity cease to be a significant drinking water threat. Report to the Source Protection Committee on
S-8	Stormwater Management Facilities	facility as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg. 525/98 (Approval Exemptions) made under the Ontario Water Resources Act		Specify Actions	Annually	compliance with the conditions of the Certificate of Approval for the stormwater management facility.
		is a significant drinking water threat:	Municipality	Specify Actions	Within two years	Develop and implement a stormwater management facility maintenance program. The program will require regular inspection of stormwater management facilities to ensure that they are being sufficiently maintained such that the facility is not a significant drinking water threat.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
S-9	Prohibition of Future Sewage Infrastructure	 Where any of the following activities would be a significant drinking water threat if undertaken in the future: a. The system is a combined sewer that may discharge sanitary sewage containing human waste to surface water; b. A sewage system that discharges to surface water and has as its primary function the collection, transmission or treatment of industrial sewage; c. A treatment tank or storage tank that is part of a sewage works within the meaning of the Ontario Water Resources Act, the tank treats or stores sanitary sewage containing human waste; d. A wastewater treatment facility that may discharge sanitary sewage containing human waste to surface water by way of a designed bypass; e. A wastewater treatment facility that discharges to surface water through a means other than a designed bypass; or f. The discharge of untreated stormwater from a stormwater management facilities as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg. 525/98 (Approval Exemptions) made under the Ontario Water Resources Act. 	Ministry of the Environment	Prescribed Instrument	Immediate	Not issue any new Certificate of Approval for the activity.

AGRICULTURE (INCLUDES PESTICIDE, FERTILIZER, PASTURE GRAZING / OUTDOOR CONFINEMENT AREA, AND AGRICULTURAL SOURCE MATERIAL THREATS) THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
A-1	Existing Agricultural Activities not Subject to Prescribed Instruments	 Where any of the following activities is a significant drinking water threat: a. The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer; b. The application of commercial fertilizer to land; c. The application of agricultural source material to land; d. The storage of agricultural source material; and e. The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area, or a farm animal yard; where the activity does not require a Nutrient Management Plan or Strategy under the Nutrient Management Act, 2002; and f. The application of pesticide to land, where the activity does not require a permit under the Pesticides Act: 	Risk Management Official	Section 58	Per G-3	Negotiate and establish a Risk Management Plan as defined in Section 58 of the Clean Water Act, 2006 with the person engaging in the activity. Where the Risk Management Plan is prepared for the application or storage of commercial fertilizer, the Risk Management Plan will include emergency response measures to address a spill that may result in the presence of nitrogen or phosphorus in groundwater or surface water.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
A-2	Existing Agricultural Activities Subject to Prescribed	Where any of the following activities is a significant drinking water threat: a. The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer; b. The application of commercial fertilizer to land; c. The application of agricultural source material to land; d. The storage of agricultural source material; and e. The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm	Issuer of the Prescribed Instrument	Prescribed Instrument	Within one year	Review the Prescribed Instrument for the property to determine if it is adequate to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat. 1 If the Prescribed Instrument is deemed to be inadequate for this purpose, it will be amended to include additional conditions that will ensure that the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.
	Instruments	animal yard; where the activity requires a Nutrient Management Plan or Strategy under the Nutrient Management Act, 2002; and f. The application of pesticide to land, where the application requires a pesticide permit under the Pesticides Act:		Specify Actions	Annually	Report to the Source Protection Authority on the status of the review of the Certificate of Approval and any orders issued as a result of an inspection during the reporting year.
A-3	Prohibition of Future Agricultural Activities	Where any of the following activities is a significant drinking water threat: a. The application of agricultural source material to land; b. The storage of agricultural source material; c. The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer; d. The application of commercial fertilizer to land; e. The application of pesticide to land; f. The handling and storage of pesticide; g. The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor; and confinement area or a farm animal yard:	Crown / Municipality	Section 57	Immediate	Future occurrences of the activity are prohibited under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
A-4	Agrichemical Warehousing Standards Association	Where the handling and storage of pesticide is a significant drinking water threat, and the pesticide is stored where it is manufactured or processed, or from which it is wholesaled, or stored for retail	Owner of the affected property	Specify Actions	Within one year	1	Any facility undertaking the activity must obtain certification from the Agrichemical Warehousing Standards Association (AWSA) and provide documentation of the certification to the Conservation Authority in which the activity the activity is located;
	Certification	sale:	Conservation Authority	Specify Actions	Annually	2	Report to the Source Protection Authority on the number of facilities certified in accordance with (a).
A-5	Prohibition of Future Aquaculture Facilities	Where the management of agricultural source material (aquaculture) would be a significant drinking water threat:	Crown / Municipality	Section 57	Immediate	prol	are occurrences of the activity are nibited under Section 57 of the <i>Clean ter Act</i> , 2006.

