

## **SPP Explanatory Document Suggested Changes Review**

Staff have been keeping a log of all changes to date to the Explanatory Document. These changes are colour coded to make review and discussion easier. Please refer to the legend below. Not all changes in the table will be reviewed during the meeting. Staff have selected changes to review that are most representative of the changes being made and/or may generate discussion. These changes are highlighted in dark green. Please feel free to request additional changes for discussion as we go through the tables.

### **Legend**

White Cells- original text

Grey cells- new text

Magenta highlight- area of original policy text to be changed (not yet reviewed by SPC)

Blue highlight- area of new policy text (not yet reviewed by SPC)

Dark Green highlight- change selected for discussion at SPC meeting

**Table 1 Existing Significant Prescribed Threat System Summary for Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region (original)**

Type of Threat	Number and Locations for Potential Significant Threats		
	Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area	Upper Thames River Source Protection Area	Region Total
The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act	-	7	7
The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage	30	384	414
Application of agricultural source material (ASM) to the land	5	68	73
Storage of ASM	1	11	12
Application of non-agricultural source material (NASM) to the land	5	26	31
Application of commercial fertilizer to the land	4	36	40
Handling and storage of commercial fertilizer	2	9	11
Application of pesticides to the land	2	40	42
Handling and storage of pesticides	3	7	10
Handling and storage of fuel	49	203	252
Handling and storage of dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs)	7	285	292
Handling and storage of organic solvents	2	5	7
The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard	2	11	13
Total	112	1092	1204
*There are no existing significant prescribed threats located within the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area			

**Table 2 Existing Significant Prescribed Threat System Summary for Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region (revised)**

Type of Threat	Number and Locations for Potential Significant Threats			
	Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area	St. Clair Region Source Protection Area	Upper Thames River Source Protection Area	Region Total
The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act	6	-	31	37
The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage	68	-	349	417
Application of agricultural source material (ASM) to the land	9	-	84	93
Storage of ASM	0	-	10	10
Application of non-agricultural source material (NASM) to the land	13	-	36	49
Application of commercial fertilizer to the land	5	-	67	72
Handling and storage of commercial fertilizer	3	6	21	30
Application of pesticides to the land	10	-	51	61
Handling and storage of pesticides	3	-	18	21
Handling and storage of fuel	6	13	59	78
Handling and storage of dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs)	14	-	172	186
Handling and storage of organic solvents	2	-	32	34
The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard	2	-	19	21
Total	141	19	949	1109
* Some parcels contain multiple threats and may result in the duplication of parcel counts				

**Table 2 Significant Local Threats in St. Clair Region Source Protection Area (original and revised)**

Original Table			New Table		
Local Threat	Volume	Intake Affected	Local Threat	Volume	Intake Affected
Tanker truck of fuel spill	34 000 L	Petrolia and LAWSS	Tanker truck of fuel spill	15,000 L	Petrolia
			Tanker truck of fuel spill	34 000 L	Petrolia, LAWSS and Wallaceburg
			Tanker truck of fuel spill	68,000 L	Wallaceburg
Fuel spill from a ship	1 million L	LAWSS, Wallaceburg	Fuel spill from a ship	1 million L	LAWSS
Fertilizer spill	30 000 kg Urea (46% nitrogen)	Wallaceburg	Fertilizer spill	34 000 kg Urea (46% nitrogen)	Wallaceburg
Pipeline rupture	275 000 L	Wallaceburg	Pipeline rupture	275 000 L	Wallaceburg

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
1.3	3	The Source Protection Plan must include policies which address activities set out in the Assessment Report that are or would be significant drinking water threats. The total number of significant prescribed threats found within the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region are: 1092 in the Upper Thames River; 112 in the Lower Thames Valley; and none in the St. Clair Region Source Protection Areas, as shown in the following tables.		
1.3	3	The Source Protection Plan must include policies which address activities set out in the Assessment Report that are or would be significant drinking water threats. The total number of significant prescribed threats found within the Thames-Sydenham and Region Source Protection Region are: 949 in the Upper Thames River; 141 in the Lower Thames Valley; and 19 in the St. Clair Region Source Protection Areas, as shown in the following tables.	# of threats has been further studied and refined	Threats #s corrected
1.3.1	6	Threat Policy Discussion Papers were not developed for two threat categories; management of agricultural source material (aquaculture), and water quantity threats. The decision to not develop a discussion paper on the management of agricultural source material (aquaculture) was based on the lack of existing operations identified through the Assessment Report process and that the Ministry of Environment Tables of Drinking Water Threats recognizes this activity cannot be a significant threat in the Thames-Sydenham and Region based on vulnerability score. Water quantity discussion papers were not developed because they are only relevant in areas where Tier 3 water budgets have been completed (a task that has not been fulfilled at this time).		
1.3.1	6	Threat Policy Discussion Papers were not developed for two threat categories; management of agricultural source material (aquaculture), and water quantity threats. The decision to not develop a discussion paper on the management of agricultural source material (aquaculture) was based on the lack of existing operations identified through the Assessment Report process and that the Ministry of Environment Tables of Drinking Water Threats recognizes this activity cannot be a significant threat in the Thames-Sydenham and Region based on vulnerability score. Water quantity discussion papers were not developed because the Tier 3 water budget has been completed and did not identify any areas where activities could pose significant or moderate risks to municipal drinking water systems.	Text refers to Tier 3 water budgets not being completed.	Updated now that tier 3 water budget has been completed.
1.3.2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 59 Restricted Land Use - a tool to screen new Planning Act applications or building permits within vulnerable areas to ensure activities that have been prohibited do not occur and to provide notice before allowing regulated activities.</li> </ul>		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
1.3.2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 59 Restricted Land Use - a tool to screen new Planning Act, and Condominium Act applications or building permits within vulnerable areas to ensure activities that have been prohibited do not occur and to provide notice before allowing regulated activities.</li> </ul>	Missing Condominium Act	Added Condominium Act
1.3.2	9	During the pre-consultation phase of the policy development process, Oxford County also reviewed and considered the draft policies circulated for comment by the TSR SPC, particularly those related to non-significant threat policies e.g. low and moderate threats and transport pathways. Given that as non-significant threat policies were not required to be addressed to the same extent by the LER SPC, Oxford simply chose to incorporate a number of the relevant policies developed by the TSR SPC into their proposed SPP policies for the TSR in an effort to achieve as much policy consistency as possible across that Region.		
1.3.2	9	During the pre-consultation phase of the policy development process, Oxford County also reviewed and considered the draft policies circulated for comment by the TSR SPC, particularly those related to non-significant threat policies e.g. low and moderate threats and transport pathways. Given that non-significant threat policies were not required to be addressed to the same extent by the LER SPC, Oxford simply chose to incorporate a number of the relevant policies developed by the TSR SPC into their proposed SPP policies for the TSR in an effort to achieve as much policy consistency as possible across that Region.	grammar	Removed the word 'as'.
1.4	10	Pre-consultation took place within the Thames-Sydenham and Region during April 1, 2012 to June 1, 2012. Consultation on the draft Source Protection Plan occurred in August and September, 2012 and the proposed Source Protection Plan consultation occurred in November to December 2012.		
1.4	10	Pre-consultation took place within the Thames-Sydenham and Region during April 1, 2012 to June 1, 2012. Consultation on the draft Source Protection Plan occurred in August and September, 2012 and the proposed Source Protection Plan consultation occurred in November and December 2012.	grammar	Replaced the word 'to' with the word 'and'.
4.1.1	20	<p>These programs should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>place a high priority on on-site septic systems including moderate and low threats;</li> <li>identify target audiences, including but not limited to: landowners; municipalities; municipal departments such as fire departments and water operators; road authorities; fuel distributors; rail operators; and private contractors (snow);</li> <li>consider partnership opportunities with agencies for the efficient delivery of education and outreach programs. Potential partners will include but are not limited to: Technical Standards and Safety Authority; Ontario Farm Environmental Coalition; Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs; Ontario Marine Operators Association; and the Ontario Ministry of Transportation Road Authorities; and</li> <li>encourage businesses and industries (both regulated and non-regulated under O. Reg. 224/07) to prepare, review and update, when required, Spill Prevention Plans and Spill Contingency Plans to ensure the protection of municipal drinking water has been addressed.</li> </ul>		
4.1.1	20	<p>These programs should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>place a high priority on on-site septic systems including moderate and low threats;</li> <li>include activities which may be expected to contribute to an issue even in the absence of an Issues Contributing Area (ICA)</li> <li>identify target audiences, including but not limited to: landowners; municipalities; municipal departments such as fire departments and water operators; road authorities; fuel distributors; rail operators; and private</li> </ul>		General E&O policy has been adjusted to include activities which may contribute to an issue to add an E&O complement to the Nitrate and Microcystin monitoring policies.

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		<p>contractors (snow);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider partnership opportunities with agencies for the efficient delivery of education and outreach programs. Potential partners will include but are not limited to: Technical Standards and Safety Authority; Ontario Farm Environmental Coalition; Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs; Ontario Marine Operators Association; and the Ontario Ministry of Transportation Road Authorities; and</li> <li>encourage businesses and industries (both regulated and non-regulated under O. Reg. 224/07) to prepare, review and update, when required, Spill Prevention Plans and Spill Contingency Plans to ensure the protection of municipal drinking water has been addressed.</li> </ul>		
4.1.2	21	<p>It was felt that consideration should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The importance of transport pathway maintenance and decommissioning;</li> <li>Existing septic systems identified through phase 1 re-inspection as being in need of repair, replacement or improvement and that have not been issued an order; and</li> <li>Supporting well and septic system inspections and basic water quality tests.</li> </ul>		
4.1.2	21	<p>It was felt that consideration should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The importance of transport pathway maintenance and decommissioning;</li> <li>Existing septic systems identified through phase 1 re-inspection as being in need of repair, replacement or improvement and that have not been issued an order;</li> <li>Activities contributing to an Issue; and</li> <li>Supporting well and septic system inspections and basic water quality tests.</li> </ul>		<p>Incentive programs policy has been adjusted to include activities which may contribute to an issue.</p>
4.1.3	21	<p>The <i>Planning Act</i> provides the legislative framework for land use planning in Ontario and sets out how land uses may be regulated. Municipalities can direct or limit the location and types of land use within their boundaries through tools such as official plans, zoning by-laws, site plan control, plan of subdivision, and consents. The SPP contains general land use planning policies (Policy 1.06 and OC-1.05) indicating that Planning authorities and municipalities are required to be consistent with significant threat policies as per Section 39 of the CWA, and have regard for moderate and low threat policies as per Section 39 (1) (b) of the CWA, in their land use planning decision-making process.</p>		
4.1.3	21	<p>The <i>Planning Act</i> provides the legislative framework for land use planning in Ontario and sets out how land uses may be regulated. Municipalities can direct or limit the location and types of land use within their boundaries through tools such as official plans, zoning by-laws, site plan control, plans of subdivision, and consents. The SPP contains general land use planning policies (Policy 1.06 and OC-1.05) indicating that Planning authorities and municipalities are required to conform with significant threat policies as per Section 39 of the CWA, and have regard for moderate and low threat policies as per Section 39 (1) (b) of the CWA, in their land use planning decision-making process.</p>	<p>grammar incorrect wording</p>	<p>Changed 'plan' to 'plans'. Changed 'be consistent' to 'conform'.</p>
4.1.4	22	<p>Implementation Timing is discussed in Section 2.3.2 of Volume II and III of the Source Protection Plan. In establishing the implementation timing, the SPC wanted to simplify the timing as much as possible to ensure that the policies could be effectively implemented. As such, a general timing policy was developed (Policy 1.09) which identifies the implementation timing by type of policy. Exceptions to the general timing are noted in individual policies.</p>		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
4.1.4	22	Implementation Timing is discussed in Section 2.3.3 of Volume II and III of the Source Protection Plan. In establishing the implementation timing, the SPC wanted to simplify the timing as much as possible to ensure that the policies could be effectively implemented. As such, a general timing policy was developed (O.C.-1.02 and Policy 1.09) which identifies the implementation timing by type of policy. Exceptions to the general timing are noted in individual policies.	Incorrect section reference.	Changed section reference from '2.3.2' to '2.3.3'.
4.1.4	23	As Official Plans and Zoning By-Laws are the primary documents governing local land use decisions, the SPC felt it important to ensure the that these land use planning documents are amended to reflect and/or the applicable Source Protection Plan policies as soon as possible. Such references will serve an important role in ensuring that future land uses do not become significant threats to drinking water. This is particularly true for those policies where land use planning is the primary tool to prevent future activities from becoming a significant threat, such as new septic systems. Land use planning documents also serve as an important tool for communicating land use restrictions that might be associated with activities that are prohibited, regulated or otherwise restricted by the policies of the Source Protection Plan using other tools, such as Part IV prohibition.		
4.1.4	23	As Official Plans and Zoning By-Laws are the primary documents governing local land use decisions, the SPC felt it important to ensure that these land use planning documents are amended to reflect the applicable Source Protection Plan policies as soon as possible. Such references will serve an important role in ensuring that future land uses do not become significant threats to drinking water. This is particularly true for those policies where land use planning is the primary tool to prevent future activities from becoming a significant threat, such as new septic systems. Land use planning documents also serve as an important tool for communicating land use restrictions that might be associated with activities that are prohibited, regulated or otherwise restricted by the policies of the Source Protection Plan using other tools, such as Part IV prohibition.	Text corrections	Removed the word 'the' and the words 'and/or'.
4.1.4	23	Within Oxford County, except where otherwise stated in the implementation timing policies (OC-1.02) or specifically set out in the Clean Water Act, all policies in the SPP come into effect at such time as the Ministry of Environment approves the Source Protection Plan and posts the notice of approval on the Environmental Registry. The policies pertaining to new/future threats will be implemented immediately. However, the majority of the existing threat policies and some of the new/future threat policies will take additional time to fully implement due to other legislative requirements and timelines that must be met, the time required to develop and implement new programs, and budgetary constraints. As such, this policy specifies implementation timing for these various policies, so that they are not required to be implemented immediately upon approval of the Source Protection Plan		
4.1.4	23	Within Oxford County, except where otherwise stated in the implementation timing policies (OC-1.02) or specifically set out in the Clean Water Act, all policies in the SPP come into effect on the effective date of the Source Protection Plan. The policies pertaining to new/future threats will be implemented immediately. However, the majority of the existing threat policies and some of the new/future threat policies will take additional time to fully implement due to other legislative requirements and timelines that must be met, the time required to develop and implement new programs, and budgetary constraints. As such, this policy specifies implementation timing for these various policies, so that they are not required to be implemented immediately upon approval of the Source Protection Plan.	Clarity of wording	Plan comes in to effect on 'effective date'.
4.1.5	24	In developing the policies of the Source Protection Plan, the SPC identified terms which it felt were important to the understanding of the policies. Definitions for 'existing' and 'future' activities have been included in Policy 1.11 and OC-1.01 to ensure the policies for existing and future threats are applied as intended. Several terms are referenced and explained in the rationale section of this document and in the glossary. Thames-Sydenham Region included terms used in policy such as "handling" and "temporary" in the interpretation sections of Volume III, while Oxford County included terms used in policy directly within its definition policy (OC-1.01).		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
4.1.5	24	In developing the policies of the Source Protection Plan, the SPC identified terms which it felt were important to the understanding of the policies. Definitions for 'existing' and 'new or future' activities have been included in Policy 1.11 and OC-1.01 to ensure the policies for existing and new or future threats are applied as intended. Several terms are referenced and explained in the rationale section of this document and in the glossary. Thames-Sydenham Region included terms used in policy such as "handling" and "temporary" in the interpretation sections of Volume III, while Oxford County included terms used in policy directly within its definition policy (OC-1.01).	Sometimes the word 'new' is used but sometimes the word 'future' is used.	Refer to 'new/future' here to indicate either may be used throughout the SPP documents.
4.1.5	24	The definitions of existing and future activities were determined to be critical to the understanding of the specific circumstance under which an existing or future policy would apply to a threat activity, which is particularly important in instances where the policy approaches for 'existing' and 'future' activities differ. For example, in most cases, future occurrences of a particular significant threat activity are prohibited, while existing occurrences are managed.		
4.1.5	24	The definitions of existing and future activities were determined to be critical to the understanding of the specific circumstance under which an existing or future policy would apply to a threat activity, which is particularly important in instances where the policy approaches for 'existing' and 'new or future' activities differ. For example, in most cases, future occurrences of a particular significant threat activity are prohibited, while existing occurrences are managed.	Sometimes the word 'new' is used but sometimes the word 'future' is used.	Refer to 'new/future' here to indicate either may be used throughout the SPP documents.
4.1.5	24	Replacements, modifications and expansions are considered existing if changes to the activity do not change the level of threat of the activity, unless otherwise noted in threat-specific policy. For example if the changes were proposed to a significant threat, it should generally be considered existing, however if the changes resulted in a moderate threat being changed to significant, this should generally be considered as a future threat as this would create a new significant threat. To further clarify the point at which an activity or threat may be considered existing, transitional provisions policies were also developed. A specific policy dealing with replacements, modifications and expansions was included in previous versions of Oxford's policies, however, it was removed based on discussions with MOE. These discussions concluded that policies were not necessary to specifically allow for replacements, modification and expansions to existing significant threats, particularly in cases where Part IV or Prescribed Instrument policies were used. For policies where it was determined that specific provisions for replacements, modifications and expansions were necessary (such as where land use planning tools were used), specific wording was added to those policies.		
4.1.5	24	Replacements, modifications and expansions are considered existing if changes to the activity do not change the level of threat of the activity, unless otherwise noted in threat-specific policy. For example if the changes were proposed to a significant threat, it should generally be considered existing, however if the changes resulted in a moderate threat being changed to significant, this should generally be considered as a future threat as this would create a new significant threat. To further clarify the point at which an activity or threat may be considered existing, transitional provisions policies were also developed. A specific policy dealing with replacements, modifications and expansions was included in previous versions of Oxford's policies, however, it was removed based on discussions with MOE. These discussions concluded that policies were not necessary to specifically allow for replacements, modifications and expansions to existing significant threats, particularly in cases where Part IV or Prescribed Instrument policies were used. For policies where it was determined that specific provisions for replacements, modifications and expansions were necessary (such as where land use planning tools were used), specific wording was added to those policies.	Grammar edit	Changed 'modification' to 'modifications'.
4.1.5	25	Policies 1.10 and OC1.03 outline transitional provisions which establish what proposals for future activities may continue to proceed subject to the policies which pertain to existing threats. Transitional provisions and related definitions e.g. 'existing' and 'new/future' are intended to define the point in time and/or circumstances (e.g. stage in		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		<p>the development approval process) under which a significant <b>treat</b> activity is to be considered new/future versus existing for the purposes of applying the significant threat policies in the Source Protection Plan. This distinction becomes important for significant threat activities for which existing and future occurrences are addressed differently by the SPP policies (e.g. managed versus prohibited). Transitional considerations are particularly important for significant threat activities in instances where future occurrences (e.g. not existing as of the date the Source Protection Plan comes into effect) are prohibited, while existing occurrences of that activity are allowed to continue with appropriate risk management. It is important to understand that the transitional provisions do not exempt a significant threat activity from complying with the policies of the Source Protection Plan, but simply clarify whether existing or future policies will apply. Either way, the threat activity will be addressed by SPP policies and will need to satisfy the CWA test of 'ceasing to be or never becoming' a significant drinking water threat. In the case of TSR, this will generally mean that this CWA test will simply need to be satisfied through management of the activity, rather than its prohibition, in the limited circumstances where transition is permitted.</p>		
4.1.5	25	<p>Policies 1.10 and OC1.03 outline transitional provisions which establish what proposals for future activities may continue to proceed subject to the policies which pertain to existing threats. Transitional provisions and related definitions e.g. 'existing' and 'new/future' are intended to define the point in time and/or circumstances (e.g. stage in the development approval process) under which a significant <b>threat</b> activity is to be considered new/future versus existing for the purposes of applying the significant threat policies in the Source Protection Plan. This distinction becomes important for significant threat activities for which existing and future occurrences are addressed differently by the SPP policies (e.g. managed versus prohibited). Transitional considerations are particularly important for significant threat activities in instances where future occurrences (e.g. not existing as of the date the Source Protection Plan comes into effect) are prohibited, while existing occurrences of that activity are allowed to continue with appropriate risk management. It is important to understand that the transitional provisions do not exempt a significant threat activity from complying with the policies of the Source Protection Plan, but simply clarify whether existing or future policies will apply. Either way, the threat activity will be addressed by SPP policies and will need to satisfy the CWA test of 'ceasing to be or never becoming' a significant drinking water threat. In the case of TSR, this will generally mean that this CWA test will simply need to be satisfied through management of the activity, rather than its prohibition, in the limited circumstances where transition is permitted.</p>	Grammar edit	Changed 'treat' to 'threat'.
4.1.5	26	<p>The second transitional circumstance pertains to uses and associated activities that could be established on a property in accordance with existing zoning, with no further local development approvals (e.g. Planning Act or building permit). A number of prescribed significant threat activities (e.g. storage and handling of commercial fertilizer, pesticides, organic solvents, DNAPLs etc.) would not likely require a building permit or any other form of local approval to be established on a property, even after the SPP comes into effect. This is most likely in cases where there are existing buildings and structures on a property that are suitable for the proposed use (e.g. storage of DNAPLs in an existing industrial building). For example, a proponent may have purchased or leased a property zoned for industrial purposes and containing existing industrial buildings, with the specific intent of operating a new industry that requires the handling and storage of DNAPLs as an essential part of their process. Given that there would not likely be any local planning or building permit approvals required, it is quite likely that the proponent would not be aware that their operation involves a significant threat activity regulated by the SPP policies, especially if the local planning documents (OP and Zoning) have not yet been updated to identify the areas and activities that are subject to the SPP policies. Similarly, in such circumstances it may also be very difficult for the implementing body for a particular policy to confirm whether such activity was established after the <b>date SPP approved</b>. For these reasons, the SPC determined that it would be fair and reasonable to give transitional consideration to such activities in such circumstances. However, the SPC also believed it was important to include the <b>proviso</b> that at such time as a Risk Management Official/Inspector has visited the site and documented the <b>treat</b> activities at that time, any</p>		



Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		<p>activities not documented as existing will thereafter be considered future. The intent is that once such inspection has occurred, the owner/operator could no longer claim to be unaware of the SPP restrictions on significant threat activities and the RMO would also have conclusive documentation of the threats that were existing at that point in time. In effect, this would provide a certain 'window' of time for such activities to be established after approval of the SPP and still be evaluated as existing threats. The intent is that the RMO/RMI on-site inspections and existing threat documentation will be conducted as soon as possible after the SPPs are approved. However, given that they will likely be completed on a prioritized basis, the duration of the 'window' for each affected property will vary.</p>		
4.1.5	26	<p>The second transitional circumstance pertains to uses and associated activities that could be established on a property in accordance with existing zoning, with no further local development approvals (e.g. Planning Act or building permit). A number of prescribed significant threat activities (e.g. storage and handling of commercial fertilizer, pesticides, organic solvents, DNAPLs etc.) would not likely require a building permit or any other form of local approval to be established on a property, even after the SPP comes into effect. This is most likely in cases where there are existing buildings and structures on a property that are suitable for the proposed use (e.g. storage of DNAPLs in an existing industrial building). For example, a proponent may have purchased or leased a property zoned for industrial purposes and containing existing industrial buildings, with the specific intent of operating a new industry that requires the handling and storage of DNAPLs as an essential part of their process. Given that there would not likely be any local planning or building permit approvals required, it is quite likely that the proponent would not be aware that their operation involves a significant threat activity regulated by the SPP policies, especially if the local planning documents (OP and Zoning) have not yet been updated to identify the areas and activities that are subject to the SPP policies. Similarly, in such circumstances it may also be very difficult for the implementing body for a particular policy to confirm whether such activity was established after <b>the effective date of the SPP</b>. For these reasons, the SPC determined that it would be fair and reasonable to give transitional consideration to such activities in such circumstances. However, the SPC also believed it was important to include the <b>provision</b> that at such time as a Risk Management Official/Inspector has visited the site and documented the <b>threat</b> activities at that time, any activities not documented as existing will thereafter be considered future. The intent is that once such inspection has occurred, the owner/operator could no longer claim to be unaware of the SPP restrictions on significant threat activities and the RMO would also have conclusive documentation of the threats that were existing at that point in time. In effect, this would provide a certain 'window' of time for such activities to be established after approval of the SPP and still be evaluated as existing threats. The intent is that the RMO/RMI on-site inspections and existing threat documentation will be conducted as soon as possible after the SPPs are approved. However, given that they will likely be completed on a prioritized basis, the duration of the 'window' for each affected property will vary.</p>	<p>Clarity of effective date.</p> <p>Grammar and spelling corrections.</p>	<p><b>Specifically refer to effective date of SPP</b></p> <p><b>Change 'proviso' to 'provision' and 'treat' to 'threat'.</b></p>
4.1.6	27	<p>Only land uses in areas where one or more significant threat activities may be subject to Part IV policies (e.g. Section 57 prohibition or Section 58 risk management plans) may be designated for the purposes of Section 59 restricted land use. The Section 59 (restricted land use) policies in this SPP (Policy 1.07, OC-1.04) are intended to capture all areas and land uses where a significant drinking water threat subject to a Part IV tools are likely to occur, while allowing some flexibility in determining the types of applications that would be required to obtain a notice from the RMO to be considered a complete application and, therefore, permitted to proceed through the planning or building permit review process. The policy designates as restricted land uses all land uses within municipal Official Plans and zoning by-laws in areas where <b>significant</b> drinking water threats that are subject to Part IV policies, with the exception of residential uses. Residential land uses have been excluded, as they are unlikely to be associated with new significant drinking water threat activities that would be prohibited or require risk management plans. As well, given the number of residential properties located within significant threat areas, the volume of residential building permits that the RMO may have been required to review could be considerable while next to none would be subject to policies utilizing prohibition or risk management under part IV of the CWA. The SPC was of the opinion</p>		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		that this could have placed unnecessary pressure on limited RMO/RMI staffing resources, resulting in potential delays in the development approval process and the implementation of other Part IV SPP policies, such as Risk Management Plans for existing activities while offering very minor improvements in the implementation and compliance with Source Protection Plan policies.		
4.1.6	27	Only land uses in areas where one or more significant threat activities may be subject to Part IV policies (e.g. Section 57 prohibition or Section 58 risk management plans) may be designated for the purposes of Section 59 restricted land use. The Section 59 (restricted land use) policies in this SPP (Policy 1.07, OC-1.04) are intended to capture all areas and land uses where a significant drinking water threat subject to a Part IV tools are likely to occur, while allowing some flexibility in determining the types of applications that would be required to obtain a notice from the RMO to be considered a complete application and, therefore, permitted to proceed through the planning or building permit review process. The policy designates as restricted land uses all land uses within municipal Official Plans and zoning by-laws in areas where <b>there are</b> significant drinking water threats that are subject to Part IV policies, with the exception of residential uses. Residential land uses have been excluded, as they are unlikely to be associated with new significant drinking water threat activities that would be prohibited or require risk management plans. As well, given the number of residential properties located within significant threat areas, the volume of residential building permits that the RMO may have been required to review could be considerable while next to none would be subject to policies utilizing prohibition or risk management under part IV of the CWA. The SPC was of the opinion that this could have placed unnecessary pressure on limited RMO/RMI staffing resources, resulting in potential delays in the development approval process and the implementation of other Part IV SPP policies, such as Risk Management Plans for existing activities while offering very minor improvements in the implementation and compliance with Source Protection Plan policies.	Grammar edit	Added the words 'there are'.
4.1.6	28	Policy 1.08 applies the same principles to areas identified through event-based <b>modelled</b> areas. In these areas only those activities which could result in the spills which were modelled are significant threats to drinking water. As a result it was determined to be more appropriate to designate only commercial, industrial, and agricultural. It is unlikely that fuel or fertilizers would be associated with other land use in quantities equal to or greater than those modelled. Therefore, in the areas where fuel and fertilizer storage were identified as significant threats through event-based modelling, only those land uses which are likely to be associated with fuel storage over <b>34,000</b> L or fertilizer storage over <b>30,000</b> kg are designated for the purposes of Section 59. These include commercial, industrial, and agricultural land use.		
4.1.6	28	Policy 1.08 applies the same principles to areas identified through event-based <b>modelling</b> . In these areas only those activities which could result in the spills which were modelled are significant threats to drinking water. As a result it was determined to be more appropriate to designate only commercial, industrial, and agricultural. It is unlikely that fuel or fertilizers would be associated with other land use in quantities equal to or greater than those modelled. Therefore, in the areas where fuel and fertilizer storage were identified as significant threats through event-based modelling, only those land uses which are likely to be associated with fuel storage over <b>15,000</b> L or fertilizer storage over <b>34,000</b> kg are designated for the purposes of Section 59. These include commercial, industrial, and agricultural land use.	Additional quantities have been modelled.	Change '34,000L' to '15,000L'. Corrected from '30,000kg' to '34,000kg'.
4.1.6	28	It is intended that the RMO will develop guidance to assist in refining the types of applications which require a notice to proceed. This guidance could be developed to provide further refinement of the geographic areas, specific land use designations, or the types of permits or applications which require a notice. This will be provided as written direction as referenced in the Restricted Land Use general policies (policies 1-08 and OC-1.04). This guidance will allow the planning authority or building official to determine that the application complies with circumstances included in the guidance and the applicant has demonstrated that a significant threat activity will not be engaged in or will not be affected by the application. If the criteria specified in the policy are satisfied then the site specific land		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		use is not designated for the purposes of Section 59 and therefore a notice is not required from the RMO for the application or approval of the application. This is intended to allow applications which clearly do not involve significant threats to proceed without the involvement of the Risk Management Official. It is anticipated that where there is any doubt as to whether significant threats are affected by the application that it would be referred to the Risk Management Official.		
4.1.6	28	It is intended that the RMO will develop guidance to assist in refining the types of applications which require a notice to proceed. This guidance could be developed to provide further refinement of the geographic areas, specific land use designations, or the types of permits or applications which require a notice. This will be provided as written direction as referenced in the Restricted Land Use general policies (policies 1-08 and OC-1.04). This guidance will allow the planning authority or building official to determine that the application complies with circumstances included in the guidance and the applicant has demonstrated that a significant threat activity will not be engaged in or will not be affected by the application. If the criteria specified in the policy are satisfied then the site specific land use is not designated for the purposes of Section 59 and therefore a notice is not required from the RMO for the application or approval of the application. This is intended to allow applications which clearly do not involve or affect significant threats to proceed without the involvement of the Risk Management Official. It is anticipated that where there is any doubt as to whether significant threats are affected by the application that it would be referred to the Risk Management Official.	Minor text edit.	Add the words 'or affect'.
4.1.6	28	General guidance to RMO on Risk Management Plan requirements, including recommendations for a compliance monitoring program, has been included in Volume II and III Section 2.3.4.		
4.1.6	28	General guidance to RMO on Risk Management Plan requirements, including recommendations for a compliance monitoring program, has been included in Volume II and III Section 2.3.5.	Incorrect section reference	Change section '2.3.4' to '2.3.5'.
4.2	28-29	A variety of factors (including vulnerable area where the activity is located, the vulnerability score assigned to that area, the circumstances related to the activity and the hazard score) determine if a threat is classified as significant, moderate or low. An activity can also be a significant threat in an IPZ (1, 2 or 3) if event-based modelling demonstrates that the contaminant reaches the intake at a concentration that deteriorates the water as a drinking water source. Under events modelled, the storage and handling of similar volumes (34,000L for fuel and 30 000 kg for fertilizer) would be considered significant threats in IPZ within the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area. Policies have been developed for all significant threat activities that currently exist or that could exist in the future. These policies are intended to ensure the activity ceases to be, or never becomes, a significant drinking water threat. The rationale for the significant threat policies are presented by the approaches used as follows:		
4.2	28-29	A variety of factors (including vulnerable area where the activity is located, the vulnerability score assigned to that area, the circumstances related to the activity and the hazard score) determine if a threat is classified as significant, moderate or low. An activity can also be a significant threat in an IPZ if event-based modelling demonstrates that the contaminant reaches the intake at a concentration that deteriorates the water as a drinking water source. Under events modelled, the storage and handling of similar volumes (15,000L for fuel and 34 000 kg for fertilizer) would be considered significant threats in IPZ within the St. Clair Region and Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Areas. Policies have been developed for all significant threat activities that currently exist or that could exist in the future. These policies are intended to ensure the activity ceases to be, or never becomes, a significant drinking water threat. The rationale for the significant threat policies are presented by the approaches used as follows:	Additional quantities have been modelled.  Modelling now completed in an additional SPA.	Corrected from 34,000L to 15,000L.  Corrected from '30,000kg' to '34,000kg'.  Add 'Lower Thames Valley'.
4.2	29	The Tables of Drinking Water Threats establish the hazards associated with each activity. These tables identify the circumstances under which each activity is a significant drinking water threat. They also identify the vulnerable areas within which this activity is a significant drinking water threat. Generally, the policies of the Source Protection Plan do not include specific circumstances; instead they refer to these tables to define the circumstances under		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		which an activity would be a significant drinking water threat.		
4.2	29	The Tables of Drinking Water Threats establish the hazards associated with each activity. These tables identify the circumstances under which each activity is a significant drinking water threat. They also identify the vulnerable areas within which this activity is a significant drinking water threat. Generally, the policies of the Source Protection Plan do not include the specific circumstances under which an activity would be a significant drinking water threat.	Text edit Minor wording change needed.	Added the word 'the'. Removed reference that policies refer to 'tables of circumstance'.
4.2.1	29	Section 57 is a "tool of last resort," for existing activities, and was only used when other options, in the opinion of the SPC, were not able to adequately reduce the threat to municipal drinking water sources and the potential impacts from prohibition of the activity was thought to be reasonable given the circumstances. The activities for which this policy approach was used and the associated rationale are outlined in Table 6 below.		
4.2.1	29	Section 57 is a "tool of last resort," for existing activities, and was only used when other options, in the opinion of the SPC, were not able to adequately reduce the threat to municipal drinking water sources and/or the potential impacts from prohibition of the activity was thought to be reasonable given the circumstances. The activities for which this policy approach was used and the associated rationale are outlined in Table 6 below.	Text edit	Added the word 'or'.

