

Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, Source Protection Program Branch

Annual Progress Reporting Supplemental Form for Source Protection

December 22, 2016

UPDATE #1: February 1, 2017 to clarify instructions and reportables

UPDATE #2: November 2017

Halton-Hamilton - Draft February 20, 2018r

Annual Progress Reporting Supplemental Form for Source Protection

ACTION REQUIRED	Complete all applicable sections of this annual progress reporting supplemental form to report on progress made on the implementation of source protection plan (SPP) policies in your source protection region/area (SPR/A).			
PURPOSE	<p>This supplemental form provides a standardized approach for the sharing of critical information from the source protection authorities (SPA) on implementation progress. This form will be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess plan implementation to demonstrate progress made in protecting sources of drinking water; • Support a consistent assessment of implementation progress across the province through a predictable, consistent, and reliable manner; • Contribute to the Minister’s summary on progress made in source protection as required by subsection 46(7) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> (CWA) and that is prepared by the ministry under the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002</i>; • Support the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)’s responses to requests for information from senior management, SPA, stakeholders, and members of the general public; • Corroborate the MOECC’s responses to any related program area audits; • Validate MOECC’s responses to the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario, as requested; and, • Provide general compliance oversight. 			
GUIDANCE	The document titled “Guidance and Rationale: Annual Progress Reporting Supplemental Form for Source Protection” has been created to complement this supplemental form. SPAs are encouraged to consult this guidance document which provides further direction on completing the reportables in this form as well as a rationale for each of the reportables.			
REPORTING PERIOD	Due to the staggered effective dates of the SPPs, the reporting period will vary. For those SPR/As submitting their first official annual progress report and supplemental form, the reporting period covers actions taken on SPP policies from the effective date of their SPP to December 31 st of the second calendar year following the year in which their SPPs take effect. For those SPR/As who are submitting their second or subsequent annual progress report and supplemental form, the reporting period is the previous calendar year unless otherwise indicated (i.e., when the information is requested on a cumulative basis).			
SUBMISSION DEADLINE	<p>Both the public-facing annual progress report template and annual progress reporting supplemental form will be due by May 1st of every year.</p> <p>This form is due by <u>May 1, 2018</u> from the following SPAs: Lakehead, Niagara, Mattagami, Mississippi-Rideau, Lake Erie-Kettle Creek, Lake Erie-Catfish Creek, Sudbury, Trent Conservation Coalition, Raisin-South Nation, Quinte, Cataraqui, Ausable Bayfield Maitland Valley, South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe, North Bay Mattawa, Sault Ste. Marie, Essex, Credit River, Toronto and Region and Central Lake Ontario, Halton-Hamilton, and Thames Sydenham & Region.</p> <p>This form is due by <u>May 1, 2019</u> from the previously listed SPAs as well as from Saugeen Grey Sauble Northern Bruce Peninsula, Lake Erie – Long Point, and Lake Erie – Grand River.</p>			
QUESTIONS	<p>The completed supplemental form as well as any questions you may have on completing the form are to be submitted and directed to the following staff at the SPPB:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Neil Gervais, Senior Drinking Water Program Advisor neil.gervais@ontario.ca</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Michael Halder, Research and Planning Analyst michael.halder@ontario.ca</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Copy your Liaison Officer (Bilal Kidwai, Mary Wooding or Brian Wright) <i>and</i> send to source.protection@ontario.ca</td> </tr> </table>	Neil Gervais, Senior Drinking Water Program Advisor neil.gervais@ontario.ca	Michael Halder, Research and Planning Analyst michael.halder@ontario.ca	Copy your Liaison Officer (Bilal Kidwai, Mary Wooding or Brian Wright) <i>and</i> send to source.protection@ontario.ca
Neil Gervais, Senior Drinking Water Program Advisor neil.gervais@ontario.ca	Michael Halder, Research and Planning Analyst michael.halder@ontario.ca	Copy your Liaison Officer (Bilal Kidwai, Mary Wooding or Brian Wright) <i>and</i> send to source.protection@ontario.ca		

Annual Progress Reporting Supplemental Form for Source Protection

SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN REGION/AREA	Halton-Hamilton
REPORTING PERIOD	December 1, 2015 – December 31, 2017
DATE SUBMITTED (dd-mm-year)	Draft February 20, 2018

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables			Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)																						
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend	N/A	N/A	N/A																							
Monitoring Policy Implementation	SPA	1a	Did all implementing bodies (IBs) submit a status update/report to the SPA for the reporting periods noted below?			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A																						
				<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2" style="width: 45%;">MONITORING POLICY REPORTING PERIOD</th> <th colspan="2" style="width: 15%;">RESPONSE</th> <th rowspan="2" style="width: 40%;">If no, how many implementing bodies did not submit their status updates?</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">Yes</th> <th style="width: 10%;">No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year)³</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	MONITORING POLICY REPORTING PERIOD	RESPONSE		If no , how many implementing bodies did not submit their status updates?	Yes	No	Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year) ³	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
MONITORING POLICY REPORTING PERIOD	RESPONSE		If no , how many implementing bodies did not submit their status updates?																												
	Yes	No																													
Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year) ³	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																													
Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																													
Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																													
Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																													
			Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually) or on an as needed basis All those with must conform monitoring policies plus others																												
Monitoring Policy Implementation	SPA	1b	Complete the table below to indicate which implementing body(ies) did not submit a status update/monitoring policy report and the reason(s) for not submitting. Insert additional rows as needed.																												
				<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 45%;">Name of Implementing Body</th> <th style="width: 55%;">Explanation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year)⁴</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of Implementing Body	Explanation	Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year) ⁴		Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)		Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)		Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)																		
Name of Implementing Body	Explanation																														
Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year) ⁴																															
Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)																															
Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)																															
Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)																															
			Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually) or on an as needed basis																												
Implementation status⁵ of SPP policies	SPA & SPPB	2a	Complete the tables below to indicate the implementation status of various policies in the SPP. NOTE: The percentages calculated and reported in tables 1 to 3 below should be cumulative percentages (i.e., status of policies since the SPP effective date). See Guidance for more details.			A	Percent of policies that address significant drinking water threats have been/are being implemented (Table 1).	100% of policies that address significant drinking water threats have been/are being implemented.	M (#5, #6) L (#10)																						
			Table 1. Implementation status of policies that address significant drinking water threat activities.																												
			<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;">Implementation Status Category</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Percentage of Plan Policies</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Implemented</td> <td style="text-align: center;">62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In progress/some progress made</td> <td style="text-align: center;">27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No progress made</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No information available/no response received</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No response required/not applicable</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Implementation Status Category	Percentage of Plan Policies	Implemented	62	Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required	6	In progress/some progress made	27	No progress made	4	No information available/no response received	0	No response required/not applicable	1	TOTAL	100				B	Percent of policies that address moderate-low	Increasing percent of policies that						
Implementation Status Category	Percentage of Plan Policies																														
Implemented	62																														
Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required	6																														
In progress/some progress made	27																														
No progress made	4																														
No information available/no response received	0																														
No response required/not applicable	1																														
TOTAL	100																														