NON-AGRICULTURAL SOURCE MATERIAL (NASM) THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
N-1	Existing NASM Activities Subject to Prescribed Instruments	Where the application, handling, or storage of non-agricultural source material is or would be significant drinking water threat, and the activity requires a Certificate of Approval under the Environmental Protection Act or a NASM Plan under the Nutrient Management Act, 2002:	Ontario Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Rural Affairs and/or Ministry of the Environment	Prescribed Instrument	Within one year	1	Review any existing Certificate of Approval or NASM Plan to determine if it is adequate to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat. If the instrument is deemed to be inadequate for this purpose, it will be amended to include additional conditions that will ensure that the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat; and
				Specify Actions	Annually	2	Report to the Source Protection Authority on the status of the review of the Certificate of Approval or NASM Plan and any orders issued as a result of an inspection during the reporting year; and
				Prescribed Instrument	Immediate	3	Not issue any Certificate of Approval or NASM Plan for future occurrences of the activity.
N-2	Future NASM Activities	Where the application, handling, and/or storage of non-agricultural source material is a significant drinking water threat:	Crown / Municipality	Section 57	Immediate	1	Future occurrences of the activity is prohibited under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006 where these activities would be a significant drinking water threats, except where the non-agricultural source material is listed as Category 1 non-agricultural source material per the General regulation (O. Reg. 267/03) made under the Nutrient Management Act, 2002.

ROAD SALT THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
R-1	Existing and Future Road Salt Application	Where the application of road salt is or would be a significant drinking water threat:	Ministry of Transportation and the municipality	Specify Actions	Within two years	1	Develop and implement a salt management plan that addresses road salt application on the roads within its jurisdiction. The plan will contain conditions that ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat. The plan can be a stand-alone document, or incorporated into an existing salt management plan. Where multiple road authorities operate within a vulnerable area, cross boundary considerations will be addressed on an ongoing basis by all road authorities responsible for the application of road salt. Where salt is applied by a contractor, the road authority responsible for the contract will ensure that contractors are made aware of the requirements of the salt management plan.
				Specify Actions	Within one year of the approval of an updated Assessment Report	2	Update the salt management plan. Report to the Source Protection Authority on the activities
		Where the		Specify Actions	AACH :		undertaken as part of the salt management plan. Sample raw water to monitor and trend changes in chloride
R-2	Monitoring of Sodium and	application of road salt is or would be	Operating Authority of the	Specify Actions	Within one year	1	and sodium concentrations on a frequency adequate to monitor concentrations; and
11-2	Chloride	a significant drinking water threat:	affected drinking water system	Specify Actions	Every 5 years	2	Report on the sampling results to the Source Protection Authority.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
R-3	Recommended Research for Road Salt Alternatives	Where the application of road salt is or would be a significant drinking water threat:	Ministry of the Environment / Ministry of Transportation / Ministry of Research and Innovation	Recommended Research	NA	The Ministries of Environment, Transportation, and Research and Innovation are encouraged to identify opportunities to eliminate salt-based compounds for managing roads using instead safe environmental alternatives. These alternatives could be included in the guidelines for managing road salt.
R-4	Future Construction of Roads and Impervious Surfaces	Where the application of road salt would be a significant drinking water threat:	Ministry of Transportation, municipality, and owner of any affected property	Specify Actions	As required	Consider the location of vulnerable areas during the planning and Environmental Assessment processes for the construction of roads, other impervious land surfaces used for vehicular traffic and parking, and all pedestrian paths.
R-5	Prohibition of Future Salt Storage	Where the handling and storage of road salt would be a significant drinking water threat:	Crown / Municipality	Section 57	Immediate	Future occurrences of the activity are prohibited under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006.