**Table 3 Rationale for the use of Section 57 Prohibition**

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
<p>The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Storage of tailings from mining operations</li> </ul>	2.03 (1634)	Existing and Future Activities	<p>The storage of tailings from mining operations is designated under the Environmental Protection Act and would require an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA); however, this sub-threat is explicitly exempted from Part V of the Environmental Protection Act RRO 1990 Regulation 34 (S.3(1)(6)). Part IV (specifically Section 57) was appropriate to address this “gap” because this sub-threat was not identified as a significant threat occurring within the TSR and there is a strong likelihood that it would not be proposed within this Region in the future. Should a mining activity establish within the region, it would not be appropriate to store or treat tailings from the operation in areas where this would be a significant drinking water threat. Location of this activity in areas where it would not pose a significant threat to drinking water sources is the only alternative considered appropriate for managing the risks associated with this activity. Where PI could be used to accomplish this prohibition it has been used; however, Part IV prohibition was used to ensure that no aspect of this activity could become a significant threat to drinking water sources in this region. There were no concerns over this prohibition identified through pre-consultation with policy implementers.</p> <p>For the purposes of policy simplicity and consistency across the County, Oxford choose to apply the same policy approach to all significant waste threats e.g. to manage existing threats through PI or RMP and prohibit future threats through PI or Part IV. Although Oxford County was supportive of TSR’s rationale for prohibiting existing occurrences of significant storage of mine tailings, the County determined that it was not necessary to specifically prohibit such existing threats in Oxford, as there were no, nor were there likely to be, any existing occurrences of such threats in the County as of the date the SPP comes into effect.</p>	
<p>The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Storage of tailings from mining operations</li> </ul>	2.03 (1634)	Existing and Future Activities	<p>The storage of tailings from mining operations is designated under the Environmental Protection Act and would require an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA); however, this sub-threat is explicitly exempted from Part V of the Environmental Protection Act RRO 1990 Regulation 34 (S.3(1)(6)). Part IV (specifically Section 57) was appropriate to address this “gap” because this sub-threat was not identified as a significant threat occurring within the TSR and there is a strong likelihood that it would not be proposed within this Region in the future. Should a mining activity establish within the region, it would not be appropriate to store or treat tailings from the operation in areas where this would be a significant drinking water threat. Location of this activity in areas where it would not pose a significant threat to drinking water sources is the only alternative considered appropriate for managing the risks associated with this activity. Where PI could be used to accomplish this prohibition it has been used; however, Part IV prohibition was used to ensure that no aspect of this activity could become a significant threat to drinking water sources in this region. There were no concerns over this prohibition identified through pre-consultation with policy implementers.</p> <p>For the purposes of policy simplicity and consistency across the County, Oxford choose to apply the same policy approach to all significant waste threats e.g. to manage existing threats through PI or RMP and prohibit future threats through PI or Part IV, with the exception of the storage of hazardous or liquid industrial waste threats not requiring an ECA. Although Oxford County was supportive of TSR’s rationale for prohibiting existing occurrences of significant storage of mine tailings, the County determined that it was not necessary to specifically prohibit such existing threats in Oxford, as there were no, nor were there likely to be, any existing occurrences of such threats in the County as of the date the SPP comes into effect.</p>	Explanation that storage of hazardous or liquid industrial waste threats not requiring an ECA is not being dealt with via section 57.
The	2.05	Future	As part of the waste managed at Waste Disposal sites, chemicals may be handled or stored which pose a threat to drinking water	

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act	(1805)  OC-2.03 (3203)	Activities	<p>sources. The release of these chemicals into surface or groundwater through the operation or maintenance of the site is a concern. Waste disposal sites are designated under the Environmental Protection Act and require an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA); however, portions of this threat (such as PCB storage) may be exempted from Part V of the Environmental Protection Act. Section 57 was used as a way to address this “gap” in a manner consistent with how other sub-categories of this threat are to be prohibited through the prescribed instrument. While it was determined to be unreasonable to prohibit existing sites where this activity is a drinking water threat, the nature of this activity is such that the committee determined that future waste disposal sites could, and therefore should, be located in areas where they are not a significant threat to drinking water sources. Through pre-consultation there were no concerns raised to prohibiting this activity in areas where it would be a significant threat to drinking water sources.</p> <p>Dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) and organic solvents were included within this policy related to waste disposal sites since they must be managed throughout their life cycles (collection, storage, transportation, treatment, recovery, and disposal). This was identified as a “gap” not covered through the other DNAPL policies.</p>	
The establishment or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act	2.05 (1805)  OC-2.03 (3203)	Future Activities	<p>As part of the waste managed at Waste Disposal sites, chemicals may be handled or stored which pose a threat to drinking water sources. The release of these chemicals into surface or groundwater through the operation or maintenance of the site is a concern. Most waste disposal sites require an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) under the Environmental Protection Act; however, a number of the waste disposal site sub-threats (such as PCB storage and storage of hazardous or liquid industrial waste) may be exempted from Part V of the Environmental Protection Act. Section 57 was used as a way to address this “gap” in a manner consistent with how other sub-categories of this threat are to be prohibited through the prescribed instrument. While it was determined to be unreasonable to prohibit existing sites where this activity is a drinking water threat, the nature of this activity is such that the committee determined that future waste disposal sites could, and therefore should, be located in areas where they are not a significant threat to drinking water sources.</p> <p>The only exception to the prohibition of new waste threats is for the following waste threat sub-categories, in circumstances where an ECA is not required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• storage of wastes described in clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste, or in clause (d) of the definition of liquid industrial waste; or</li> <li>• storage of hazardous or liquid industrial waste,</li> </ul> <p>These two exceptions were introduced based on further details regarding the nature of these threats that was provided by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change as part of their review of the plan. Upon review of this information, it was determined that these two threat categories capture both large and small quantities of hazardous and liquid industrial waste that can be generated by a broad range of industrial, commercial and/or institutional operations. Examples of such operations include nursing homes, medical clinics, retailers, print shops and laboratories that may only generate small quantities of such wastes as part of their regular operations (e.g. hardware stores that collect hazardous waste for disposal).</p> <p>Given that there are a considerable number of industrial, commercial and institutionally zoned properties located within significant threat areas in the County, it was determined that prohibition of such waste threats where an ECA is not required may have the unintentionally consequence of constraining or prohibiting many planned land uses that only generate fairly small quantities of such wastes. It should be noted that although such activities are not subject to an ECA, there are other tools prescribed by the Environmental Protection Act that the Ministry of the Environment uses to manage such activities. Further, it is understood that</p>	<p>Explanation of changes to waste prohibitions resulting from MOE comments.</p> <p>All aspects of the DNAPL and organic solvent life cycles are now dealt with in DNAPL and organic solvent policies, so removed from this policy.</p>

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			<p>uses or sites that store larger quantities of such wastes (e.g. landfills and transfer stations) are generally subject to an ECA. Therefore, the County determined that it would be appropriate to continue to prohibit future threat activities in these two threat sub-categories in cases where an ECA is required.</p> <p>As part of their review, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change had also suggested that the County consider management versus prohibition for the storage of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) waste threat sub-category. However, given that such threats can only be significant if they are located below grade or in an outdoor area and not in a container, it was the opinion of the County that prohibition remains a reasonable and appropriate approach for future occurrences of such threat activities, as it would simply mean that they would need to be located above grade and in an indoor area or in a container.</p> <p>Through pre-consultation there were no concerns raised with respect to prohibiting this activity in areas where it would be a significant threat to drinking water sources.</p>	
Application of non-agricultural source material (NASM)	2.23 (1656)	Existing and Future Activities	<p>Nitrogen and pathogens are potential concerns that could make their way into municipal drinking water sources when NASM is applied to the land. While the tables of drinking water threats identify only certain types of NASM, as a significant threat due to pathogens, this distinction is not made for the chemical threats associated with NASM. The tables identify application of NASM, including Category 1, as significant threats. The SPC decided that the NMA did not address Category 1 NASMs in a way that the activity would cease to be a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>While the NMA prohibits the application of the listed activities within 100 m of a well (WHPA-A), the NMA does not make a similar prohibition for WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. The NMA's use of prohibition within 100 m from a well pre-dated the establishment of WHPA travel time based zones and vulnerability scoring to establish well specific information on which to base local policy decisions. In fact, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 have a high intrinsic vulnerability, while many of the WHPA-A in the SPR are moderate or low intrinsic vulnerability. As such, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 may be considered more vulnerable than many WHPA-As, even though they have the same vulnerability score. Therefore, the SPC determined that the most appropriate and consistent policy approach would be to prohibit this significant threat activity within the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA), as well as the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10 where the activities listed in the table below are not already prohibited. It is important to note that prohibition only applies to the activity when it is being undertaken in the circumstances which make it a significant threat. For NASMs, the circumstances include criteria which include livestock density and managed land percentage. The same policy approach has been applied to both existing and future occurrences of this threat, given that NASM application does not occur on an on-going basis on the same parcel of land and, therefore, in effect there can be no application of NASM that would be considered 'existing' under the TSR definition.</p> <p>Oxford County determined the existing Prescribed Instrument (NMA) was adequate to prohibit this activity in Oxford, while Part IV of the CWA was determined to be the most appropriate tool for the remainder of the TSR region</p>	
Application of non-agricultural source material (NASM)	2.23 (1656)	Existing and Future Activities	<p>Nitrogen and pathogens are potential concerns that could make their way into municipal drinking water sources when NASM is applied to the land. While the tables of drinking water threats identify only certain types of NASM, as a significant threat due to pathogens, this distinction is not made for the chemical threats associated with NASM. The tables identify application of NASM, including Category 1, as significant threats. The SPC decided that the NMA did not address Category 1 NASMs in a way that the activity would cease to be a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>While the NMA prohibits the application of NASM within 100 m of a well (WHPA-A), the NMA does not include a similar prohibition</p>	<p>Edit for clarity of language.</p> <p>Inclusion of nitrate ICA in Oxford to this policy.</p>

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			<p>for WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 or Issues Contributing Areas (ICA) for nitrates [section 5.6 of the Upper Thames Region Source Protection Authority Assessment Report provides full detail on the Nitrate ICA that has been delineated in Oxford County]. The NMA's use of prohibition within 100 m from a well pre-dated the establishment of WHPA travel time based zones and vulnerability scoring and ICAs for nitrates which provide well specific information on which to base local policy decisions. In fact, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 have a high intrinsic vulnerability, while many of the WHPA-A in the SPR are moderate or low intrinsic vulnerability. As such, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 may be considered more vulnerable than many WHPA-As, even though they have the same vulnerability score. Further, ICAs for nitrates are intended to provide specific protection from threats that may contribute to an identified nitrate issue for a particular well. Therefore, the SPC determined that the most appropriate and consistent policy approach would be to prohibit this significant threat activity within the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA), as well as the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10 and ICAs for nitrates. It is important to note that prohibition only applies to the activity when it is being undertaken in the circumstances which make it a significant threat. For NASMs, the circumstances include criteria which include livestock density and managed land percentage. The same policy approach has been applied to both existing and future occurrences of this threat, given that NASM application does not occur on an on-going basis on the same parcel of land and, therefore, in effect there can be no application of NASM that would be considered 'existing' under the TSR definition.</p> <p>Oxford County determined the existing Prescribed Instrument (NMA) was adequate to prohibit this activity in Oxford, while Part IV of the CWA was determined to be the most appropriate tool for the remainder of the TSR region</p>	
Storage of NASM	2.25 (1661) OC-2.20 (3218)	Future Activities	<p>The storage of NASM within vulnerable areas could impact municipal drinking water sources through the release of pathogens or nitrogen into surface or groundwater. In considering policy choices, it was determined that prohibition of existing storage was, in most cases, not reasonable. The committee also determined that managing future storage of NASM was not appropriate, when prohibition of future NASM storage was a reasonable and a more precautionary policy direction. Section 57 prohibition prevents the establishment of new significant threats of this type and would therefore accomplish the overall goal of protecting municipal drinking water systems.</p> <p>Oxford County determined the existing Prescribed Instrument (NMA) was adequate to prohibit this activity in Oxford, while Part IV of the CWA was determined to be the most appropriate tool for the remainder of the TSR region.</p>	
			No changes	
Handling and storage of commercial fertilizer	2.28 (1750) OC-2.23 (3221)	Future Activities	<p>Potential impacts to municipal drinking water sources from the storage of commercial fertilizer relate to leaks and spills as a result of aging infrastructure or improper storage. Since the areas where this activity would be prohibited are relatively small and alternate locations could be found to locate new facilities, Section 57 was determined to be the most appropriate approach as it provides the greatest certainty for protection of municipal drinking water sources, by ensuring no additional significant drinking water threats related to this activity can be established.</p>	
Handling and storage of commercial fertilizer	2.28 (1750) OC-2.23	Future Activities	<p>Potential impacts to municipal drinking water sources from the storage of commercial fertilizer relate to leaks and spills as a result of aging infrastructure or improper storage. Since the areas where this activity would be prohibited are relatively small and alternate locations could be found to locate new facilities, Section 57 was determined to be the most appropriate approach in the TSR outside of Oxford.</p> <p>In Oxford the County determined it would use prohibition for handling and storage of commercial fertilizer in quantities greater than</p>	Explanation that prohibition not to be used in Oxford for quantities less than 2500kg.



Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
	(3221)		<p>2,500 kilograms which is the minimum size threshold for being a significant threat in a WHPA. This approach provides the greatest certainty for protection of municipal drinking water sources, by ensuring no additional significant drinking water threats of that type and size can be established.</p> <p>However, it was determined that Section 57 would not be the most appropriate approach for handling and storage of commercial fertilizer in quantities less than or equal to 2,500 kilograms as they can be a significant threat in an ICA for Nitrates at any quantity. The primary reason being that prohibiting such threats would impact a considerably larger area and number of properties than just those contained in the WHPA A and B and the absence of any minimum size threshold may create unnecessary hardship for existing uses planning to handle or store smaller quantities of commercial fertilizer within such areas in the future. As such, it was determined that any future handling or storage of such smaller quantities of commercial fertilizer could be adequately managed through a Risk Management Plan.</p>	
Handling and storage of pesticides (greater than 2500 kg or 2500 L)	2.33 (1755) OC-2.26 (3224)	Future Activities	Spills from improper handling and storage of pesticides can result in impacts to municipal drinking water sources. The volumes noted in the policy description are established in the Tables of Drinking Water Threats which establish that this activity is a significant threat to drinking water. The areas where this activity is a significant threat are relatively small and alternative locations for this activity to be established are likely available. While the committee did not feel that it was reasonable to prohibit existing storage facilities, it was felt that it was prudent to direct new activities to areas where the risks are not significant. Section 57 was determined to be the most appropriate approach, as it provides the greatest certainty for protection municipal drinking water sources, by ensuring no additional significant drinking water threats related to this activity can be established.	
			No change	
Handling and storage of road salt	2.35 (1668) OC-2.28 (3226)	Existing and Future Activities	Prohibition of both future and existing salt handling and storage through Section 57 was determined to be the most appropriate approach because road salt storages were not identified within the Thames-Sydenham and Region Assessment Reports as existing significant threats. Only large storage which is exposed to precipitation or runoff is considered a significant threat. The most effective way of managing this threat is to protect it from precipitation and runoff, as that would result in the storage no longer being a significant threat and therefore not prohibited. As a result, the prohibition of the significant threat was determined to be the most appropriate policy approach for this activity, as the activity can still continue or be established, provided that it is constructed in a manner which would not be a significant drinking water threat (not exposed to precipitation or runoff).	
			No change	
Handling and storage of fuel	2.40 (1763) OC-2.32 (3230)	Future Activities	The areas where this activity would be a significant threat to drinking water are relatively small and other locations are generally available where this activity could be undertaken without being a significant threat to drinking water. In the case of fuel less than 2500 L, storage at or above grade is not considered to be a significant threat; therefore, if such storage is located at or above grade it would not be prohibited. This results in only larger storages being prohibited below, at, or below grade in significant threat areas. While the committee did not feel that it was appropriate to prohibit existing storage of fuel which was a significant threat, they determined that Section 57 was the most appropriate approach for future threats, as it provides the greatest certainty for protection municipal drinking water sources, by ensuring no additional significant drinking water threats related to this activity are established. These larger facilities should be located in areas where they are not a significant threat to drinking water.	
Handling and storage of fuel	2.40 (1763)	Future Activities	The areas where this activity would be a significant threat to drinking water are relatively small and other locations are generally available where this activity could be undertaken without being a significant threat to drinking water. In the case of fuel storage less than 2500 L (e.g. residential heating oil storage), storage at or above grade is not considered to be a significant threat; therefore, if such storage is located at or above grade it would not be prohibited. Larger storage would be prohibited whether	Edits for grammar and clarity.

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
	OC-2.32 (3230)		above or below grade in significant threat areas. While the committee did not feel that it was appropriate to prohibit existing storage of fuel which was a significant threat, they determined that Section 57 was the most appropriate approach for future threats, as it provides the greatest certainty for protection of municipal drinking water sources, by ensuring no additional significant drinking water threats related to this activity are established. These larger facilities should be located in areas where they are not a significant threat to drinking water.	
Handling and storage of dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs)	2.47 (1675) OC-2.35 (3233)	Future Activities	Dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) are persistent and very toxic chemicals. The CWA establishes that any quantity of the specified chemicals is a significant threat in WHPA-A, B and C regardless of vulnerability score. Section 57 was used to prohibit this activity only in WHPA-A and B with a vulnerability score of 10. In reaching this policy choice, the committee considered that prohibition over the more extensive WHPA-B and C areas could seriously impact economic opportunities in some areas, given the large number of industrial and commercial properties potentially affected. In recognition of these potential impacts, Section 58 (risk management plans) was applied in the other WHPA areas where this activity is a significant threat. This is consistent with the policy direction applied to certain other activities, where prohibition was used to protect the most vulnerable areas, while management was determined to be adequate to reduce the threat to drinking water sources in less vulnerable areas. This prohibition was only applied to future activities, as prohibition of existing activities could result in undue hardship for existing established operations. While prohibition of existing activities was not relied upon to manage the risk, this would not limit the Risk Management Official/Inspector from discussing opportunities for using alternatives to the prescribed DNAPL, or relocating to an alternative location as part of a RMP.	
			Dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) are persistent and very toxic chemicals. The CWA establishes that any quantity of the specified chemicals is a significant threat in WHPA-A, B and C regardless of vulnerability score. Section 57 was used to prohibit this activity only in WHPA-A and B with a vulnerability score of 10. In reaching this policy choice, the committee considered that prohibition over the more extensive WHPA-B and C areas could seriously impact economic opportunities in some areas, given the large number of industrial and commercial properties potentially affected. In recognition of these potential impacts, Section 58 (risk management plans) was applied in the other WHPA areas where this activity is a significant threat. This is consistent with the policy direction applied to certain other activities, where prohibition was used to protect the most vulnerable areas, while management was determined to be adequate to reduce the threat to drinking water sources in less vulnerable areas. This prohibition was only applied to future activities, as prohibition of existing activities could result in undue hardship for existing established operations. While prohibition of existing activities was not relied upon to manage the risk, this would not limit the Risk Management Official/Inspector from discussing opportunities for using alternatives to the prescribed DNAPL, or relocating to an alternative location as part of a RMP. This policy also relates to waste disposal sites since the DNAPLs must be prohibited throughout their life cycles (collection, storage, transportation, treatment, recovery, and disposal).	DNAPLs have been removed from the waste policies and the policy text of the DNAPL policy now specifies that this policy applies to the DNAPLs throughout their life cycle.
Handling and storage of organic solvents	2.49 (1677) OC-2.38 (3236)	Future Activities	The Tables of Drinking Water Threats identify quantities above 25L for the handling and storage of prescribed organic solvents as a significant threat to drinking water sources. Only certain types of organic solvents are significant drinking water threats and many are no longer in common use, or there may be alternatives available. As such, this policy is not concerned with addressing household or other incidental use. Section 57 was used to prohibit new handling and storage of organic solvents from being established where it would be a significant threat to drinking water, as the areas where this future activity is prohibited are relatively small alternative locations are generally available. As with other activities which the Source Protection Committee chose to prohibit, they decided that it was not reasonable to prohibit existing handling and storage.	
			The Tables of Drinking Water Threats identify quantities above 25L for the handling and storage of prescribed organic solvents as a significant threat to drinking water sources. Only certain types of organic solvents are significant drinking water threats and	Organic solvents have been removed from the waste policies and the policy

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			<p>many are no longer in common use, or there may be alternatives available. As such, this policy is not concerned with addressing household or other incidental use. Section 57 was used to prohibit new handling and storage of organic solvents from being established where it would be a significant threat to drinking water, as the areas where this future activity is prohibited are relatively small alternative locations are generally available. As with other activities which the Source Protection Committee chose to prohibit, they decided that it was not reasonable to prohibit existing handling and storage. This policy also relates to waste disposal sites since the organic solvents must be prohibited throughout their life cycles (collection, storage, transportation, treatment, recovery, and disposal).</p>	<p>text of the organic solvents policy now specifies that this policy applies to the organic solvents throughout their life cycle.</p>
Application of ASM to Land	OC-2.14 (3212)	Existing and Future (Oxford only)	<p>While the NMA prohibits the application and storage of ASM within 100 m of a well (WHPA-A) for farms regulated under the NMA, it does not establish similar prohibitions for WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. The NMA's use of prohibition within 100 m from a well pre-dated the establishment of WHPA travel time based zones and vulnerability scoring as the well specific information upon which to base local policy decisions. Under the Clean Water Act, the tables of drinking water threats identify the risk and level of threat posed by this activity as the same within all areas with a vulnerability score of 10. In fact, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 have a high intrinsic vulnerability, while many of the WHPA-As in the SPR are moderate or low intrinsic vulnerability. As such, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 may be considered more vulnerable than many WHPA-As, even though they have the same vulnerability score.</p> <p>The County also closely considered the potential impacts of prohibiting the existing and future application of ASM to land in both the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA), and the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10. However, it was determined that such an approach may have a substantial impact on existing agricultural operations, as this significant threat activity was identified as existing, or likely to be existing, on all agricultural properties located within significant threat areas in the County. For this reason, it was also determined that it would be unlikely that application of ASM to land would be considered a 'new/future' activity on affected properties in the Oxford context. Therefore, the County chose to apply Part IV prohibition to existing and future application of ASM only in the WHPA A, as this is consistent with the requirements for operations regulated under the NMA. As the NMA does not apply to all agricultural operations, Part IV prohibition was determined to be the most appropriate tool to prohibit this activity, as it would ensure that all agricultural operations undertaking this activity within significant threat areas are treated consistently.</p>	
Application of ASM to Land	OC-2.14 (3212)	Existing and Future (Oxford only)	<p>While the NMA prohibits the application and storage of ASM within 100 m of a well (WHPA-A) for farms regulated under the NMA, it does not establish similar prohibitions for WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. The NMA's use of prohibition within 100 m from a well pre-dated the establishment of WHPA travel time based zones and vulnerability scoring and nitrate ICAs which provide well specific information on which to base local policy decisions. Under the Clean Water Act, the tables of drinking water threats identify the risk and level of threat posed by this activity as the same within all areas with a vulnerability score of 10. In fact, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 have a high intrinsic vulnerability, while many of the WHPA-As in the SPR are moderate or low intrinsic vulnerability. As such, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 may be considered more vulnerable than many WHPA-As, even though they have the same vulnerability score.</p> <p>As such the County closely considered the potential impacts of prohibiting the existing and future application of ASM to land in both the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA), the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10 and nitrate ICAs. However, it was determined that such an approach may have a substantial impact on existing agricultural operations, as this significant threat activity was identified as existing, or likely to be existing, on all agricultural properties located within significant threat areas in the County. For this reason, it was also determined that it would be unlikely that application of ASM to land would be considered a 'new/future'</p>	<p>Edits for grammar.</p> <p>Inclusion of nitrate ICA in Oxford to this policy.</p>

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			<p>activity on affected properties in the Oxford context. Therefore, the County chose to apply Part IV prohibition to existing and future application of ASM only in the WHPA A, as this is consistent with the requirements for operations regulated under the NMA. As the NMA does not apply to all agricultural operations, Part IV prohibition was determined to be the most appropriate tool to prohibit this activity, as it would ensure that all agricultural operations undertaking this activity within significant threat areas are treated consistently.</p>	
Storage of ASM	OC-2.16 (3214)	Future (Oxford only)	<p>In the case of the future storage of ASM, it was determined that the most effective and consistent policy approach would be to prohibit within both the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA) and the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10 (where storage of ASM is not currently prohibited on farms regulated under the NMA). This in keeping with the County's overall policy approach, which is generally to prohibit new/future significant threats from becoming established where achievable and reasonable.</p> <p>As the NMA does not apply to all agricultural operations, Part IV prohibition was determined to be the most appropriate tool to prohibit this activity, as it would ensure that all agricultural operations undertaking this activity within significant threat areas are treated consistently. Prohibition was also deemed to be a reasonable approach in Oxford, given the location of existing livestock barns and other farm buildings/structures, the limited area affected and the ample opportunities to locate new facilities outside of significant threat areas. Furthermore, the establishment of ASM storage facilities in the WHPA-A and B is already prohibited by the water quality policies in the Oxford County Official Plan, so the proposed SPP policies will actually reduce the area where such significant threat activities are currently prohibited.</p>	
Storage of ASM	OC-2.16 (3214)	Future (Oxford only)	<p>In the case of the future storage of ASM, it was determined that the most effective and consistent policy approach would be to prohibit within both the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA) and the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10 (where storage of ASM is not currently prohibited on farms regulated under the NMA). This in keeping with the County's overall policy approach, which is generally to prohibit new/future significant threats from becoming established where achievable and reasonable.</p> <p>As the NMA does not apply to all agricultural operations, Part IV prohibition was determined to be the most appropriate tool to prohibit this activity, as it would ensure that all agricultural operations undertaking this activity within significant threat areas are treated consistently. Prohibition was also deemed to be a reasonable approach in Oxford, given the location of existing livestock barns and other farm buildings/structures, the limited area affected and the ample opportunities to locate new facilities outside of significant threat areas. Furthermore, the establishment of ASM storage facilities in the WHPA-A and B is already prohibited by the water quality policies in the Oxford County Official Plan, so the proposed SPP policies will actually reduce the area where such significant threat activities are currently prohibited.</p> <p>The storage of ASM is also a significant threat in the nitrate ICAs in Oxford. However, given the considerably larger area and number of properties affected and the more limited opportunity to locate such storage facilities outside of a vulnerable area on a number of the agricultural properties located within the ICA, it was determined that it would be more appropriate and reasonable to simply manage future storage of ASM through an RMP in an ICA, but outside of a WHPA A or B, with a vulnerability score of 10. It is intended that the RMP process would be used to direct ASM storage facilities to be located on a portion of a property outside of a vulnerable area wherever possible.</p>	<p>Edits for grammar.</p> <p>Explanation why nitrate ICA not included in this policy.</p>
Handling and Storage of Snow	OC-2.30 (3228)	Future (Oxford only)	<p>Oxford chose to use Risk Management Plans to address existing occurrences of this activity, as no existing occurrences of this activity were identified and, even if there were, it would not be appropriate to prohibit such activities. However, given the threat circumstances e.g. size of storage area at or above grade and existing and planned land uses in significant threat areas, it was determined to be very unlikely that new significant snow storage activities would be proposed in Oxford. Based on the threat circumstances, the limited area potentially affected and the ample opportunities to locate new facilities outside of significant threat areas, it was determined that Section 57 was the most appropriate approach for future, as it provides the greatest certainly</p>	

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			for protection of municipal drinking water sources, by ensuring no additional significant drinking water threats related to this activity are established.	
Handling and Storage of Snow	OC-2.30 (3228)	Future (Oxford only)	<p>Oxford chose to use Risk Management Plans to address existing occurrences of this activity, as no existing occurrences of this activity were identified and, even if there were, it would not be appropriate to prohibit such activities. However, given the threat circumstances e.g. size of storage area (&gt; 1 ha) at or above grade and existing and planned land uses in significant threat areas, it was determined to be very unlikely that new significant snow storage activities would be proposed within a WHPA-A or B with a vulnerability score of 10 in Oxford. Based on the threat circumstances, the limited area potentially affected and the ample opportunities to locate new facilities outside of significant threat areas, it was determined that Section 57 was the most appropriate approach for future threats in these vulnerable areas, as it provides the greatest certainty for protection of municipal drinking water sources, by ensuring no additional significant drinking water threats related to this activity are established.</p> <p>However, the storage of snow is also a significant threat in a nitrate ICA regardless of the storage area size. Given, the absence of a storage area size threshold to be a significant threat in an ICA and the considerably larger area and number of properties affected, it was determined that it would be more appropriate and reasonable to simply manage future snow storage facilities of &lt;= 1 ha through an RMP, where they are a significant threat. It is intended that the RMP process would be used to encourage such snow storage facilities to be located on a portion of a property outside of a vulnerable area wherever possible.</p>	Remove prohibition on storage of snow in areas less than 1ha.