¹ **NOTE:** The SPPB is sometimes listed in the second column to indicate where SPPB may facilitate the collection and sharing of information to the SPAs on the implementation of policies by provincial ministries.

² The anticipated outcomes are denoted with “S” for a short-term outcome, “M” for a medium-term outcome, and “L” for a long-term outcome. The letters S, M, L are followed by a number in brackets that corresponds with the specific program outcome described in the program outcomes document and displayed in the program logic model. Please refer to these documents for more information.

³ For CTC, Halton-Hamilton, and Thames Sydenham and Region, the Year 1 monitoring policy reporting period is from December 31, 2015 (i.e., the effective dates of these three SPPs) to December 31, 2016.

⁴ For CTC, Halton-Hamilton, and Thames Sydenham and Region, the Year 1 monitoring policy reporting period is from December 31, 2015 (i.e., the effective dates of these three SPPs) to December 31, 2016.

⁵ Please refer to the accompanying Guidance document for a detailed description of each of the implementation status categories as used in this form.

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures		Outcomes ² (S, M, L)																																	
					ID	Measure		Target/Trend																																
			<p>Table 2. Implementation status of policies that address <i>moderate-low</i> drinking water threat activities.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Implementation Status Category</th> <th>Percentage of Plan Policies</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Implemented</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In progress/some progress made</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No progress made</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No information available/no response received</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No response required/not applicable</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 3. Implementation status of policies (i.e., transport pathway, general education & outreach (E&O), some specify action, etc.) <i>not</i> directly associated with addressing specific drinking water threat activities.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Implementation Status Category</th> <th>Percentage of Plan Policies</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Implemented</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In progress/some progress made</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No progress made</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No information available/no response received</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No response required/not applicable</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>COMMENTS (Include any comments below, if needed, to explain any of the data reported in the tables above): In total, 60% of policies are implemented, 27% are in progress, 6% have had no action, 6% have been determined to not require any action, and 1% are not applicable. Some policies apply to significant, moderate and low risk, which results in double counting in Tables 1 and 2.</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually) until such time all policies in the SPP are considered implemented.</p>		Implementation Status Category	Percentage of Plan Policies	Implemented	67	Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required	0	In progress/some progress made	33	No progress made	0	No information available/no response received	0	No response required/not applicable	0	TOTAL	100	Implementation Status Category	Percentage of Plan Policies	Implemented	50	Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required	5	In progress/some progress made	28	No progress made	17	No information available/no response received	0	No response required/not applicable	0	TOTAL	100	C	drinking water threats have been/are being implemented (Table 2). For reporting by theme/other policies: Percent of other policies that have been/are being implemented (Table 3).	address moderate-low drinking water threats have been/are being implemented. For reporting by theme/other policies: Increasing percent of other policies being implemented.	
Implementation Status Category	Percentage of Plan Policies																																							
Implemented	67																																							
Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required	0																																							
In progress/some progress made	33																																							
No progress made	0																																							
No information available/no response received	0																																							
No response required/not applicable	0																																							
TOTAL	100																																							
Implementation Status Category	Percentage of Plan Policies																																							
Implemented	50																																							
Policy outcome(s) evaluated; no further action(s) required	5																																							
In progress/some progress made	28																																							
No progress made	17																																							
No information available/no response received	0																																							
No response required/not applicable	0																																							
TOTAL	100																																							
Implementation status of SPP policies (as per O. Reg. 287/07, ss. 52(1), p. 1)	SPA & SPPB	2b	Summarize the reasons for results recorded above as being "No progress made" and/or "No information available/no response received" by the dates specified in your source protection plan for significant drinking water threat activities (Table 1) and for any moderate/low threat policies that used prescribed instruments and <i>Planning Act</i> tools by completing the table below with the following details. Insert additional rows as needed.																																					
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Policy ID</th> <th>Implementing Body</th> <th>Explanation of why actions were not taken by the person(s) or body(ies)</th> <th>Outline next steps to support implementation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>T-15-S a.</td> <td>Landowners</td> <td>Not a must conform policy – it is unknown at this time if the threat exists, landowners are likely unaware of policy</td> <td>Will work with municipalities to identify appropriate landowners for direct contact.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T-29-S d.</td> <td>Agrichemical Warehousing Standards Association</td> <td>Not a must conform policy – No response received</td> <td>Will continue outreach</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T-49-S a.&b.</td> <td>De-icing contractors</td> <td>Not a must conform policy – Failure to contact prior to winter</td> <td>Work with municipalities and Landscape Ontario to identify contractors in Region and contact directly</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T-53-S c.</td> <td>MMA</td> <td>Not a must conform policy - No explanation given</td> <td>Will contact MMA directly</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L-2-S a.&b.</td> <td>NEB/OEB</td> <td>Not a must conform policy – Failure to contact</td> <td>Will contact OEB and NEB replacement once established</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually) or on as needed basis</p>		Policy ID	Implementing Body	Explanation of why actions were not taken by the person(s) or body(ies)	Outline next steps to support implementation	T-15-S a.	Landowners	Not a must conform policy – it is unknown at this time if the threat exists, landowners are likely unaware of policy	Will work with municipalities to identify appropriate landowners for direct contact.	T-29-S d.	Agrichemical Warehousing Standards Association	Not a must conform policy – No response received	Will continue outreach	T-49-S a.&b.	De-icing contractors	Not a must conform policy – Failure to contact prior to winter	Work with municipalities and Landscape Ontario to identify contractors in Region and contact directly	T-53-S c.	MMA	Not a must conform policy - No explanation given	Will contact MMA directly	L-2-S a.&b.	NEB/OEB	Not a must conform policy – Failure to contact	Will contact OEB and NEB replacement once established												
Policy ID	Implementing Body	Explanation of why actions were not taken by the person(s) or body(ies)	Outline next steps to support implementation																																					
T-15-S a.	Landowners	Not a must conform policy – it is unknown at this time if the threat exists, landowners are likely unaware of policy	Will work with municipalities to identify appropriate landowners for direct contact.																																					
T-29-S d.	Agrichemical Warehousing Standards Association	Not a must conform policy – No response received	Will continue outreach																																					
T-49-S a.&b.	De-icing contractors	Not a must conform policy – Failure to contact prior to winter	Work with municipalities and Landscape Ontario to identify contractors in Region and contact directly																																					
T-53-S c.	MMA	Not a must conform policy - No explanation given	Will contact MMA directly																																					
L-2-S a.&b.	NEB/OEB	Not a must conform policy – Failure to contact	Will contact OEB and NEB replacement once established																																					