FUEL THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
		Where the storage of liquid fuel in a tank at a facility as defined in section 1 of O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil) made under the <i>Technical Standards and Safety Act</i> , 2000; or a facility as defined in section 1 of O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels) made under the <i>Technical Standards and Safety Act</i> , 2000, but not including a bulk plant, is a significant drinking water threat:	Technical	Specify Actions	Within three years	1	Increase the frequency of comprehensive inspections for fuel tanks that are located below grade or partially below grade; and
F-1	Support of Existing TSSA Requirements		Standards and Safety Authority	Specify Actions	As required	2	Forward all information related to fuel tank inspections in vulnerable areas to the municipality in which the tank is located, including the number of inspections and any deficiencies identified; and
	Requirements		Municipality	Specify Actions	Annually	3	Report to the Source Protection Authority on the information provided by the Technical Standards and Safety Authority.
F-2	Prohibition of future facilities regulated under O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil)	Where the storage of liquid fuel at a facility as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil) made under the <i>Technical Standards and Safety Act</i> , 2000 would be a significant drinking water threat:	Crown / Municipality	Section 57	Immediate		ture occurrences of the activity are prohibited under ction 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act,</i> 2006.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
F-3	Existing Fuel Storage	Where any of the following activities is a significant drinking water threat: - the storage of liquid fuel in a tank at a facility as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels) and O. Reg. 213/01 (Fuel Oil) made under the Technical Standards and Safety Act, 2000; and - a facility that manufactures or refines fuel:	Risk Management Official	Section 58	Per G-3	Negotiate and establish a Risk Management Plan as defined in Section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006 for each property on which the activity is being undertaken.
F-4	Prohibition of future facilities regulated under O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels)	Where any of the following activities would be a significant drinking water threat: - storage of liquid fuel in a tank at a facility as defined in Section 1 of O. Reg. 217/01 (Liquid Fuels) made under the Technical Standards and Safety Act, 2000; and - a facility that manufactures or refines fuel:	Crown	Section 57	Immediate	Future occurrences of the activity are prohibited under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006.

DENSE NON-AQUEOUS PHASE LIQUID (DNAPL) AND ORGANIC SOLVENT THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date	Requirements
C-1	Risk Management Plans for Existing DNAPL and Organic Solvent Threats	Where the handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid and /or the handling and storage of an organic solvent are a significant drinking water threat:	Risk Management Official	Section 58	Per G-3	Negotiate and establish a Risk Management Plan as defined in Section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006 with the person engaging in the activity.
C-2	Prohibition of Future DNAPL and Organic Solvent Threats	Where the handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid or the handling and storage of an organic solvent would be a significant drinking water threat:	Crown / Municipality	Section 57	Immediate	Future occurrences of the activity are prohibited under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006.

MANAGEMENT OF RUNOFF FROM AIRCRAFT DE-ICING THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
	Prohibition	S	Crown / Municipality	Section 57	Immediate	1	Future occurrences of the activity are prohibited under Section 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006.
P-1	of Future Aircraft De-Icing	that contains chemicals used in the de-icing of aircraft is a significant drinking water threat:	Landowner	Specify Actions	As required	2	Notify the municipality during the planning phase of an airport.

WASTE DISPOSAL THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance D	ate	Requirements
W-1	Existing Certificates of Approval	Where the operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act is a significant drinking water	Ministry of the Environment	Prescribed Instrument	Within one year	1	Review the Certificate of Approval for the waste disposal site to determine if it is adequate to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat. If the Certificate of Approval is deemed to be inadequate for this purpose, it will be amended to include additional conditions that will ensure that the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat.
		threat:		Specify Actions	Annually	2	Report to the Source Protection Authority on the status of the review of the Certificate of Approval and any orders issued as a result of an inspection during the reporting year.
W-2	Future Certificates of Approval	Where the operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> would be a significant drinking water threat:	Ministry of the Environment	Prescribed Instrument	Immediate	Not issue any Certificate of Approval for future occurre of the activity.	