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
4.2.2	34	The RMP process also serves as a site specific education and outreach opportunity by allowing the RMO to comprehensively review and discuss potential alternatives (e.g. processes, substances or locations) that might eliminate the significant threat, as well as best management practices and any available local incentives with the person undertaken the activity. The policies that use Section 58 generally do not outline the contents of a RMP so that the RMO has flexibility to negotiate a RMP that reduces the risk at an appropriate level based on the site-specific situation. A more prescriptive policy may either, not allow the RMO the latitude to satisfy the regulatory requirements that the risk be managed to the point of no longer being significant, or result in the imposition of requirements that may not be necessary in every situation. In some cases, suggested approaches are provided in the policies; however, these are not intended to limit the flexibility of the RMO to negotiate an appropriate RMP with the person engaged in the activity.		
4.2.2	34	The RMP process also serves as a site specific education and outreach opportunity by allowing the RMO to comprehensively review and discuss potential alternatives (e.g. processes, substances or locations) that might eliminate the significant threat, as well as best management practices and any available local incentives with the person undertaking the activity. The policies that use Section 58 generally do not outline the contents of a RMP so that the RMO has flexibility to negotiate a RMP that reduces the risk at an appropriate level based on the site-specific situation. A more prescriptive policy may either, not allow the RMO the latitude to satisfy the regulatory requirements that the risk be managed to the point of no longer being significant, or result in the imposition of requirements that may not be necessary in every situation. In some cases, suggested approaches are provided in the policies; however, these are not intended to limit the flexibility of the RMO to negotiate an appropriate RMP with the person engaged in the activity.	Minor text change	Change the word 'undertaken' to 'undertaking'.



Table 4 The use of Part IV Section 58 Regulated Activities

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
Establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act - waste disposal sites (not subject to Environmental Compliance Approvals)	2.04 (1799)  OC-2.02 (3239)	Existing	<p>Prescribed instruments (PI) issued by the province through various ministries set out terms and conditions that are designed to protect the environment or human health. Where activities are exempt from PI (i.e. Environmental Protection Act) such as PCB storage, it was determined that Section 58 – RMP was the most appropriate tool to fill this “gap.”, as it ensures all aspects of the threat are adequately addressed to ensure it ceases to be a significant threat to drinking water.</p> <p>Dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) and organic solvents were included within this policy related to waste disposal sites since they must be managed throughout their life cycles (collection, storage, transportation, treatment, recovery, and disposal). This was identified as a “gap” not covered through the other DNAPL policies.</p>	
Establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act - waste disposal sites (not subject to Environmental Compliance Approvals)	2.04 (1799)  OC-2.02 (3239)	Existing	<p>Prescribed instruments (PI) issued by the province through various ministries set out terms and conditions that are designed to protect the environment or human health. Where activities are exempt from PI (i.e. Environmental Protection Act) such as PCB storage, it was determined that Section 58 – RMP was the most appropriate tool to fill this “gap.”, as it ensures all aspects of the threat are adequately addressed to ensure it ceases to be a significant threat to drinking water.</p>	All aspects of the DNAPL and organic solvent life cycles are now dealt with in DNAPL and organic solvent policies, so removed from this policy.
Handling and storage of fuel	2.38 (1762)  OC-2.31 (3229)	Existing	<p>Although prohibition was determined to be the most appropriate approach for addressing future handling and storage of fuel for the reasons outlined under the Part IV prohibition rationale, given the number of potential existing occurrences of this activity, it was determined that a Risk Management Plan was the more appropriate approach for addressing existing threats. The Risk Management Plan process can be used to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Technical Standards and Safety Act and any other requirements deemed necessary by the RMO to protect municipal drinking water sources.</p> <p>Oxford County selected this approach to provide the necessary flexibility to allow for new fuel storage required for back-up generators at municipal wells (which are required for emergency purposes) provided appropriate risk management measures are in place. TSR exempted back-up generators from this policy 2.38 and choose to manage back-up generators using prescribed instruments in policy 2.41.</p>	
Handling and storage of fuel	2.38 (1762)  OC-2.31 (3229)	Existing	<p>Although prohibition was determined to be the most appropriate approach for addressing future handling and storage of fuel for the reasons outlined under the Part IV prohibition rationale, given the number of potential existing occurrences of this activity, it was determined that a Risk Management Plan was the more appropriate approach for addressing existing threats. The Risk Management Plan process can be used to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Technical Standards and Safety Act and any other requirements deemed necessary by the RMO to protect municipal drinking water sources.</p> <p>Oxford County selected this approach to provide the necessary flexibility to allow for new fuel storage required for back-up generators at municipal wells (which are required for emergency</p>	Corrected reference to policy #.

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			purposes) provided appropriate risk management measures are in place. TSR exempted back-up generators from this policy 2.38 and choose to manage back-up generators using prescribed instruments in policy 2.42.	
Handling and storage of dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPL)	2.44, 2.46 (1673, 1674)  OC-2.33 (3231) OC-2.34 (3232) OC-2.36 (3234)	Existing, Future	DNAPL are a significant threat in WHPA-A, B and C regardless of vulnerability scores. While the SPC thought it was important to prohibit the establishment of new activities within WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10, they did not feel that it was appropriate to extend this prohibition to all handling and storage where it would be a significant threat due to the extent of the area potentially effected and the associated impact on local economic development opportunities. Nor did they feel that it was appropriate to prohibit existing activities. Specific quantities, concentrations, or risk management measures were not prescribed in the policies developed by the SPC to allow the RMO to effectively manage the risks and focus on the instances of this threat that pose the greatest risk to the drinking water systems. The committee focused this policy only on quantities and concentrations of DNAPL which, in the opinion of the RMO, were not typical of household use. It was determined that household use could be adequately dealt with through education and outreach focused on the safe storage, handling and disposal of these chemicals	
			DNAPL are a significant threat in WHPA-A, B and C regardless of vulnerability scores. While the SPC thought it was important to prohibit the establishment of new activities within WHPA-A, B with a vulnerability score of 10, they did not feel that it was appropriate to extend this prohibition to all handling and storage where it would be a significant threat due to the extent of the area potentially effected and the associated impact on local economic development opportunities. Nor did they feel that it was appropriate to prohibit existing activities. Specific quantities, concentrations, or risk management measures were not prescribed in the policies developed by the SPC to allow the RMO to effectively manage the risks and focus on the instances of this threat that pose the greatest risk to the drinking water systems. The committee focused this policy only on quantities and concentrations of DNAPL which, in the opinion of the RMO, were not typical of household use. It was determined that household use could be adequately dealt with through education and outreach focused on the safe storage, handling and disposal of these chemicals. This policy also relates to waste disposal sites since the DNAPLs must be managed throughout their life cycles (collection, storage, transportation, treatment, recovery, and disposal).	DNAPLs have been removed from the waste policies and the policy text of the DNAPL policy now specifies that this policy applies to the DNAPLs throughout their life cycle.
Handling and storage of organic solvents	2.48 (1676)  OC-2.37 (3235)	Existing	Section 58 was used for existing handling and storage of organic solvents to allow activities to only be undertaken when the risks can be adequately managed through a RMP. While prohibition of future activities was determined to be the most appropriate approach to address new risks associated with these chemicals, the committee did not think it appropriate to prohibit existing activities and, therefore, chose to manage them through S. 58. Proponents within vulnerable areas may have other threats on their property that would require a RMP. Risk management measures have not been prescribed in order to allow flexibility to the RMO.	
			Section 58 was used for existing handling and storage of organic solvents to allow activities to only be undertaken when the risks can be adequately managed through a RMP. While prohibition of future activities was determined to be the most appropriate approach to address new risks associated with these chemicals, the committee did not think it appropriate to prohibit existing activities and, therefore, chose to manage them through S. 58. Proponents within vulnerable areas may have other threats on their property that would require a RMP.	Organic solvents have been removed from the waste policies and the policy text of the organic solvents policy now specifies that this policy applies to the organic solvents throughout their life cycle.



Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			Risk management measures have not been prescribed in order to allow flexibility to the RMO. This policy also relates to waste disposal sites since the organic solvents must be prohibited throughout their life cycles (collection, storage, transportation, treatment, recovery, and disposal).	
Handling and storage of commercial fertilizer (IPZ event-based modelled areas)	2.29 (2506)	Existing and Future	According to Technical Rule 130, an activity is or would be a significant threat in an IPZ (1, 2 or 3) if modeling demonstrates that the contaminant reaches the intake at a concentration that deteriorates the water as a drinking water source. Modeled significant threats were identified within the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area through event-based modeling of various contaminant spill scenarios including 30 000 kg of commercial fertilizer. Storage and handling of this amount of fertilizer would be considered significant threats in these IPZs. By using Section 58, the handling and storage of commercial fertilizer of this quantity can be undertaken in designated vulnerable areas only when the risk is managed through a Risk Management Plan. Section 57 (prohibition) was considered; however, this approach would be too restrictive and would unduly hamper agricultural opportunities in such a large area. Risk management measures were not explicitly prescribed in the policy to provide flexibility to the Risk Management Official to negotiate suitable measures for the site with the persons engaged in this activity.	
Handling and storage of commercial fertilizer (Event Based Areas (EBA))			According to Technical Rule 130, an activity is or would be a significant threat in an IPZ (1, 2 or 3) if modeling demonstrates that the contaminant reaches the intake at a concentration that deteriorates the water as a drinking water source. Modeled significant threats were identified within the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area through event-based modeling of various contaminant spill scenarios including 34 000 kg of commercial fertilizer. Storage and handling of this amount of fertilizer would be considered significant threats in these EBAs. By using Section 58, the handling and storage of commercial fertilizer of this quantity can be undertaken in designated vulnerable areas only when the risk is managed through a Risk Management Plan. Section 57 (prohibition) was considered; however, this approach would be too restrictive and would unduly hamper agricultural opportunities in such a large area. Risk management measures were not explicitly prescribed in the policy to provide flexibility to the Risk Management Official to negotiate suitable measures for the site with the persons engaged in this activity.	Corrected from '30,000kg' to '34,000kg'.  Areas where event modeling has identified threats are now being called 'Event Based Areas (EBA)'
Application of pesticides	2.30 (1663)  OC-2.24 (3222)	Existing and Future	Eleven (11) chemicals have been identified within the Ministry of Environment's Tables of Drinking Water Threats. There is the potential for these chemicals to enter either surface or groundwater and pose a threat to municipal drinking water sources. It was generally determined that handling BMPs can adequately manage the risks associated with these activities. Section 58 would be the most appropriate approach to ensure that BMPs are appropriately applied to manage the risks. Many people engaged in this activity would likely have other threats on their property and a RMP could capture them without introducing another management tool.	
			No change	
Storage of Pesticides	2.32 (1666)  OC-2.27 (3225)	Existing and Future	Section 58 was the most appropriate approach because it was felt that there are risk management measures which can adequately manage the risks such that the activity ceases to be a significant threat. Many proponents engaged in this type of activity would likely have other threats on their property and a RMP would capture them without introducing another management tool. Flexibility should be provided to the RMO in order to attain the goal of	

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			<p>protecting municipal drinking water sources.</p> <p>Potential opportunities to relocate such storage outside of significant threat areas could also be discussed as part of the RMP process.</p>	
			No change	
Storage of Pesticides (greater than 2500 kg and 2500 L)	2.34 (3255) OC-2.25 (3223)	Existing	Section 58 was used for existing handling and storage of pesticides at a facility where they are manufactured, distributed or processed to allow activities to only be undertaken when the risk is managed through a RMP. While prohibition of future activities was determined to be necessary to manage the risks associated with these pesticides, the committee did feel it would be appropriate to prohibit existing activities and, therefore, chose to manage them through S. 58. Proponents within vulnerable areas may have other threats on their property that would require a RMP. Risk management measures have not been prescribed in order to allow flexibility to the RMO.	
Storage of Pesticides (greater than 2500 kg and 2500 L)	2.34 (3255) OC-2.25 (3223)	Existing	Section 58 was used for existing handling and storage of pesticides at a facility where they are manufactured, distributed or processed to allow activities to only be undertaken when the risk is managed through a RMP. While prohibition of future activities was determined to be necessary to manage the risks associated with these pesticides, the committee did not feel it would be appropriate to prohibit existing activities and, therefore, chose to manage them through S. 58. Proponents within vulnerable areas may have other threats on their property that would require a RMP. Risk management measures have not been prescribed in order to allow flexibility to the RMO.	Edit for grammar
Storage of Snow	2.36 (1669) OC-2.29 (3227)	Existing and Future Oxford - Existing only	<p>Snow storage and disposal sites are usually located as close as possible to snow removal sites to minimize snow hauling costs and other impacts to the environment. Where snow is stored at the site where it is accumulated, Risk Management Measures can adequately manage the risk such that the activity ceases to be, or never becomes, a significant threat. When snow is being transported to another site, the committee determined that it was important that the snow be transported to a site where it would not be a significant threat. For this reason, the committee decided to include that it was necessary for Risk Management Plans to include provisions that the site not accept snow from other locations.</p> <p>Oxford County chose to use risk management plans for managing existing snow storage and disposal sites, for the above noted reasons. However, Oxford chose to Part IV prohibit new snow storage and disposal sites for the reasons outlined under the Part IV prohibition policy approaches section above.</p>	
Storage of Snow	2.36 (1669) OC-2.29 (3227)	Existing and Future Oxford - Existing and future, where storage area is <= 1 ha	<p>Snow storage and disposal sites are usually located as close as possible to snow removal sites to minimize snow hauling costs and other impacts to the environment. Where snow is stored at the site where it is accumulated, Risk Management Measures can adequately manage the risk such that the activity ceases to be, or never becomes, a significant threat. When snow is being transported to another site, the committee determined that it was important that the snow be transported to a site where it would not be a significant threat. For this reason, the committee decided to include that it was necessary for Risk Management Plans to include provisions that the site not accept snow from other locations.</p> <p>Oxford County chose to use risk management plans for managing existing snow storage and disposal sites and new snow storage and disposal sites &lt;= 1 ha, for the above noted</p>	Addition of future storage of snow in areas less than 1ha.

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			reasons. However, Oxford chose to use Part IV to prohibit new snow storage > 1 ha in area and disposal sites for the reasons outlined under the Part IV prohibition policy approaches section above.	
Handling and storage of fuel (IPZ event-based modelled areas)	2.39 (2505)	Existing and Future	According to Technical Rule 130, an activity is or would be a significant threat in an IPZ (1, 2 or 3) if modelling demonstrates that the contaminant reaches the intake at a concentration that deteriorates the water as a drinking water source. Modelled significant threats were identified within St. Clair Region Source Protection Area through event-based modelling of various contaminant spill scenarios including 34 000 L of fuel. Storage and handling of similar or larger volumes of fuel would be considered significant threats in the IPZs identified through the modelling process. By using Section 58, the handling and storage of fuel can be undertaken in designated vulnerable areas only when the risk is managed through a Risk Management Plan. Section 57 (prohibition) was considered; however, this approach would be too restrictive in such a large area. Specific contents of the Risk Management Plan were not prescribed to allow flexibility to the Risk Management Official.	
Handling and storage of fuel (Event Based Areas (EBA))	2.39 (2505)	Existing and Future	According to Technical Rule 130, an activity is or would be a significant threat in an IPZ (1, 2 or 3) if modelling demonstrates that the contaminant reaches the intake at a concentration that deteriorates the water as a drinking water source. Modelled significant threats were identified within St. Clair Region Source Protection Area through event-based modelling of various contaminant spill scenarios including 15 000 L of fuel. Storage and handling of similar or larger volumes of fuel would be considered significant threats in the EBAs. By using Section 58, the handling and storage of fuel can be undertaken in designated vulnerable areas only when the risk is managed through a Risk Management Plan. Section 57 (prohibition) was considered; however, this approach would be too restrictive in such a large area. Specific contents of the Risk Management Plan were not prescribed to allow flexibility to the Risk Management Official.	Corrected from '34,000L' to '15,000L'. Areas where event modeling has identified threats are now being called 'Event Based Areas (EBA)'
Management of runoff that contains chemicals used in de-icing of aircraft	2.50 (1678) OC-2.39 (3237)	Existing and Future  Oxford – Future only	The primary consideration for the management of runoff that contains aircraft de-icing chemicals is to make sure that this runoff does not enter surface and/or groundwater. Although there are no existing instances related to this threat currently within the Thames-Sydenham and Region that are significant threats, a policy was developed to address this threat to encompass the development of new airports or the reclassification of an existing airport's threat level due to changes in passenger service. While airports and related activities are regulated by the Federal government, it was determined that municipalities should work collaboratively with airport authorities to ensure that activities associated with this drinking water threat never become significant. A Risk Management Plan is a formalization of the collaborative effort between the airport authority and the RMO.	
			No change	
Application of ASM	2.21 (1652) OC-2.15 (3213)	Existing and Future  Existing and Future (outside WHPA-A)	While both Oxford and TSR choose to prohibit application of ASMs in WHPA-A and manage in WHPA-B, Oxford used Section 57 to prohibit in the WHPA-A and TSR uses the Risk Management Plan to effectively prohibit in the WHPA-A based on NMA principles.  Further rationale is provided below.	