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables	Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)						
				ID	Measure	Target/Trend							
Part IV (Section 57 – Prohibition, Section 58 - Risk Management Plan & Section 59 - Restricted Land Uses)	SPA	3a	<p>If applicable to the SPR/A, complete the table below for risk management plans (RMPs) established.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total number of RMPs agreed to/established within the SPR/A since effective date of the SPP (i.e., cumulative total) (Column A)</th> <th>Number of RMPs agreed to or established within the SPR/A (for existing and future threats) during the reporting period (i.e., annual total) (Column B)</th> <th>Total number of properties (i.e., parcels) with RMPs agreed to or established since the effective date of the SPP (Column C)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>	Total number of RMPs agreed to/established within the SPR/A since effective date of the SPP (i.e., cumulative total) (Column A)	Number of RMPs agreed to or established within the SPR/A (for existing and future threats) during the reporting period (i.e., annual total) (Column B)	Total number of properties (i.e., parcels) with RMPs agreed to or established since the effective date of the SPP (Column C)	0	0	0	D	Total number of risk management plans established since the effective date of the SPP.	Increasing over time until all required activities have RMPs established.	S (#1, #2) M (#5, #6, #7) L (#9, #10)
	Total number of RMPs agreed to/established within the SPR/A since effective date of the SPP (i.e., cumulative total) (Column A)	Number of RMPs agreed to or established within the SPR/A (for existing and future threats) during the reporting period (i.e., annual total) (Column B)	Total number of properties (i.e., parcels) with RMPs agreed to or established since the effective date of the SPP (Column C)										
	0	0	0										
					E	Total number of properties that are subject to risk management plans since the effective date of the SPP.	All properties that are subject to section 58 have RMPs established.						
	SPA	3b	<p>How many existing* significant drinking water threats have been managed through the established RMPs since the plan took effect (i.e., the cumulative count)? <u>0</u> (* meaning engaged in OR enumerated as existing significant threats)</p> <p>NOTE: SPAs are asked to maintain a running tally of progress in addressing existing significant threats that were on the ground before plans were approved. The running tally consists of the formula: A+B-C-D. See corresponding reportable #39. See guidance document for additional details.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A = Original estimate of SDWT engaged in/enumerated when SPP approved B = Additional SDWT identified after first SPP approved as a result of field verification (i.e., <u>not</u> part of original estimate of SDWT) C = SDWT included in enumeration estimates at time of plan approval but subsequently determined through field verification that: (i) it was not actually engaged in at a particular location after all OR (ii) it was no longer engaged in (e.g., land may still have an agricultural operation but owner no longer applying pesticides for their own reasons) D = SDWT addressed because policy is implemented* (*Note: Where multiple policy tools address any given threat sub-category, implemented means that actions associated with at least one policy tool have been completed/are in place.) SPAs may use their local discretion in which policy tool they wish to reflect as being implemented. <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually) or until such time all existing (enumerated) threats are managed according to plan policies</p>	N/A	No direct measure, but links with measure “O” associated with Implementation Status and Enumerated Threats: Percent of significant drinking water threats that existed in the area when the SPP was approved and that have been addressed (i.e., eliminated or managed).	N/A	N/A						
	SPA	4	<p>[OPTIONAL]: What gaps, if any, are risk management measures that are included in RMPs addressing as they relate to drinking water threat activities?</p> <p>RESPONSE: N/A</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>										
SPA	5	<p>How many section 59 notices were issued in this reporting period for:</p> <p>(i) activities to which neither a prohibition (section 57) nor a RMP (section 58) policy applied, as per ss. 59(2)(a) of the CWA <u>31</u></p> <p>(ii) activities to which a RMP (section 58) policy applied, as per ss. 59(2)(b) of the CWA <u>0</u></p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>											
SPA	6	<p>For the purposes of section 61 of O. Reg. 287/07, how many notices and/or copies of prescribed instruments that state the prescribed instrument conforms with the significant drinking water threat policies in the SPP (i.e., statement of conformity confirms the instrument holder is exempt from requiring a RMP) did the RMO receive? <u>0</u></p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>											
<p>NOTE: The term inspections as used in the reportables below refer to those conducted as a site visit on a planned (i.e., proactive) and/or responsive (i.e., complaint-based) basis. This includes inspections carried out for threat verification purposes because the Risk Management Inspector (RMI) had reasonable grounds to <i>believe</i> that an activity that is being engaged in on a property may be subject to section 57 (i.e., including those that resulted in no activities found</p>				F	Percent of inspections that show conformity	Inspections show 100% conformity with	S (#2) M (#5, #6) L (#9, #10)						