SNOW STORAGE THREAT POLICIES

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
0-1	Existing Snow	Where the storage of snow is a significant drinking water threat, and the snow is stored at a snow storage facility:	Landowner	Specify Actions	Within one year (relocation within two years where feasible)	1	Assess the feasibility of relocating the snow storage facility to an area where it would not be a significant drinking water threat. If an appropriate alternate site is identified, the snow storage facility will be relocated to the alternate site.
	Storage		Risk Management Official	Section 58	Per G-3	2	If an appropriate alternate site is not identified per clause (1), the Risk Management Official will negotiate and establish a Risk Management Plan as defined in Section 58 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006 for each property on which the activity is occurring.
0-2	Future Snow Storage	Where the storage of snow would be a significant drinking water threat:	Crown / Municipality	Section 57	Immediate		ire occurrences of the activity are prohibited under ion 57 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , 2006.

LOCAL THREAT POLICIES: LANDSCAPING THAT PROMOTES THE CONGREGATION OF WATERFOWL

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
L-1	Landscaping that promotes the congregation	Where maintaining open areas of mown grass for recreational activities that promote the congregation of waterfowl within or near	Municipality	Specify Actions	Initiated within one year, completed within three years	1	Develop a waterfowl management plan to reduce the presence of waterfowl on properties owned by the municipality. The plan must follow an adaptive approach to waterfowl management that includes habitat modification and ongoing monitoring of the plan's effectiveness. The plan may include, but is not limited to site alterations to reduce the attractiveness of the property to waterfowl, such as planting of shoreline vegetation, and installation of physical barriers. Post signage at any areas frequently used by the public
	of waterfowl	surface water bodies is or would be a significant drinking water threat:				2	to feed waterfowl that indicate that the feeding of waterfowl is prohibited.
					Annually	3	Report to the Source Protection Authority on the activities undertaken as part of the waterfowl management plan and the results of any related monitoring activities.
					Within one year	4	Establish a by-law to prohibit the feeding of waterfowl at parks and mown areas.

LOCAL THREAT POLICIES: CONVEYANCE OF OIL BY WAY OF A PIPELINE

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
L-2	Conveyance of oil by	Where the conveyance of oil by way of a pipeline is a	Owner of	Specify Actions	Within one year	they cross The a. Sp wl b. A c. Tl d. Pr m	ew their relevant emergency response plans or procedures to ensure that are adequate to respond to a pipeline rupture in an area where the pipeline ses a body of open water. emergency response plan must include, at a minimum: Decific procedures for responding to a pipeline rupture in an area there the pipeline crosses a body of open water; communications protocol; the location of available spill response materials; and rovisions to immediately notify the affected water treatment plant and unicipality in the event of a pipeline rupture.
L-Z	way of a pipeline	significant drinking water	pipeline		Within one year	2	vide a summary to the Source Protection Authority of any updates to existing ergency plans made to address a pipeline rupture.
		threat:			As required	-	ort to the Source Protection Authority regarding any activation of the ergency response plan for activities undertaken as a result of a pipeline cure.
					Annually	4 Revi	ew and update the emergency response plans.
					Annually	5	duct practice exercises and/or emergency response scenarios related to the ergency response plan.
					As required	h	fy the potentially affected municipality and water treatment plant prior to pipeline maintenance activities.