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
Application of ASM	2.21 (1652)  OC-2.15 (3213)	Existing and Future  Existing and Future (outside WHPA-A)	While both Oxford and TSR choose to prohibit application of ASMs in WHPA-A and manage in WHPA-B, Oxford used Section 57 to prohibit in the WHPA-A and TSR uses the Risk Management Plan to effectively prohibit in the WHPA-A based on NMA principles.  Further rationale is provided <a href="#">in section below this table</a> .	<a href="#">Edit for clarity</a>
Storage of ASM	2.22 (1654)  OC-2.17 (3215)	Existing and Future  Existing	Rationale is provided in section below.  In the TSR, temporary storage is prohibited through the RMP, see section below for further rationale.	
Storage of ASM	2.22 (1654)  OC-2.17 (3215)	Existing and Future  Existing and Future (outside WHPA-A or B, v-score 10)	Rationale is provided in section below <a href="#">this table</a> .  In the TSR, temporary storage is prohibited through the RMP, see section below for further rationale.	<a href="#">Edit for clarity</a>
Handling and Storage of NASM	2.24 (1659)	Existing	Rationale is provided in section below.  In the TSR, temporary storage is prohibited through the RMP, see section below for further rationale.	
Handling and Storage of NASM	2.24 (1659)	Existing	Rationale is provided in section below <a href="#">this table</a> .  In the TSR, temporary storage is prohibited through the RMP, see section below for further rationale.	<a href="#">Edit for clarity</a>
Application of commercial fertilizer	2.26 (1662)  OC-2.21 (3219)	Existing and Future	Both Oxford and TSR used the RMP to manage existing and future application of fertilizer. TSR prohibits within WHPA-A through application of NMA prohibitions to the RMP. Oxford exempts residential land use from this section 58 policy, using an education and outreach policy (OC-2.47) for residential properties instead.  Further rationale is provided in section below.	
Application of commercial fertilizer	2.26 (1662)  OC-2.21 (3219)	Existing and Future	Both Oxford and TSR used the RMP to manage existing and future application of fertilizer. TSR prohibits within WHPA-A through application of NMA prohibitions to the RMP. Oxford exempts residential land use from this section 58 policy, using an education and outreach policy (OC-2.47) for residential properties instead.  Further rationale is provided in section below <a href="#">this table</a> .	<a href="#">Edit for grammar</a>  <a href="#">Edit for clarity</a>

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
Handling and Storage of Commercial Fertilizer	2.27 (1749) OC-2.22	Existing	Rationale is provided in section below.  In the TSR, temporary storage is prohibited through the RMP, see section below for further rationale.	
Handling and Storage of Commercial Fertilizer	2.27 (1749) OC-2.22	Existing and Future (outside WHPA-A or B, v-score 10)	Rationale is provided in section below this table.  In the TSR, temporary storage is prohibited through the RMP, see section below this table for further rationale.	Edit for clarity
The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing, an outdoor confinement area or a farm animal-yard	2.51 (1682) OC-2.40 (3238)	Existing and Future	Although outdoor confinement areas are regulated by the Nutrient Management Act, not all farms contained within significant threat areas are subject to the Nutrient Management Act and, therefore, required to have Nutrient Management Plans and/or Strategies. In addition, the Nutrient Management Act does not regulate livestock grazing or pasturing activities. Therefore, It was determined that Risk Management Plans would be the most consistent, appropriate and effective means of addressing this threat.  Oxford County did not select direct prohibition of future occurrences of this activity as the preferred approach given the difficulty of differentiating between existing and future occurrences of these activities, which typically do not require a building permit or other development approvals. However, given that no existing OCAs have been identified in the County and there are few, if any, existing livestock barns located within significant threat areas, it is anticipated that the RMP process can be used to achieve location or relocation of such activities outside of significant threat areas in most cases.  Similar to Oxford, the TSR SPC felt that while the RMP could best be used to manage this activity, there was a greater risk involved with locating new large outdoor confinement areas within a WHPA-A or WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. The SPC chose to direct the RMO to consider new outdoor confinement areas be located outside the significant threat area where it would be necessary to protect drinking water.  Further rationale is provided in section below.	
The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing, an outdoor confinement area or a farm animal-yard	2.51 (1682) OC-2.40 (3238)	Existing and Future	Although outdoor confinement areas (OCA) are regulated by the Nutrient Management Act, not all farms contained within significant threat areas are subject to the Nutrient Management Act and, therefore, required to have Nutrient Management Plans and/or Strategies. In addition, the Nutrient Management Act does not regulate livestock grazing or pasturing activities. Therefore, It was determined that Risk Management Plans would be the most consistent, appropriate and effective means of addressing this threat.  Oxford County did not select direct prohibition of future occurrences of this activity as the preferred approach given the difficulty of differentiating between existing and future occurrences of these activities, which typically do not require a building permit or other development approvals. However, given that no existing OCAs have been identified in the	Edit for grammar. Edit for clarity

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			<p>County and there are few, if any, existing livestock barns located within significant threat areas, it is anticipated that the RMP process can be used to achieve location or relocation of such activities outside of significant threat areas in most cases.</p> <p>Similar to Oxford, the TSR SPC felt that while the RMP could best be used to manage this activity, there was a greater risk involved with locating new large outdoor confinement areas within a WHPA-A or WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. The SPC chose to direct the RMO to consider new outdoor confinement areas be located outside the significant threat area where it would be necessary to protect drinking water.</p> <p>Further rationale is provided in section below <a href="#">this table</a>.</p>	

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
4.2.2	38	The SPC determined that the most appropriate approach would be to apply Section 58 to significant drinking water threat activities regulated by the Nutrient Management Act, even in instances where they would be subject to a prescribed instrument issued under the NMA. It was felt that using Section 58 policies would ensure that all properties and operations associated with such activities are subject to the same review process and monitoring and management requirements. As well, properties containing such significant threat activities are also likely to contain other significant threats that would require a RMP. Therefore, the RMP process would allow for all threats on a property to be dealt with through a single, consistent process and serve as an education and outreach opportunity by allowing the RMO to inform the person undertaken the activity of any related education and outreach materials and local incentives that might be available. Section 61 O.Reg. 287/07 of the CWA outlines exemptions from Section 58 of the Act wherein a prescribed instrument regulates that activity and that instrument includes conditions which conform to the significant threat policies set out in the Source Protection Plan. This provision allows the person engaged in the activity to determine whether they wish to negotiate a Risk Management Plan for this activity along with other activities not included in the prescribed instrument or pursue a Prescribed Instrument (or notice from the issuer of the instrument) that the instrument contains conditions that conform to the Source Protection Plan. Either way, it is intended that the principles of the NMA would serve as the general basis for the development of a RMP for significant drinking water threats and it is anticipated that the RMO will work closely with OMAFRA staff to determine how such principles should be applied.		
4.2.2	38	The SPC determined that the most appropriate approach would be to apply Section 58 to significant drinking water threat activities regulated by the Nutrient Management Act, even in instances where they would be subject to a prescribed instrument issued under the NMA. It was felt that using Section 58 policies would ensure that all properties and operations associated with such activities are subject to the same review process and monitoring and management requirements. As well, properties containing such significant threat activities are also likely to contain other significant threats that would require a RMP. Therefore, the RMP process would allow for all threats on a property to be dealt with through a single, consistent process and serve as an education and outreach opportunity by allowing the RMO to inform the person undertaking the activity of any related education and outreach materials and local incentives that might be available. Section 61 O.Reg. 287/07 of the CWA outlines exemptions from Section 58 of the Act wherein a prescribed instrument regulates that activity and that instrument includes conditions which conform to the significant threat policies set out in the Source Protection Plan. This provision allows the person engaged in the activity to determine whether they wish to negotiate a Risk Management Plan for	Minor text change	Change the word 'undertaken' to 'undertaking'.

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		this activity along with other activities not included in the prescribed instrument or pursue a Prescribed Instrument (or notice from the issuer of the instrument) that the instrument contains conditions that conform to the Source Protection Plan. Either way, it is intended that the principles of the NMA would serve as the general basis for the development of a RMP for significant drinking water threats and it is anticipated that the RMO will work closely with OMAFRA staff to determine how such principles should be applied.		
4.2.2	39	The Nutrient Management Act prohibits the application and storage of ASMs, NASMs, and commercial fertilizers within the 100 m zone of municipal wells. The policies (2.21, 2.22, 2.24, 2.26, 2.27, and 2.51) refer to managing rather than prohibiting these activities. However, these policies require that NMA principles, including any NMA prohibitions, form the basis of the RMP and therefore will allow for consistency with the NMA in prohibiting the activities within the WHPA-A while managing in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10.		
4.2.2	39	The Nutrient Management Act prohibits the application and storage of ASMs, NASMs, and commercial fertilizers within the 100 m zone of municipal wells. As such, Oxford County has chosen to directly prohibit such threats in the WHPA A (100 m zone) zone through Section 57 and PI policies (OC-2.14, OC-16, OC-2.18, OC-2.20, OC-2.23), with the exception of existing ASM storage and the application of commercial fertilizer, which are to be managed through an RMP and existing NASM storage which is to be managed through the PI. For consistency, Oxford also chose to prohibit new ASM and NASM storage and NASM application within the WHPA B with a v-score of 10. The policies applying to the areas of the TSR outside of Oxford (2.21, 2.22, 2.24, 2.26, 2.27, and 2.51) refer to managing rather than prohibiting these activities. However, these management policies require that NMA principles, including any NMA prohibitions, form the basis of the RMP and therefore will allow for consistency with the NMA in prohibiting the activities within the WHPA-A while managing in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10.	Further detail on Oxford agricultural policies.	Further detail on Oxford agricultural policies.
4.2.2	39	The SPC felt that there was a substantially greater likelihood of a leak or spill occurring related to temporary storage. For permanent storage, regulatory controls allow for the implementation and confirmation of structural risk management measures and also serve as an opportunity to ensure that procedural controls and other preventative measures are in place to adequately manage the risks. Temporary facilities do not benefit from these same opportunities, making it a difficult activity to manage. Further, temporary facilities do not generally have the same investment in infrastructure that would be associated with a permanent storage facility. To adequately mitigate the risks related to temporary storage, more prohibitive measures were determined to be necessary. For this reason, Policies 2.22, 2.24, and 2.27 all require that Risk Management Plans shall prohibit temporary storages. Prohibition of temporary facilities was not specifically identified in the Oxford RMP policies for these activities as Oxford was of the opinion that prohibition of such activities would be effectively achieved through the requirements of the RMP.		
4.2.2	39	The SPC felt that there was a substantially greater likelihood of a leak or spill occurring related to temporary storage. For permanent storage, regulatory controls allow for the implementation and confirmation of structural risk management measures and also serve as an opportunity to ensure that procedural controls and other preventative measures are in place to adequately manage the risks. Temporary facilities do not benefit from these same opportunities, making it a difficult activity to manage. Further, temporary facilities do not generally have the same investment in infrastructure that would be associated with a permanent storage facility. To adequately mitigate the risks related to temporary storage, more prohibitive measures were determined to be necessary. For this reason, Policies 2.22, 2.24, and 2.27 all require that Risk Management Plans shall prohibit temporary storages. Prohibition of temporary facilities was not specifically identified in the Oxford RMP policies for these activities (O.C.-2.17, 2.19, 2.22) as Oxford was of the opinion that prohibition of such activities would be effectively achieved through the requirements of the RMP.	No reference to Oxford policies	Added reference to policies 'O.C.-2.17, 2.19, and 2.22'.

**Table 9 Instruments Prescribed in the Clean Water Act**

Prescribed Instrument	Gaps Identified	Policy solution	Change
Ontario Water Resources Act	Emergency Generators are often associated with pumping stations and other sewage works. These generators are often fuelled by fuels and in quantities which would be a significant threat to the drinking water.	While the storage of fuel for other purposes is dealt with through Part IV tools, policy requires that these threats be managed through the instruments rather than requiring them to deal with an additional regulatory process (RMP).	
		No change	
Safe Drinking Water Act	Emergency Generators are often associated with wells and intakes and therefore are located within the most vulnerable areas.	While the storage of fuel for other purposes is dealt with through Part IV tools, policy requires that these threats be managed through the instruments rather than requiring them to deal with an additional regulatory process (RMP).	
		No change	
Pesticide Act	The application of pesticides applies to only a limited number of chemicals used in specific circumstances.	The PI policies have been complemented by Section 58 (RMP) for pesticide application that is undertaken in such a manner that it is a significant threat, but does not require approval under the PA.	
		No change	
Nutrient Management Act	Activities associated with the NMA such as application and storage of ASMs, NASMS and commercial fertilizers are prohibited within WHPA-A, but the often more vulnerable WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 where these activities are also significant threats are not <b>considered</b> .	The NMA's use of prohibition within 100 m from a well pre-dated the establishment of WHPA travel time based zones and vulnerability scoring to establish well specific information on which to base local policy decisions. In fact, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 have a high intrinsic vulnerability, while many of the WHPA-A in the SPR are moderate or low intrinsic vulnerability. As such, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 may be considered more vulnerable than many WHPA-As, even though they have the same vulnerability score. Therefore, the SPC determined that the most appropriate and consistent policy approach would be to prohibit these significant threat activities within the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA), as well as the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10, where the activities are not already prohibited, <b>under the NMA</b> . It is important to note that prohibition only applies to the activity when it is being undertaken in the circumstances which make it a significant threat	
Nutrient Management Act	Activities associated with the NMA such as application and storage of ASMs, NASMS and commercial fertilizers are prohibited within WHPA-A, but the often more vulnerable WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 where these activities are also significant threats are not <b>specifically addressed by the NMA</b> .	The NMA's use of prohibition within 100 m from a well pre-dated the establishment of WHPA travel time based zones and vulnerability scoring to establish well specific information on which to base local policy decisions. In fact, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 have a high intrinsic vulnerability, while many of the WHPA-A in the SPR are moderate or low intrinsic vulnerability. As such, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 may be considered more vulnerable than many WHPA-As, even though they have the same vulnerability score. Therefore, the SPC determined that the most appropriate and consistent policy approach would be to prohibit these significant threat activities within the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA), <b>with the exception of existing ASM and NASM storage and application of commercial fertilizer</b> , as well as the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10, <b>with the exception of existing ASM and NASM storage and ASM and commercial fertilizer application, for the reasons indicated in the policy specific rationale</b> . It is important to note that prohibition only applies to the	



		activity when it is being undertaken in the circumstances which make it a significant threat	
Nutrient Management Act	Many existing farms within vulnerable areas are not required to have a NMS. This would include existing farms that annually generate between 5 to 300 nutrient units (NU). These farms would only be subject to the regulatory process if they submitted a building permit application for a new or expanding livestock or manure storage facility. There are two additional triggers that would require a new/existing farm to obtain a NMS – 1. An earthen permanent nutrient storage facility is constructed, and 2. Off-farm anaerobic digestion material is received for treatment.	Use the Part IV tools to capture all farm operations in the WHPA-A and WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10	
Nutrient Management Act	Many existing farms within vulnerable areas are not required to have a NMS. This would include existing farms that annually generate between 5 to 300 nutrient units (NU). These farms would only be subject to the regulatory process if they submitted a building permit application for a new or expanding livestock or manure storage facility. There are two additional triggers that would require a new/existing farm to obtain a NMS – 1. An earthen permanent nutrient storage facility is constructed, and 2. Off-farm anaerobic digestion material is received for treatment.	Use the Part IV tools to capture all farm operations in the WHPA-A and WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 and within ICAs for nitrates, where applicable.	Addition of nitrate ICAs.
Nutrient Management Act	NMA does not require review and approval of instruments. Not all Nutrient Management Strategies (NMS) or Nutrient Management Plans (NMP) are approved by the Director of the Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs. Only the first NMS is Director approved and subsequent NMSs updates/revisions are not reviewed and approved. A property owner must have a NMS in order to have a NMP. As of January 1st, 2011, NMPs are no longer Director approved. They are also not submitted to OMAFRA. They are held on the farm property in the event of an inspection and it would be up to the individual farmer to update their plans.	Apply S. 58 to manage these threats generally using the principles of the NMA. While it is possible for the person engaged in the activity to provide a notice from OMAFRA under Sec. 61 O.Reg 287/07 that they have a prescribed instrument that adequately manages the risk, in order for the director to issue such a notice, they would need to review the instrument to ensure that it does adequately manage the risk.	
Nutrient Management Act	NMA does not require review and approval of instruments. Not all Nutrient Management Strategies (NMS) or Nutrient Management Plans (NMP) are approved by the Director of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. Only the first NMS is Director approved and subsequent NMSs updates/revisions are not reviewed and approved. A property owner must have a NMS in order to have a NMP. As of January 1st, 2011, NMPs are no longer Director approved. They are also not submitted to OMAFRA. They are held on the farm property in the event of an inspection and it would be up to the individual farmer to update their plans.	Prohibit these threats directly through Part IV or PI tools and/or apply S. 58 to manage these threats generally using the principles of the NMA. While it is possible for the person engaged in the activity to provide a notice from OMAFRA under Sec. 61 O.Reg 287/07 that they have a prescribed instrument that adequately manages the risk, in order for the director to issue such a notice, they would need to review the instrument to ensure that it does adequately manage the risk.	
Nutrient Management Act	The CWA includes ASM generation through livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or farm animal yard. Not all aspects of this threat are covered under the NMA.	Apply S. 58 to manage the threats using the principles of the NMA including NMA prohibitions where applicable.	
		No change	