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables	Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
				ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			that were subject to section 57). The term <i>contravention</i> as used in the context of inspections refers to activities being undertaken that are in violation of sections 57 and 58 of the CWA relative to the timelines noted in the SPP.		with prohibition and risk management plan policies in an approved SPP.	prohibition and risk management plan policies over time.	
	SPA	7a	(i) How many, if any, inspections (including any follow-up site visits) were carried out for activities (existing or future) that are prohibited under section 57 of the CWA? <u> 0 </u> (ii) How many properties (i.e., parcels) had inspections for the purposes of section 57? <u> 0 </u> Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)				
	SPA	7b	Among these inspections, how many showed that activities were taking place on the landscape even though they were prohibited (i.e., in contravention) under section 57 of the CWA? <u> N/A </u> Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)				
	SPA	8	How many existing significant drinking water threats have been prohibited as a result of section 57 prohibitions since the plan took effect (i.e., the cumulative count)? <u> 0 </u> Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually) or until such time all existing (enumerated) threats are prohibited according to plan policies				
	SPA	9a	(i) What is the total number of inspections (including any follow-up site visits) that were carried out for activities that require a RMP under section 58 of the CWA? <u> 5 </u> (ii) How many properties (i.e., parcels) had inspections for the purposes of section 58? <u> 2 </u> Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)				
	SPA	9b	Among these inspections, (i) how many were in contravention with section 58 of the CWA (i.e., person engaging in a drinking water threat activity without a RMP as required by the SPP)? <u> 5 </u> (ii) how many were in non-compliance with the specific contents of the RMP? (Note: Please only include those inspections that showed non-compliance with measures/conditions to manage the actual threat activity.) <u> N/A </u> Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)	G	Percent compliance with the contents of risk management plans.	100% compliance with RMPs established under section 58 of the CWA.	S (#2) M (#5, #6) L (#9, #10)
	SPA	9c	Where there were cases of non-compliance with RMPs, describe, in general terms, how these cases were resolved? If applicable, please also include the number of any notices and/or orders that may have been issued in the response. RESPONSE: N/A Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)				
	SPA	10	[OPTIONAL]: What new/additional knowledge (e.g., threats, transport pathways, abandoned wells, etc. and how they are managed), if any, did the lead SPA gain through communication with their RMO/RMIs, based on the RMO/RMI's work in the field? RESPONSE: N/A Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)	N/A	No direct measure. However, this reportable may help to illustrate the value-added knowledge/benefit the RMOs bring to communities and SPAs through their day-to-day work.	N/A	N/A
NOTE: The reportables for Prescribed Instruments (PIs) applies to ministries responsible for issuing PIs under the following legislation: Environmental Protection Act (MOECC), Ontario Water Resources Act (MOECC), Pesticides Act (MOECC), Safe Drinking Water Act (MOECC), Nutrient Management Act (Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)), and Aggregate Resources Act (Ministry of Natural Resources (MNRF) and Ministry of Transportation (MTO)). As such, responses to the reportables below on PI integration and conformity are to be provided by each ministry program area as indicated below.							
Prescribed instruments -	SPPB	11	Indicate the specific measures that provincial ministries have taken/are taking to integrate source protection into the business processes of their respective program areas associated with PIs. See ministry PI electronic/paper reporting forms for responses.	H	Number of applicable	All applicable provincial	S (#1, #2)