No.	Name	Applicable Area & Activity	Delivery Agent	Tool	Compliance Date		Requirements
L-2	Conveyance of oil by way of a pipeline	Where the conveyance of oil by way of a pipeline is a significant drinking water threat:	Municipality	Specify Actions	Within one year Within one year	2	Review their relevant emergency response plans or procedures to ensure that they are adequate to respond to a pipeline rupture in an area where the pipeline crosses a body of open water. The emergency response plan must include, at a minimum: a. Specific procedures for responding to a pipeline rupture in an area where the pipeline crosses a body of open water; b. A communications protocol; and c. The location of available spill response materials. Provide a summary to the Source Protection Authority of any updates to existing emergency plans made to address a pipeline rupture.
					As required	3	Report to the Source Protection Authority regarding any activation of the emergency response plan for activities undertaken as a result of a pipeline rupture.
					Annually	4	Review and update the emergency response plans.

Exhibit G Page 1 of 4

Notes re: Policy Applicability Table

S-1: "Policy only applies for sewage systems as defined in section 1 of O. Reg. 350/06 (Building Code) made under the *Building Code Act, 1992*"

S-2: "Policy only applies for sewage works as defined in section 1 of the *Ontario Water Resources Act."*

A-1: "Policy only applies for activities that <u>do not</u> require a Nutrient Management Plan or Strategy, or a Pesticide Permit"

A-2: "Policy only applies for activities that require a Nutrient Management Plan or Strategy, or a Pesticide Permit"

Note re: Policies for Existing Activities

The Policy Applicability Table identifies policies for existing activities based on the threats assessment completed for the Amended Proposed Assessment Reports. While this assessment was comprehensive, a policy will still apply to an existing activity that was missed in the threats assessment (and is thus not shown as "applicable" in the table).

Notes re: Acronyms

E – Existing Activities

F – Future Activities

GW – Groundwater

SW – Surface Water

	Plan							(I)					Exhibit G						
			MP					Emergency Response	u					Pa	age	2	of 4	1	
			Relocation or RMP		,	Waterfowl Mgmt.	re	y Res	Land Acquisition			ort	ort						
			atior	on 57	on 57	rfow	cultu	genc	Acqu	Incentives		-Supp	-Supp		Supp	E&O-Support	Stora	Hand	on 59
			Reloc	Section	Section 57	Wate	Aquaculture	Emer	Land	Incer	RMP	RMP-Support	RMP-Support	E&0	E&O-Support	E&O-	Fuel Storage	Fuel Handling	Section !
			E	F	F	E/F	F	E	E/F	E/F	E able f	Е	E	E/F	E/F	E/F	E	Е	F
										Applic	able i	roncie	5						
Municipality	System	Source Type		Sno	w Stoi	rage		Pipeline			General								
		,,,,	0.1		D 4		A 5		C 1	6.2	6.2	C 4	0.5	0.6	6.7			C 40	C 11
	Birch Point	GW	0-1	0-2	P-1	L-1	A-5	L-2	G-1	G-2	G-3	G-4	G-5	G-6	G-/	G-8	G-9	G-10	G-11
	Canadiana Shores	GW																	
	Janetville King's Bay	GW GW																	
	Manorview	GW																	
	Mariposa Estates	GW																$\vdash \vdash \vdash$	
	Pinewood Pleasant Point	GW GW																	
	Sonya	GW																	
City of Kawartha Lakes	Victoria Glen Victoria Place	GW GW																	
	Woodfield	GW																	
	Woods of Manilla	GW																	
	Bobcaygeon Fenelon Falls	SW SW																	
	Kinmount	SW																	
	Lindsay	SW																	
	Norland Southview Estates	SW SW																	
City of Peterborough	Peterborough	SW																	
6"	Bayside	SW																	
City of Quinte West	Frankford Trenton	SW SW																	
Township of Douro-Dummer	Lakefield	SW																	
	Peterborough 	SW																	
Municipality of Asphodel- Norwood	Hastings Norwood	SW GW																	
Municipality of Brighton	Brighton	GW																	
Municipality of Highlands East	Cardiff	GW																	
	Dyno Estates Marmora	GW																	
Mun. of Marmora and Lake		SW																	
Municipality of Port Hope	Port Hope Campbellford	SW SW																	
Municipality of Trent Hills	Hastings	SW																	
. ,	Warkworth	SW																	
	Blackstock Greenbank	GW GW																\vdash	
Regional Municipality of	Mariposa Estates	GW																	
Durham	Newcastle	SW																	
	Orono Port Perry	GW GW																	
Town of Cobourg	Cobourg	SW																	
Town of Port Hope	Cobourg	SW																	
Township of Alnwick-	Newcastle	SW																	
Haldimand	Grafton	GW																	
Township of Cavan	Fraserville	GW																igwdap	
Monaghan Township of Cramahe	Millbrook Colborne	GW GW																	
	Alpine Village	GW																	
Township of Galway- Cavendish and Harvey	Buckhorn Lake Estates	GW																	
,	Kinmount Camborne	SW GW																 	
Township of Hamilton	Cobourg	SW																	
Township of Hamilton	Creighton Heights	GW																 	
Township of HBM	Port Hope Havelock	SW GW																	
	Kinmount	SW																	
Township of Minden Hills	Lutterworth Pines	GW																	
Township of Otonabee-South	Minden Crystal Springs	GW GW																	
Monaghan	Keene Heights	GW																	
Township of Smith-Ennismore		SW																	
Lakefield	Peterborough	SW																	
Township of Stirling-Rawdon	Stirling	GW																	