**Table 10: Prescribed Instrument Policy additional rationale**

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
Waste Disposal Sites	2.04 (1799) 2.05 (1805)  OC-2.01 (3201) OC-2.03 (3239)	Existing and Future	<p>Although the Environmental Compliance Approval process is considered to be rigorous, prohibition of future activity through the ECA process was determined to be the most appropriate approach for the same reasons as outlined in the rationale provided for the uses of Section 57 prohibition for future occurrences of this threat that are not subject to an ECA. Management through a review and, if necessary amendment of the ECA was deemed most appropriate for existing waste disposal sites.</p> <p>The Thames-Sydenham Region included dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) and organic solvents within this policy related to waste disposal sites since they must be managed throughout their life cycles (collection, storage, transportation, treatment, recovery, and disposal). This was identified as a “gap” not covered through the other DNAPL policies. Further it is important that implementers are aware that DNAPLs are significant threats in areas where Waste Disposal would not otherwise be a significant threat.</p>	
Waste Disposal Sites	2.04 (1799) 2.05 (1805)  OC-2.01 (3201) OC-2.03 (3239)	Existing and Future	<p>Although the Environmental Compliance Approval process is considered to be rigorous, prohibition of future activity through the ECA process was generally determined to be the most appropriate approach for the same reasons as outlined in the rationale provided for the uses of Section 57 prohibition for future occurrences of this threat that are not subject to an ECA, with the exception of the storage of hazardous and liquid industrial waste. Management through a review and, if necessary amendment of the ECA, or where no ECA is required, a risk management plan was deemed most appropriate for existing waste disposal sites and for new storage of hazardous and liquid industrial waste sites that do not require an ECA, for the reasons indicated in the Section 58 policy rationale table.</p>	All aspects of the DNAPL and organic solvent life cycles are now dealt with in DNAPL and organic solvent policies, so removed from this policy.
Discharge of Stormwater	2.07 (1640)	Existing	<p>Discharge of stormwater is a significant threat under certain circumstances related to drainage area, land use and chemicals of concern. In addition to these consideration in the review and approval of prescribed instruments it is important to understand that snow melt water may contaminate stormwater where the storage of snow and road salt is a significant threat. These threats also need to be considered in the approvals and review process of Stormwater facilities. It is important to note that the areas and circumstances where these threats are significant may differ slightly from those areas where stormwater discharge is considered a significant threat.</p>	
Discharge of Stormwater	2.07 (1640) 2.08 (1641)  O.C.-2.12 (3210)	Existing	<p>Discharge of stormwater is a significant threat under certain circumstances related to drainage area, land use and chemicals of concern. In addition to these consideration in the review and approval of prescribed instruments it is important to understand that snow melt water may contaminate stormwater where the storage of snow and road salt is a significant threat. These threats also need to be considered in the approvals and review process of Stormwater facilities. It is important to note that the areas and circumstances where these threats are significant may differ slightly from those areas where stormwater discharge is considered a significant threat.</p>	Additional policy references added.
Application and Handling and Storage of Non-agricultural Source Materials (NASM)	OC-2.18 (1748) OC-2.19 (1650) OC-2.20 (1651)	Existing and Future	<p>Oxford County choose to apply the PI tool for NASM while TSR choose not to rely exclusively on the PI.</p> <p>Oxford County determined that since the application (both existing and future) or new storage of NASM appears to be comprehensively regulated by the applicable Prescribed Instruments (no gaps or exceptions were identified), these existing regulatory tools were the most appropriate for achieving the desired prohibition of such activities where they would be a significant threat.</p> <p>The Tables of Drinking Water Threats identify the circumstances and vulnerable areas where these activities are a significant threat to drinking water sources. While the NMA prohibits the application or storage of NASM within 100 m of a</p>	

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			<p>well (WHPA-A), the NMA does not require a similar prohibition for WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. The NMA's use of prohibition within 100 m from a well pre-dated the establishment of WHPA travel time based zones and vulnerability scoring which provides well specific information upon which to base local Source Protection policy decisions. Under the Clean Water Act, the tables of drinking water threats identify that the risk and level of threat posed by this activity is the same within areas with a vulnerability score of 10. In fact, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 have a high intrinsic vulnerability, while many of the WHPA-As actually have moderate or low intrinsic vulnerability. As such, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 may be considered more vulnerable than many WHPA-As, even though they have the same vulnerability score.</p> <p>Therefore, based on the Clean Water Act science, it was determined that the most appropriate and consistent policy approach would be to prohibit these significant threat activities within both the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA) and the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10 (where application of NASM is not currently prohibited under the NMA). The same policy approach has been applied to both existing and future occurrences of this threat, given that NASM application does not occur on an on-going basis on the same parcel of land and, therefore, in effect there can be no application of NASM that would be considered 'existing' under the Oxford definition.</p> <p>Given that existing storage of NASM was not identified, or suspected, in significant threat areas in Oxford, prohibition of existing NASM storage was not deemed to be necessary. However, it was determined that managing future storage of NASM was not appropriate, when prohibition of future NASM storage was both a reasonable and more precautionary policy approach, particularly given the limited area of agricultural land that would be affected within Oxford, much of which is owned by the County. Prohibition prevents the establishment of new significant threats of this type and, therefore, provides the most certainty in achieving the overall goal of protecting municipal drinking water systems.</p>	
Application and Handling and Storage of Non-agricultural Source Materials (NASM)	OC-2.18 (1748) OC-2.19 (1650) OC-2.20 (1651)	Existing and Future	<p>Oxford County chose to apply the PI tool for NASM while TSR choose not to rely exclusively on the PI.</p> <p>Oxford County determined that since the application (both existing and future) and new storage of NASM appears to be comprehensively regulated by the applicable Prescribed Instruments (no gaps or exceptions were identified), these existing regulatory tools were the most appropriate for achieving the desired prohibition of such activities where they would be a significant threat.</p> <p>The Tables of Drinking Water Threats identify the circumstances and vulnerable areas where these activities are a significant threat to drinking water sources While the NMA prohibits the application or storage of NASM within 100 m of a well (WHPA-A), the NMA does not require a similar prohibition for WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10. The NMA's use of prohibition within 100 m from a well pre-dated the establishment of WHPA travel time based zones and vulnerability scoring and ICAs for nitrates which provides well specific information upon which to base local Source Protection policy decisions. Under the Clean Water Act, the tables of drinking water threats identify that the risk and level of threat posed by this activity is the same within areas with a vulnerability score of 10. In fact, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 have a high intrinsic vulnerability, while many of the WHPA-As actually have moderate or low intrinsic vulnerability. As such, areas in WHPA-B with a vulnerability score of 10 may be considered more vulnerable than many WHPA-As, even though they have the same vulnerability score.</p> <p>Therefore, based on the Clean Water Act science, it was determined that the most appropriate and consistent policy approach would be to prohibit these significant threat activities within both the WHPA-A, (as per the NMA) and the WHPA-B, with a vulnerability score of 10 (where application of NASM is not currently prohibited under the NMA). This prohibition was also applied to vulnerable areas within an ICA for Nitrates in Oxford, as it was determined to be appropriate to prohibit</p>	<p>Edit for grammar.</p> <p>Edit to include ICA.</p>

Threat	Policy Number	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
			<p>any threats that could contribute to an identified nitrate issue wherever possible and reasonable. The same policy approach has been applied to both existing and future occurrences of this threat, given that NASM application does not occur on an on-going basis on the same parcel of land and, therefore, in effect there can be no application of NASM that would be considered 'existing' under the Oxford definition.</p> <p>Given that existing storage of NASM was not identified, or suspected, in significant threat areas in Oxford, prohibition of existing NASM storage was not deemed to be necessary. However, it was determined that managing future storage of NASM was not appropriate, when prohibition of future NASM storage was both a reasonable and more precautionary policy approach, particularly given the limited area of agricultural land that would be affected within Oxford, much of which is owned by the County. Prohibition prevents the establishment of new significant threats of this type and, therefore, provides the most certainty in achieving the overall goal of protecting municipal drinking water systems.</p>	

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
4.2.4	44	<p>Given that majority of the prescribed drinking water threats are managed or prohibited through other tools (Prescribed Instruments or Part IV of the Clean Water Act), the Thames-Sydenham and Region developed a general policy that uses land use planning as a complementary approach for significant threats, with one exception: sewage systems or sewage works (on-site septics) (Policy 2.15, OC-2.06). On-site septic systems, particularly leaching bed systems, are prevalent throughout the Thames-Sydenham and Region in areas that are not serviced by municipal or communal wastewater treatment systems. Since Part IV tools (Section 57, Section 58, and Section 59) of the Clean Water Act do not apply to this activity, and the Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECA) issued under the Ontario Water Resources Act only apply to large septic systems, the most appropriate approach was to use <i>land use planning</i> where prohibition was the desired outcome for future significant threats related to on-site septics. While the mandatory maintenance and inspection program for septic systems approved under the Building Code was seen to be an adequate management tool for existing septic systems, the Source Protection Committee determined that prohibition was the most appropriate approach for future systems as it is consistent with the SPC's overall approach for future threats, to prevent new threats from becoming established wherever possible and reasonable. This approach could prohibit the installation of any uses serviced by private individual sewage both small and large, within vulnerable areas where this activity could be significant.</p>		
4.2.4	44	<p>Given that the majority of the prescribed drinking water threats are managed or prohibited through other tools (Prescribed Instruments or Part IV of the Clean Water Act), the SPC developed a general policy that uses land use planning as a complementary approach for significant threats, with one exception: sewage systems or sewage works (on-site septics) (Policy 2.15, OC-2.06). On-site septic systems, particularly leaching bed systems, are prevalent throughout the Thames-Sydenham and Region in areas that are not serviced by municipal or communal wastewater treatment systems. Since Part IV tools (Section 57, Section 58, and Section 59) of the Clean Water Act do not apply to this activity, and the Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECA) issued under the Ontario Water Resources Act only apply to large septic systems, the most appropriate approach was to use <i>land use planning</i> where prohibition was the desired outcome for future significant threats related to on-site septics. While the mandatory maintenance and inspection program for septic systems approved under the Building Code was seen to be an adequate management tool for existing septic systems, the Source Protection Committee determined that prohibition was generally the most appropriate approach for future systems as it is consistent with the SPC's overall approach for future threats, to prevent new threats from becoming established wherever possible and reasonable. This approach could prohibit the installation of any uses serviced by private individual sewage both small and large,</p>	<p>Minor text edits</p> <p>Additional information provided for new nitrate ICA areas.</p>	<p>Edit for grammar.</p> <p>Explanation why septic prohibition not used in ICA.</p>

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		<p>within vulnerable areas where this activity could be significant.</p> <p>The one exception to the prohibition through land use planning policy approach for new septic systems has been established for vulnerable areas located within ICA for nitrates, but outside of a WHPA A or B with a vulnerability score of 10. There is one such area that has been identified within Oxford County. Given that the vulnerable area associated with the ICA covers a considerably larger area and number of properties than just those contained in the WHPA A and B, it was determined that prohibition may have the potential to prevent some properties from establishing a new dwelling anywhere on the property (where permitted by existing zoning) and as such would not be reasonable. As such, it was determined that any future septic systems and holding tanks within such vulnerable areas could be permitted and appropriately managed through the septic system re-inspection program. However, through the septic system approval process, property owners would still be encouraged to locate new systems outside of the ICA on their property wherever possible.</p>		
4.2.4	45	<p>Additionally, in the case of Oxford County, the area affected by this prohibition is limited and, based on review of the properties potentially affected, the impact on future development in the County is anticipated to be minimal. Furthermore, development on new septic systems in the WHPA-A and B is already prohibited by the water quality policies contained in the Oxford County Official Plan, so the proposed policies will actually reduce the area where such significant threat activities are currently prohibited.</p>		
4.2.4	45	<p>Additionally, in the case of Oxford County, the area affected by this prohibition is limited to the WHPA A and B with a vulnerability score of 10 and, based on review of the properties potentially affected, the impact on future development in the County is anticipated to be minimal. Furthermore, development on new septic systems in the WHPA-A and B is already prohibited by the water quality policies contained in the Oxford County Official Plan, so the proposed policies will actually reduce the area where such significant threat activities are currently prohibited.</p>	Clarify area of applicability	Specified WHPA-A&B(10)
4.2.5	45	<p>In Oxford County, two significant threat policies use education and outreach, one for DNAPLS (OC-2.33) and one for residential use of commercial fertilizer application (OC-2.47). As DNAPLS are considered a significant drinking water threat in any quantity, the use of small quantities or concentrations of DNAPLS in association with residential uses may potentially be a significant threat, as the chemicals are readily available and may be found within commonly used products. However, given the large number of residential properties that would need to be reviewed to determine whether DNAPLS were present and the likelihood of anything other than small 'household' type quantities being found, it was determined that an education and outreach program focused on the safe storage, handling and disposal of these chemicals would generally be adequate to ensure DNAPLS potentially associated with these land uses cease to be, or never become, a significant drinking water threat.</p>		
4.2.5	45	<p>In Oxford County, two significant threat policies use education and outreach, one for DNAPLS (OC-2.33) and one for residential use of commercial fertilizer application (OC-2.47). As DNAPLS are considered a significant drinking water threat in any quantity, the use of small quantities or concentrations of DNAPLS in association with residential uses may potentially be a significant threat, as the chemicals are readily available and may be found within commonly used products. However, given the large number of residential properties that would need to be reviewed to determine whether DNAPLS were present and the likelihood of anything other than small 'household' type quantities being found, it was determined that an education and outreach program focused on the safe storage, handling and disposal of these chemicals would generally be adequate to ensure DNAPLS potentially associated with these land uses cease to be, or never become, a significant drinking water threat.</p>	Grammar edit	Corrected spelling
4.2.6	46	<p>Since there may be significant application and/or administrative fees associated with amending an existing</p>		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for existing waste disposal sites, Policies 2.06 and OC-2.43 were developed to encourage early compliance. The SPC felt that it was not appropriate to require the person engaged in the activity to pay an additional fee for an ECA amendment required for the sole purpose of satisfying this policy. This incentive would reduce the potential financial impact on proponents to comply with the Source Protection Plan and in achieving the overall goal of reducing the risks to municipal drinking water sources. This policy, if implemented by the province, would provide an incentive for early adoption of risk management measures rather than the applicant waiting until they are forced to amend their instrument. By implementing management or mitigation measures earlier, the risks to drinking water sources are reduced.		
4.2.6	46	Since there may be significant application and/or administrative fees associated with amending an existing Prescribed Instrument (PI), Policies 2.06 and OC-2.43 were developed to encourage early compliance. The SPC felt that it was not appropriate to require the person engaged in the activity to pay an additional fee for a PI amendment required for the sole purpose of satisfying this policy. This incentive would reduce the potential financial impact on proponents to comply with the Source Protection Plan and in achieving the overall goal of reducing the risks to municipal drinking water sources. This policy, if implemented by the province, would provide an incentive for early adoption of risk management measures rather than the applicant waiting until they are forced to amend their instrument. By implementing management or mitigation measures earlier, the risks to drinking water sources are reduced.		
4.2.7	46	The establishment, operation, or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats, or disposes sewage - Septic systems and holding tanks (Policy 2.16) suggests municipalities make mandatory hook-ups to sanitary sewers where they exist in significant threat areas. Although Oxford County does not include a similar policy, that does not preclude the County from enacting such By-law where deemed necessary or appropriate by the County.		
4.2.7	46	The establishment, operation, or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats, or disposes of sewage - Septic systems and holding tanks (Policy 2.16) suggests municipalities make mandatory hook-ups to sanitary sewers where they exist in significant threat areas. Although Oxford County does not include a similar policy, that does not preclude the County from enacting such By-laws where deemed necessary or appropriate by the County.	Minor text edits	Edit for grammar
4.2.7	46	In developing the policies of this plan, there was a perception by most people involved that inspections of various activities were random and infrequent. Inspections for the purposes of compliance monitoring and enforcement are an important part of reducing the risk to drinking water sources. For example, in the case of the handling and storage of fuel, the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) inspect public outlets every three (3) years, but they do not inspect private outlets unless invited by the owner/operator. Other compliance monitoring programs are complaint driven rather than proactively assessing the compliance with prescribed instruments. Through discussions with the Ministry of Environment, it was determined that policies for increasing/ prioritizing inspections could not be written into Prescribed Instrument policies. Specify Action was identified as the most appropriate approach to address the compliance monitoring and enforcement. Policies have also been developed to reinforce and serve as a reminder of the importance of inspections that are required to be completed under regulatory requirements (e.g. septic system inspections under the Ontario Building Code Act). The threats affected by inspection policies are:		
4.2.7	46	In developing the policies of this plan, there was a perception by most people involved that inspections of various activities were random and infrequent. Inspections for the purposes of compliance monitoring and enforcement are an important part of reducing the risk to drinking water sources. For example, in the case of the handling and	Minor text edits	Edit for grammar