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables										Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)									
			BUSINESS PROCESSES										ID	Measure	Target/Trend										
Integration and Conformity NOTE: Since the responses to reportables #11-#13, #15 and #18 are already provided through the provincial ministry electronic/paper reporting forms, there is no need for the SPA to reproduce the responses in this form. As such, these reportables have been shaded out. These reportables are being retained in the supplemental form for information purposes should SPAs wish to share this information with their respective SPC. In this case, SPAs may choose to provide a summary of the responses.			PROVINCIAL MINISTRY PROGRAM AREAS											provincial ministry program areas integrating source protection and/or use source protection science/information in their business or operational processes.	ministry program areas integrating source protection considerations and/or use source protection science/information in their business or operational processes.	M (#4, #5, #6, #7) L (#8, #9, #10)									
			BUSINESS PROCESSES														MOECC: Waste disposal – landfilling & storage	MOECC: Sewage Works/Wastewater	MOECC: Pesticides	MOECC: Water Takings	MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids	MOECC: Municipal water licences/works permits	OMAFRA: Nutrient Management	MNRF: Aggregates – Fuel storage	MTO: Aggregates – Fuel storage
			Relevant staff training on source protection related to PIs including inspections	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
			Guidance documents (e.g., standard operating policy/procedures) available to align with new program changes for source protection for reference by ministry staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
			Screening process in place to identify incoming PI applications potentially affected by SPP policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>														
			Information or other support tools created and/or made available to external stakeholders (i.e. applicants) to inform them that restrictions may result from source protection policies, so that potential impacts can be considered in advance of making an application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
			System in place to track the PIs that are subject to SPP policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>														
			Process in place to map or otherwise geo-reference PIs that are subject to PI policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>														
			Protocol in place to review previously issued (i.e., existing) PIs potentially affected by SPP policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
			Other changes made to business processes. Provide a brief description below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
No changes made. If no changes made to business processes to integrate source protection, please explain the reason(s) below.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																
Reporting Frequency: One-time (but may be needed again if and when further changes are made to business processes to integrate source protection) MOECC-MRDWS-Fuel H&S - Approvals & Licensing Staff in the Environmental Assessment and Permissions Branch (policy, review engineers) have all attended source protection training and are updated on source protection matters during regularly scheduled staff meetings. MOECC has built and provided province wide staff access to an online internal source protection resource library, where they can access source protection policies, protocols, legislation, plans, contacts, guidance and support. For Prescribed Instrument conformity, the Ministry has undertaken an exercise to identify all high risk fuel storage and handling associated with municipal residential drinking water systems. Through this review, the ministry identified 15 licenced municipal drinking water systems that include fuel handling and storage that is a significant drinking water threat. By the end of 2017, the MOECC amended the Municipal Drinking Water Licences for each of these systems to include new conditions that address the fuel storage risk. MOECC-Water Takings - The ministry has a centralized data system (Integrated Divisional System - IDS), which is an integrated information repository to record, process, review and approve Prescribed Instrument applications. The ministry has a project underway to develop a new Information Technology Platform for electronic applications. The proposed source protection-related data input fields for approvals will allow for streamlined tracking of the prescribed instruments that are subject to source protection plan policies. The project is expected to be implemented in 2018. Source protection water quantity vulnerable area data has recently been made available with the Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division of the ministry. Sites with active water taking permits within source protection water quantity vulnerable areas will be identified and compliance inspections will be planned based on risk analysis during Year-Start Planning process for FY 2018-19.																									