			Prescribed Instrument	PI- No New C of A	Prescribed Instrument	Section 57	Aquaculture	OBC - Reporting on Inspecti	OWRA - Review C of A	OWRA - No New C of A	OBC - Connection to Munic	OBC - Future On-Site Requi	Collection Facilities	Collection Facilities - No Ne	SWM Facility - Review C of	Other Sewage - No New Co
Munic	System Source Type		E	F /aste	E Dispos	F sal Site	F es	E/F	Е	F	E	F Sewag	E e	F	Е	F
			W-1	W-2	N-1	N-2	A-5	S-1	S-2	S-3	S-4	S-5	S-6	S-7	S-8	S-9
	Birch Point Canadiana Shores	GW GW													$\vdash\vdash$	
	Janetville	GW														
	King's Bay	GW														
	Manorview	GW														
	Mariposa Estates	GW					-									
	Pinewood Pleasant Point	GW GW														
	Sonya	GW														
City of Kawartha Lakes	Victoria Glen	GW														
	Victoria Place	GW														
	Woodfield	GW					_								\vdash	
	Woods of Manilla Bobcaygeon	GW SW													$\vdash\vdash\vdash$	
	Fenelon Falls	SW														
	Kinmount	SW														
	Lindsay	SW														
	Norland	SW														
City of Datashasayah	Southview Estates Peterborough	SW														
City of Peterborough	Bayside	SW SW														
City of Quinte West	Frankford	SW														
	Trenton	SW														
Township of Douro-Dummer	Lakefield	SW														
	Peterborough	SW														
Municipality of Asphodel-	Hastings	SW					_									
Norwood Municipality of Brighton	Norwood	GW					<u> </u>								\vdash	
	Brighton Cardiff	GW GW					\vdash								\vdash	
Municipality of Highlands East	Dyno Estates	GW														
Mun. of Marmora and Lake	Marmora	SW														
Municipality of Port Hope	Port Hope	SW														
	Campbellford	SW														
Municipality of Trent Hills	Hastings Warkworth	SW														
	Blackstock	SW GW					┢								\vdash	
	Greenbank	GW														
Regional Municipality of	Mariposa Estates	GW														
Durham	Newcastle	SW														
	Orono	GW					_								\square	
Town of Cobourg	Port Perry Cobourg	GW SW					-									
	Cobourg	SW														
Town of Port Hope	Newcastle	SW							Ì							
Township of Alnwick- Haldimand	Grafton	GW														
Township of Cavan	Fraserville	GW														
Monaghan	Millbrook	GW														
Township of Cramahe	Colborne	GW														
Township of Galway-	Alpine Village	GW													\square	
Cavendish and Harvey	Buckhorn Lake Estates Kinmount	GW SW					-								$\vdash\vdash\vdash$	
	Camborne	GW														
Taxonakin of the colle	Cobourg	SW														
Township of Hamilton	Creighton Heights	GW														
	Port Hope	SW													igsqcut	
Township of HBM	Havelock	GW													\longmapsto	
Township of Minden Hills	Kinmount Lutterworth Pines	SW GW					-								$\vdash\vdash\vdash$	
rownship of Millaen Hills	Minden	GW													$\vdash\vdash\vdash$	
Township of Otonabee-South		GW														
Monaghan	Keene Heights	GW														
Township of Smith-Ennismore		SW														
Lakefield	Peterborough	SW													igsqcut	
Township of Stirling-Rawdon	Stirling	GW														