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		<p>storage of fuel, the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) inspect public outlets every three (3) years, but they do not inspect private outlets unless invited by the owner/operator. Other compliance monitoring programs are complaint driven rather than proactively assessing the compliance with prescribed instruments. Through discussions with the Ministry of Environment, it was determined that policies for increasing/ prioritizing inspections could not be written into Prescribed Instrument policies. Specify Action was identified as the most appropriate approach to address compliance monitoring and enforcement. Policies have also been developed to reinforce and serve as a reminder of the importance of inspections that are required to be completed under regulatory requirements (e.g. septic system inspections under the Ontario Building Code Act). The threats affected by inspection policies are:</p>		

**Table 11 Supplementary Specify Action Policies**

Threat	Policy Number	Policy Description	Threat Status	Rationale	Change
Storage of snow	2.37(1761)	Prohibition of snow storage in aggregate operations	Future and Existing	The Ministry of Natural Resources under the Aggregate Resources Policy Manual Policy A.R. 5.00.14 (salt storage and snow dumps on licensed/permitted sites) prohibits the storage of snow in aggregate operations. A policy was developed as a reminder of this regulation.	
				No change	
Handling and storage of fuel	2.43(1768) OC-2.43 (3265)	Removal of abandoned fuel storage tanks	Future and Existing	Fuel can enter into surface water or groundwater via spills. There had been a “gap” identified regarding the removal of abandoned fuel tanks. Specify Action was the best approach to address this.	
Handling and storage of fuel	2.43(1768) OC-2.46 (3265)	Removal of abandoned fuel storage tanks	Future and Existing	Fuel can enter into surface water or groundwater via spills. There had been a “gap” identified regarding the removal of abandoned fuel tanks. Specify Action was the best approach to address this. The same effective date is being used for both existing and future for this policy. The rationale behind that is that for this policy future mean newly found rather than newly created, so it was determined that it was not feasible to immediately remove fuel tanks on abandoned properties as soon as the Province is made aware of them.	Corrected policy reference #  Included rationale for same existing and future dates.

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
4.2.8	47	<p>Local threats policies are based on local threats that have been approved by the Ministry of Environment. The transportation of fuel and fertilizer along provincial highways, county and local roads, railways, waterways, and the transportation of liquid petroleum products through pipelines have been identified as local threats in IPZ-1, 2 and 3 in the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area. The intent of Policies 2.53 and 2.54 associated with local threats is to manage the risks to drinking water sources through spills response. It is important that these programs build in existing consideration of the downstream use of the water sources for drinking by adding the knowledge of the Intake Protection Zones into spills preparedness, response and prevention programs. It is important to understand that risks to drinking water sources exist beyond the defined IPZ areas. The IPZ areas, especially IPZ-2, provide an indication of the level of risk and travel time to the intake under modelled conditions.</p> <p>Local threats have been only identified within the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area. Event-based modelling, which is used to determine these local threats, has only been completed for the IPZ-3 regions of LAWSS, Petrolia and Wallaceburg intakes. The event-based modelling has established these local threats as significant drinking water threats in the IPZ of the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area.</p>		
4.2.8	47	<p>Local threats policies are based on local threats that have been approved by the Ministry of Environment. The transportation of fuel and fertilizer along provincial highways, county and local roads, railways, waterways, and the transportation of liquid petroleum products through pipelines have been identified as local threats in EBAs in the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area. The intent of Policies 2.53 and 2.54 associated with local threats is to manage the risks to drinking water sources through spills response. It is important that these programs build in existing consideration of the downstream use of the water sources for drinking by adding the knowledge of the Intake Protection Zones into spills preparedness, response and prevention programs. It is important to understand that risks to drinking water sources exist beyond the defined IPZ areas. The IPZ areas, especially IPZ-2, provide an indication of the level of risk and travel time to the intake under modelled conditions.</p>	IPZ-3s now being referred to as event based areas (EBAs)	Change IPZ-3 reference to EBA



Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
		Local threats have been only identified within the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area. Event-based modelling, which is used to determine these local threats, has only been completed for the EBAs of LAWSS, Petrolia and Wallaceburg intakes. The event-based modelling has established these local threats as significant drinking water threats in the IPZ of the St. Clair Region Source Protection Area.		
4.3.1	48	Low and moderate threats policies that use the Prescribed Instrument approach have only been developed for the application of pesticides. Pesticide permits are required in order to apply these chemicals in some situations. It is important that applicants and the issuer of the permits are fully aware of the potential impacts of pesticides on drinking water sources. By making the applicant aware that they are in an area where the application of the pesticide is a low or moderate threat to drinking water, it is less likely that, through error or intent, application discharge could occur (Policy 3.02 and OC-3.01).		
4.3.1	48	<p>Low and moderate threats policies that use the Prescribed Instrument approach have been developed for two policies. For the application of pesticides, pesticide permits are required in order to apply these chemicals in some situations. It is important that applicants and the issuer of the permits are fully aware of the potential impacts of pesticides on drinking water sources. By making the applicant aware that they are in an area where the application of the pesticide is a low or moderate threat to drinking water, it is less likely that, through error or intent, application discharge could occur (Policy 3.02 and OC-3.01).</p> <p>The policy on new PIs related to moderate and low threats (3.03, OC-3.02) was developed to encourage consideration when issuing PIs that the level of risk reduction imposed by the PI be reasonable, in the opinion of the issuer of the PI, so that the threat never becomes a SDWT in areas where the vulnerability would allow for that. Where the activity provides a potential threat to a municipal drinking water source it is suggested that the operator of the drinking water system be consulted on their perception of the level of risk.</p>	Additional PI policy was created.	Rationale for the new policy was added.
4.4	49	<p>The Clean Water Act indicates that the Source Protection Plan may contain other permitted policies. The Thames-Sydenham and Region has focused on two groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• spill prevention plans, spill contingency plans and emergency response plans; and</li> <li>• transport pathways.</li> </ul>		
4.4	49	<p>The Clean Water Act indicates that the Source Protection Plan may contain other permitted policies. One of the other permitted policies that were created was a policy for environmental assessment reviews (4.12, OC-4.10). This policy was developed to emphasize the importance that Source Water Protection is considered at the beginning and throughout the EA process. If not considered when proposed and preferred alternative options are being assessed, it may result in the selection of an alternative which conflicts with policies within the Source Protection Plan (SPP). This may result in challenges for the proponent later through approval processes. This policy would apply in areas where the activity would be a significant, moderate or low drinking water threat.</p> <p>The remainder of other permitted policies for the Thames-Sydenham and Region has focused on three groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• spill prevention plans, spill contingency plans and emergency response plans;</li> <li>• transport pathways; and</li> <li>• monitoring of a drinking water issue identified in the assessment report.</li> </ul>	Policy was added requesting source water protection is considered throughout the entire EA process.	Rationale for the EA policy added.

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
4.4.1	49	Spill prevention plans, spill contingency plans, and emergency response plans are communication tools for a variety of agencies (province, municipal staff) as well as the general public. As such, policies have been developed to be implemented by the province and the municipality. These plans would benefit from including information about areas where spills may pose a risk to municipal drinking water sources. Since the impacts as well as the outcomes of most spills are directly related to the level of preparedness, it was important to include these types of policies (Policies 4.01, 4.02 and 4.03 and OC-4.01) within the Source Protection Plan to encourage municipalities and the province to include the vulnerable areas and other information developed through the Source Protection Planning process in the spill prevention, spill contingency, and emergency response plans. Specify Action was the most appropriate approach to use to develop these policies.		
4.4.1	49	Spill prevention plans, spill contingency plans, and emergency response plans are communication tools for a variety of agencies (provincial, municipal, etc.) as well as the general public. As such, policies have been developed to be implemented by the province and the municipality. These plans would benefit from including information about areas where spills may pose a risk to municipal drinking water sources. Since the impacts as well as the outcomes of most spills are directly related to the level of preparedness, it was important to include these types of policies (Policies 4.01, 4.02 and 4.03 and OC-4.01) within the Source Protection Plan to encourage municipalities and the province to include the vulnerable areas and other information developed through the Source Protection Planning process in the spill prevention, spill contingency, and emergency response plans. Specify Action was the most appropriate approach to use to develop these policies.	Minor text edits	Edit for grammar
		<b>New Section</b>		
4.4.3	51	<p><b>Monitoring of a Drinking Water Issue Identified in the Assessment Report</b></p> <p>Through the assessment reports two separate issues have been identified, Nitrate at the Wallaceburg surface water intake and Microcystin at the Wheatley and Chatham/South Kent surface water intakes. While there was adequate information to identify these issues the SPC determined that at this time there was not adequate information available to: determine if Issues Contributing Areas (ICA) are required, delineate the ICAs, and develop significant threat policies for the ICAs. Policies 4.13 and 4.14 were created to identify the need for continued water quality monitoring to provide the required data to answer the outstanding questions. In the case of Nitrate it was decided to conduct additional monitoring/data collection while awaiting the outcome of an ongoing Environmental Assessment on the drinking water sources for the Wallaceburg area. If the EA determines the existing intake will remain in use this monitoring is required to confirm the potential reversing of the nitrate trend and provide insight into whether Nitrate should remain an issue at the intake. If Nitrate remains an issue, the monitoring would also provide data to refine the area contributing to the nitrate issue. In the case of Microcystin continued monitoring, of Microcystin and Phosphorous (a limiting nutrient for Microcystin), is required to provide enough years of data to determine if there is an increasing trend in Microcystin levels at the intakes. These policies support the continuation of existing Provincial, Conservation Authority and Municipal data collection programs, as well as the inclusion of new data collection programs such as collection of event-based data. The policy acknowledges that this data collection will all be dependent on the availability of funding and staff resources.</p>	Policy was added suggesting further monitoring/data collection for the Nitrate and Microcystin policies.	Rationale for the Nitrate and Microcystin monitoring policies.
4.5	51	It was also realized that a level of consistency in the monitoring reports was essential. To achieve this consistency, it was determined that a guidance document was necessary. This guidance is to be developed by the Conservation Authorities in collaboration with the policy implementer as outlined in Policies 5.02 and OC-5.09. This document would outline specific contents and format of the monitoring report and is intended to obtain meaningful information without being unduly onerous.		

Section / Policy	Page	Text	Reason For Change	Changes Made
4.5	51	It was also realized that a level of consistency in the monitoring reports was essential. To achieve this consistency, it was determined that a guidance document was necessary. This guidance is to be developed by the Conservation Authorities in collaboration with the policy implementer as outlined in Policies 5.02 and OC-5.08. This document would outline specific contents and format of the monitoring report and is intended to obtain meaningful information without being unduly onerous.	Incorrect policy # reference	Changed 'O.C.-5.09' to 'O.C.-5.08'
5	53	This Explanatory Document has provided the rationale that Thames-Sydenham and Region SPC used to develop the policies within the Source Protection Plan that would satisfy these objectives. The policies were developed using the SPC guiding principles (develop fair and reasonable solutions; ensure consensus within SPC; ensure clarity of information; ensure open communication and respect diversity of opinion) ensuring that the policies were effective, fair and reasonable as well as being implementable.		
5	53	This Explanatory Document has provided the rationale that the Thames-Sydenham and Region SPC used to develop the policies within the Source Protection Plan that would satisfy these objectives. The policies were developed using the SPC guiding principles (develop fair and reasonable solutions; ensure consensus within the SPC; ensure clarity of information; ensure open communication and respect diversity of opinion) ensuring that the policies were effective, fair and reasonable as well as being implementable.	Minor text edits	Edit for grammar
5	53	Education and Outreach as well as Land Use Planning tools were generally used as complementary tools for significant threats. Incentives have also been identified as a complementary tool; however, policies were only developed for existing activities for specific prescribed threats. Where Section 57 (prohibition) and Section 58 (risk management plans) were used, Section 59 (restricted land use) was used as a complementary tool. In situations where the desired action was not within the authority of the other tools, policies were developed to specify actions that would achieve the Source Protection Plan's objectives. The Clean Water Act provides the authority that the Source Protection Plan may include other permitted policies which the Thames-Sydenham and Region used to developed policies that addressed spills and transport pathways.		
5	53	Education and Outreach as well as Land Use Planning tools were generally used as complementary tools for significant threats. Incentives have also been identified as a complementary tool; however, the policies developed only apply to existing activities for specific prescribed threats. Where Section 57 (prohibition) and Section 58 (risk management plans) were used, Section 59 (restricted land use) was used as a complementary tool. In situations where the desired action was not within the authority of the other tools, policies were developed to specify actions that would achieve the Source Protection Plan's objectives. The Clean Water Act provides the authority that the Source Protection Plan may include other permitted policies which the Thames-Sydenham and Region used to developed policies that addressed spills and transport pathways.	Minor text edits	Edit for grammar
5	53	Monitoring is a key component of understanding the effectiveness of the Source Protection Plan in reducing threats to drinking water sources. The Thames-Sydenham and Region has developed policies that use a collaborative approach to accomplish this goal. Policies of the Source Protection Plan will ensure that the Source Protection Authorities have the necessary information to fulfil their reporting requirements. This information is important to ensure that the Source Protection Plan is meeting its requirements in an effective manner.		
5	53	Monitoring is a key component of understanding the effectiveness of the Source Protection Plan in reducing threats to drinking water sources. The Thames-Sydenham and Region has developed policies that use a collaborative approach to accomplish this goal. Policies of the Source Protection Plan will ensure that the Source Protection Authorities have the necessary information to fulfill their reporting requirements. This information is important to ensure that the Source Protection Plan is meeting its requirements in an effective manner.	Minor text edits	Edit for grammar