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables	Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
				ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			<p>The ministry has a Source Water Protection Information Atlas, including a mapping tool, in Geocortex platform that will allow staff to search a location for source protection water quantity vulnerability and follow the links to source protection plan policies and threats tool to find out if water taking is a drinking water threat and need to be managed using Permits To Take Water. Source protection layers have also been added to regional ArcGIS. The ministry has provided access and training to technical staff regarding the map tools and the Tier 3 water budget so that they have better understanding of the Tier 3 Water Budget and local risk assessment results. The ministry also plans to develop guidance material for proponents and qualified persons about using the source protection water budget science (including the input data, model and results) in their preparation of applications and for the Permit To Take Water decision-making process, particularly those for higher risk groundwater takings.</p> <p>MOECC-Pesticides - Measures were implemented in 2015. Changes to the ministry's centralized data system (Integrated Divisional System – IDS) for Pesticide Permit module were completed in 2017. This includes Source Protection Plan specific selections to facilitate extracting relevant source protection information from pesticide inspection reports. The modifications will enable automated tracking/reporting capabilities.</p> <p>MOECC-Hauled Sewage - Since 2015 every hauled sewage site and biosolids site (aka "processed organic waste) application submitted to MOECC District/Area offices has undergoing Source Protection Screening. Internal staff training, data tracking and program support materials have been developed and deployed for appropriate staff directly involved in screening and Environmental Compliance Approval review/approval activities. Other program upgrades are in development and are being/will be deployed in 2018 for external stakeholder use including updated application forms and guides and a new on-line Environmental Compliance Approval application platform. The Source Water Protection Information Atlas is available for external stakeholder use on the Ministry's public web site.</p> <p>MOECC-Landfilling and Storage - For details on internal business process changes and tracking of prescribed instruments for this program area, see Questions 2-6 in Section 1.</p> <p>OMAFRA- Other changes made: approvals process revised to delegate letter of conformity preparation for instruments not approved by OMAFRA to certified person.</p>				
	SPPB	12	Provide a brief description of each provincial ministry's process for ensuring PI decisions for <i>incoming</i> PI applications (new or amendments) conform with the significant drinking water threat PI policies applicable to each SPR/A (i.e., a description of the screening process in place) in the table below.				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
			ID	DESCRIPTION	Measure	Target/Trend		
			MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA	DESCRIPTION				
			MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage	<p>Since May 2015, the ministry has been screening environmental compliance approval (ECA) applications for waste disposal site activities to determine if the activity is located in an area where the activity could be a significant drinking water threat. This is called the “primary screening”. The vulnerable areas are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wellhead protection area or intake protection zone with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher, • An issues contributing area, or • An event-based area. <p>If any of the above criteria apply, the ECA application is flagged for a more detailed ‘secondary screening’ to determine if the activity associated with the application is a significant drinking water threat. If yes, the appropriate standard operating policy (SOP) is applied. As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a prescribed instrument to prohibit an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an instrument for the activity. It should be noted that an ECA application may also be refused for reasons outside of source protection policies. Where a source protection plan policy outcome is to manage the activity for a waste disposal site, the ministry will conform to the policy by continuing to apply protective requirements under the Environmental Protection Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, and existing regulations, policies, and guidelines. New waste disposal ECAs include stringent terms and conditions that consider the protection of drinking water sources, such as requirements for: - buffer lands, and appropriate setbacks from wellheads or intake zones; - financial assurance (for privately owned sites) to ensure that if a proponent is unable or unwilling to meet their responsibilities for the site or if the site is abandoned, the site is properly closed and maintained to ensure it does not pose a risk to the environment, including drinking water sources. In addition to the SOP, we have provided detailed guidance to affected municipalities “Source Protection Information Bulletin: Environmental Compliance Approvals for Waste Disposal Sites (2015)”. The ministry emailed this draft information bulletin to municipalities affected by source protection plans in early June, 2015. A public version of all MOECC program area SOPs was posted on the EBR on April 1, 2015 under EBR #012-2968.</p>				
			MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater	<p>Since January 2015, every application for a new or amended prescribed instrument goes through a ‘primary screening’ to determine if the activity associated with the application is located in one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wellhead protection area or intake protection zone with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher, • An issues contributing area, or • An event-based area. <p>If any of the above criteria apply, the prescribed instrument application is flagged for a more detailed ‘secondary screening’ to determine if the activity associated with the application is a significant drinking water threat. If yes, the appropriate standard operating policy is applied.</p> <p>As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a prescribed instrument to prohibit an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an instrument for the activity. Source protection policies may be just one of the reasons an application is denied. Where a source protection plan policy outcome is to manage a significant threat to drinking water sources through the prescribed instrument for sewage works, the ministry is meeting the policy’s obligations by including design and operational measures in an Environmental Compliance Approval. To assist in the implementation of this approach, anyone subject to policy requiring management of a significant</p>				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
				<p>drinking water threat is required to include in their application a description of the measures necessary to protect drinking water and submit a 'Source Protection Supplementary Report' to outline how the activity for the sewage works will be managed so that the activity will not become a significant drinking water threat. As a precautionary and pollution prevention approach is fundamental to the design of all sewage works, additional measures are assessed on a site specific basis. In addition to this, sewage works that pose a significant threat to drinking water which are also eligible for the Transfer of Review Program require that the letter of recommendation from the municipality outline that the works was reviewed in accordance with the Clean Water Act and the local Source Protection Plan and is and will no longer pose a significant threat to drinking water as a result of the measures identified by the proponent and with appropriate ECA terms and conditions, if approved.</p> <p>In addition to the standard operating policies, we have provided detailed guidance to affected municipalities "Source Protection Information Bulletin: Environmental Compliance Approvals for Sewage Works (2015)". The ministry emailed this draft information bulletin to municipalities affected by source protection plans in early June, 2015. A public version of all MOECC program area standard operating policies was posted on the Environmental Registry on April 1, 2015 under EBR #012-2968.</p>				
			MOECC: Pesticides	<p>Since January 2015, every application for a new or amended prescribed instrument goes through a 'primary screening' to determine if the activity associated with the application is located in one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A land application of pesticides in a source protection area that includes any of the pesticide ingredients from the Tables of Drinking Water Threats under the Clean Water Act, 2006 •A wellhead protection area or intake protection zone with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher, <p>If any of the above criteria apply, the prescribed instrument application is flagged for a more detailed 'secondary screening' to determine if the activity associated with the application is a significant drinking water threat. If yes, the appropriate standard operating policy is applied.</p> <p>As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a prescribed instrument for implementation prohibits an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an instrument for the activity. Source protection policies may be just one of the reasons an application is denied.</p> <p>When issuing pesticide permits for the application of pesticides on land in areas where this activity would be considered a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is including the following terms and conditions as per the standard operating policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •ensure the permit includes appropriate terms and conditions that address emergency response measures and spill contingency plans for any pesticide mixing, loading, and handling related to the proposed pesticide treatment which are protective of drinking water sources. •ensure the permit includes applicable terms and conditions related to site specific setbacks to watercourses, timing restrictions (including consideration of weather events) and spills/runoff management or other measures necessary to manage the significant threat activity in order to protect sources of drinking water. 				