														E	Exhibit G					
					eats										age	,	of 4	1 a		
				nent	All Ag. Threats	u										Research on Salt Alternati		- Salt Storage		
				Prescribed Instrument	All Ag	AWSA Certification				SA		Ь	57	ив	& Na Monitoring	Salt A	Future Construction	alt Si		
				ed In	1	ertifi	ture		27	- TSSA		213/217- RMP	- Section 57	Salt Mgmt Plan	Mon	no r	onsti	57 - 5		
			Ь	scrib	Section 57	SA C	Aquaculture	Д	Section 57	213/217		/217	- Se	Mgr	& Na	earck	ure C	Section 57		
			RMP				-	RMP			213		217		Ċ					
			E	E	F	E	F	Е	F	E	F	Е	F	E/F	E/F	E/F	F	F		
Munic	System	Source Type			ricultu			Chen	nicals			ıel			R	oad Sa	ılt			
	Birch Point	GW	A-1	A-2	A-3	A-4	A-5	C-1	C-2	F-1	F-2	F-3	F-4	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5		
	Canadiana Shores	GW																		
	Janetville	GW																		
	King's Bay Manorview	GW GW																		
	Mariposa Estates	GW																		
	Pinewood	GW																		
	Pleasant Point Sonya	GW GW																		
City of Kawartha Lakes	Victoria Glen	GW																		
	Victoria Place	GW																		
	Woodfield Woods of Manilla	GW GW					<u> </u>													
	Bobcaygeon	SW					 													
	Fenelon Falls	SW																		
	Kinmount	SW																		
	Lindsay Norland	SW SW																		
	Southview Estates	SW																		
City of Peterborough	Peterborough	SW																		
City of Quinte West	Bayside Frankford	SW SW																		
City of Quinte West	Trenton	SW																		
Township of Douro-Dummer	Lakefield	SW																		
·	Peterborough	SW SW																		
Municipality of Asphodel- Norwood	Hastings Norwood	GW																		
Municipality of Brighton	Brighton	GW																		
Municipality of Highlands East	Cardiff	GW																		
	Dyno Estates Marmora	GW SW																		
Municipality of Port Hope	Port Hope	SW																		
	Campbellford	SW																		
Municipality of Trent Hills	Hastings Warkworth	SW SW																		
	Blackstock	GW																		
	Greenbank	GW																		
Regional Municipality of	Mariposa Estates	GW																		
Durham	Newcastle Orono	SW GW																		
	Port Perry	GW																		
Town of Cobourg	Cobourg	SW																		
Town of Port Hope	Cobourg Newcastle	SW SW																		
Township of Alnwick-	Grafton	GW																		
Haldimand Township of Cavan	Fraserville	GW																		
Township of Cavan Monaghan	Millbrook	GW																		
Township of Cramahe	Colborne	GW																		
Township of Galway-	Alpine Village	GW																		
Cavendish and Harvey	Buckhorn Lake Estates Kinmount	GW SW					-													
	Camborne	GW																		
Township of Hamilton	Cobourg	SW																		
· ·	Creighton Heights Port Hope	GW SW					-													
Township of HBM	Havelock	GW																		
·	Kinmount	SW																		
Township of Minden Hills	Lutterworth Pines	GW					<u> </u>													
Township of Otonabee-South	Minden Crystal Springs	GW GW																		
-	Keene Heights	GW																		
Township of Smith-Ennismore		SW																		
Lakefield	Peterborough	SW																		
Township of Stirling-Rawdon	Stirling	GW																		