			MOECC: Water Taking	<p>As part of the current Permit To Take Water review and decision making process, the ministry is using the best available science to assess the sustainability and potential impacts to municipal drinking water systems, other users, and the natural and built</p>				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
				<p>environments. The ministry is working to fully operationalize the new Standard Operating Policy. As per the Standard Operating Policy, the ministry staff are required to consider the information and conclusions of Tier 3 Water Budgets in addition to the site specific technical information provided in the support of the application for the purposes of incorporating Source Protection Plan policies into the Permit To Take Water review and decision making process.</p>				
			MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids	<p>Since January 2015, every application received by MOECC District/Area offices for a new or amended hauled sewage or biosolid spreading site prescribed instrument goes through a source protection screening performed Southwest Region staff to determine if the activity associated with the application is located in any of the following areas where the land application and/or storage of hauled sewage or Processed Organic Waste could be considered to be a significant drinking water threat, this includes sites located within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A wellhead protection area with vulnerability score of 10 •An intake protection zone with vulnerability score of 8 or higher •An issues contributing area linked to pathogens, phosphorus or nitrates <p>If necessary, the prescribed instrument undergoes a more detailed screening (performed by southwest region or Source Protection Programs Branch) to help confirm the potential threat level of the operation at the site in question. Once the appropriate potential threat classification is determined the applicable standard operating policy is applied.</p> <p>As legally required, where a source protection policy that relies on a waste disposal site prescribed instrument issued under the Environmental Protection Act for implementation prohibits an activity that is a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is conforming to the policy by refusing to issue an approval for the activity in that area. Source protection policies may be just one of the reasons an application is denied. Note that an approval may still be issued for those portions of the site where the activity is not considered to be a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>For applications proposing to apply or dispose of untreated hauled sewage (e.g. waste from septic tanks and holding tanks, etc.) to land in areas where this activity would be a significant drinking water threat, the ministry is not issuing an approval, even if a source protection plan policy allows for managing the threat through the environmental compliance approval. Note that an approval may still be issued for those portions of the site where the activity is not considered to be a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>MOECC is responsible for regulating the land application of Processed Organic Waste (e.g. digested sewage biosolids, processed organic food waste, pulp and paper biosolids, off-spec composts and other organic wastes etc) on non-agricultural sites. At these sites, Processed Organic Waste storage and land application is regulated with an "Organic Soil Conditioning Site" environmental compliance approval issued under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act. To be consistent with O. Reg. 267/03 under the Nutrient Management Act, for applications seeking to store or land apply biosolids within 100 metres of a municipal well, the ministry is not issuing any approval for the land application or storage of this material regardless of the policy in the local source protection plan. Outside this zone, where the policy outcome is to manage the threat, MOECC is taking a local approach to any approvals for the land application or storage of this material.</p>				
			MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits (Fuel storage)	<p>Applications are screened to determine if fuel storage or handling activities are being proposed or altered. Such applications are reviewed in detail to ensure conformance with significant drinking water threat policies. In addition, where fuel storage and</p>				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
				handling has been identified as significant threat in a drinking water system and conditions have been added to the prescribed instrument (municipal drinking water licence), all applications received for that system are screened in detail to ensure that fuel storage and handling activities remain in conformance with significant drinking water threat policies.				
			OMAFRA: Nutrient Management	Each new prescribed instrument application and application for amendment to exiting prescribed instruments that is received goes through a detailed screening for source water protection policies. The farm has a municipal tax roll number associated with it that is searched using a Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping application. Once the farm is located, several source water protection layers are turned on to determine if any policies apply to the area. If not, the review carries on as normal. If policies may apply then the vulnerability score is determined to see if the activity is a significant drinking water threat, and if so, we determine what policies apply and add applicable conditions, if necessary, to the prescribed instrument approval.				
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)	MNRF Aggregate Inspectors have received an overview of Source Protection and applicable Source Protection policies and have been instructed to screen new applications and amendments using the mapping tool developed by MOECC.				
			MTO: Aggregates -road construction (Fuel storage)	For applications that propose to extract material above the water table the permit application process includes the preparation of a water table summary report and/or hydrogeological studies undertaken by a Professional Engineer or Professional Geoscientist. Applications that propose extraction of aggregate material below or near the water table require a Level 1 Hydrogeological Report to determine the potential for adverse effects to groundwater and surface water resources and their uses. A Level 2 Hydrogeological Report is required if a potential for adverse effects is identified by the Level 1 Report. The Level 2 Report must demonstrate the significance of the effect and feasibility of mitigation, and is completed by a professional that is qualified to address items specified in the Aggregates Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards (AROPS). Any required monitoring programs or mitigation measures that result are incorporated into the site plans. In accordance with the mandatory requirements of the AROPS, all new aggregate and wayside permit applications must be circulated to the Upper and Lower Tier Municipality for review and comment. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is sent those permit applications that require the completion of a Level 2 Hydrogeological Report for review. Feedback provided back to MTO is considered in the application review and approvals process.				
			Reporting Frequency: One-time					
	SPPB	13	Provide a brief description of the approach each provincial ministry is taking for incoming PI applications (new or amendments) to have regard to any moderate and/or low drinking water threat policies that rely on PIs.					
			MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA	DESCRIPTION				
			MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage	As noted in the standard operating policy posted on the Environmental Registry on April 1, 2015 under Environmental Registry #012-2968, the ministry has reviewed moderate and low drinking water threat policies for all its program areas and determined that current site-specific processes for the review and approval of the majority of instruments meets the requirements of these policies (exception is hauled sewage sites).				
			MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater	As outlined in the 2015 standard operating policies posted on the Environmental Registry on April 1, 2015 under EBR #012-2968, the ministry has reviewed moderate and low drinking water threat policies for all its program areas and determined that				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
				the current site specific processes for the review and approval of sewage works / wastewater environmental compliance approval applications meets the requirements of these policies.				
			MOECC: Pesticides	See Environmental Registry No. 012-2968 for details on the Standard Operating Policy for MOECC program areas. The ministry has determined that for pesticide permits where the activity is a moderate or low drinking water threat, the existing review and approval processes for prescribed instruments satisfy the requirements of source protection prescribed instrument policies. For activities that are moderate or low drinking water threats, no additional measures beyond the existing approval requirements are required to have regard to source protection prescribed instrument policies.				
			MOECC: Water Taking	There are no moderate policies that rely on the Permit To Take Water instrument in the approved plans. Prescribed instrument policies which address new and increased water takings in WHPA-Q1s with a moderate stress (risk) level are classified as significant threat policies. Prescribed instrument policies which address existing water takings within WHPA-Q1s with a high stress (risk) level are also classified as significant threat policies.				
			MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids	<p>The measures described below have been adopted by MOECC for approvals issued by MOECC District offices under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act for hauled sewage disposal sites and processed organic waste (aka biosolids) sites.</p> <p>The MOECC standard operating policy identifies new considerations for the review and approval of environmental compliance approval applications for the land application of hauled sewage in areas where this activity would potentially be a low or moderate drinking water threat (results of the screening are documented for each site). As such, in addition to conducting screening to flag sites that may be a significant drinking water threat, hauled sewage site environmental compliance approval applications submitted to District/Area offices are also screened to determine if they may be a low or moderate drinking water threat (this involves the application of broader screening criteria).</p> <p>If the ministry issues an environmental compliance approval authorizing the land application of hauled sewage in locations where the activity would be a moderate or low threat, it will include terms and conditions that require the site to be designed, constructed and operated in a manner that meets acceptable standards that are protective of the environment and drinking water sources. The ministry is strengthening the application and review requirements in these locations.</p> <p>Processed Organic Waste sites approved by District/Area offices for the land application or storage of Processed Organic Waste also undergo screening to flag potential low or moderate threat sites. With these sites the MOECC is taking a local approach to the review and approval of these sites.</p> <p>Results of all source protection screening for Hauled sewage and Processed Organic Waste environmental compliance approval applications submitted to District/Area offices are centrally tracked.</p>				
			MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits (Fuel storage)	No process in place - Applications are screened to determine if fuel storage or handling activities are being proposed or altered. Such applications are reviewed in detail to ensure conformance with significant drinking water threat policies. A standard operating procedure for this process is being finalized. This procedure will also ensure that regard is given to any applicable moderate and/or low drinking water threat policies.				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			OMAFRA: Nutrient Management	<p>In the Thames-Sydenham and Cataraqui source protection areas where low/moderate threat policies may apply, prescribed instruments are screened regarding any activity that may be a threat. The process is the same as described in Question 2 of Section 1, but the addition of any conditions on the prescribed instrument is up to OMAFRA to decide. Typically, the certified person that prepares the prescribed instrument works with the farmer to determine what best management practices could be used to address the low or moderate threat and therefore help ensure there is no threat to drinking water. OMAFRA determines if these practices are acceptable and adds them as a condition on the prescribed instrument if adequate.</p> <p>In other Source Protection Areas, the standards included in Ontario Regulation 267/03 are assumed to be sufficient to address low and moderate threats, therefore all approved nutrient management strategies have regard to low and moderate threat policies.</p>				
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)	<p>MNRF Aggregate Inspectors have received an overview of Source Protection and applicable Source Protection policies and have been instructed to screen new applications and amendments using the mapping tool developed by MOECC. All new aggregate licence and permit applications submitted to MNRF must be circulated to the Upper and Lower Tier Municipality for review and comment. In addition, all new licence applications must be circulated to the local Conservation Authority for review and comment. All new aggregate licences and permits issued since 1997 contain conditions prescribed in regulation that require a Spills Contingency Program to be developed prior to site preparation and that all fuel storage tanks must be installed and maintained in accordance with the Liquid Fuels Handling Code. All new aggregate licences and permits must also identify the location of existing and proposed fuel storage areas on the site plan. In addition, the site plans also identify the elevation of the water table and regulate extraction depths. All new aggregate licence and permit applications that propose to extract below the water table must complete a Hydrogeological Level 1 Report to determine the potential for adverse effects to groundwater and surface water resources and their uses. If the results of the Level 1 Report identify a potential for adverse effects, an impact assessment (Hydrogeological Level 2 Report) is required to demonstrate the significance of the effect and feasibility of mitigation. A Hydrogeological Level 2 Report must be completed by a qualified person and address the items specified in the Aggregate Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards (e.g. waterwells, groundwater aquifers, springs, surface water courses and bodies). Monitoring programs or mitigation measures identified in the technical reports are written into the site plan to ensure their implementation and enforceability. A new licence or permit application in which a Level 2 Hydrogeological Report was completed must be circulated to the MOECC.</p>				
			MTO: Aggregates – road construction (Fuel storage)	<p>For applications that propose to extract material above the water table the permit application process includes the preparation of a water table summary report and/or hydrogeological studies undertaken by a Professional Engineer or Professional Geoscientist. Applications that propose extraction of aggregate material below or near the water table require a Level 1 Hydrogeological Report to determine the potential for adverse effects to groundwater and surface water resources and their uses. A Level 2 Hydrogeological Report is required if a potential for adverse effects is identified by the Level 1 Report. The Level 2 Report must demonstrate the significance of the effect and feasibility of mitigation, and is completed by a professional that is qualified to</p>				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)																																	
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend																																		
				<p>address items specified in the Aggregates Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards (AROPS). Any required monitoring programs or mitigation measures that result are incorporated into the site plans.</p> <p>In accordance with the mandatory requirements of the AROPS, all new aggregate and wayside permit applications must be circulated to the Upper and Lower Tier Municipality for review and comment. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is sent those permit applications that require the completion of a Level 2 Hydrogeological Report for review. Feedback provided back to MTO is considered in the application review and approvals process.</p>																																					
			Reporting Frequency: One-time																																						
	SPPB	14	<p>Complete the tables below to assist with tracking decisions made on incoming PI applications (new and amendments) for significant drinking water threat activities indicated. The tables below can be completed by the data provided by the applicable ministries through their respective PI electronic/paper reporting forms. The data in the tables are the annual counts of actions taken on incoming applications (i.e., not the cumulative count).</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">MOECC: Waste disposal site – landfilling and storage (transfer/processing sites)</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection</th> <th colspan="2">ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions</th> <th>Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>While not all Source Protection Plans included the use of Prescribed Instruments issued under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) to address waste disposal sites – landfilling and storage (i.e. transfer / processing sites), all source protection region/areas (Source Protection Region/Area) are listed in recognition of the fact that MOECC has adopted a provincial-approach to implement source protection policies for activities that are a significant drinking water threat. In other words, the ministry applied the Standard Operating Policy to Environmental Compliance Approvals for waste disposal site activities to protect drinking water sources throughout the province regardless of the presence or absence of a source protection plan policy. •The data represents incoming applications for waste disposal site Environmental Compliance Approvals (landfilling and storage (i.e. transfer and processing sites) under the Environmental Protection Act that went through detailed screening because primary screening indicated they were within a source protection area wellhead protection area or intake protection zone that had a vulnerability score of 8 or higher, or were located in a Issues Contributing Area or an Event Based Area.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection</th> <th colspan="2">ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions</th> <th>Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">MOECC: Pesticides</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection</th> <th colspan="2">ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions</th> <th>Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>While not all source protection plans included pesticide permit prescribed instrument policies, all source protection region/areas are listed in this table in recognition of the fact that MOECC has adopted a</p>		MOECC: Waste disposal site – landfilling and storage (transfer/processing sites)			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs		Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited	0	N/A	N/A	MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs		Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited	5	0	0	MOECC: Pesticides			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs		Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MOECC: Waste disposal site – landfilling and storage (transfer/processing sites)																																									
Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs																																								
	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited																																							
0	N/A	N/A																																							
MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater																																									
Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs																																								
	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited																																							
5	0	0																																							
MOECC: Pesticides																																									
Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs																																								
	Number of decisions made where PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited																																							
0	N/A	N/A																																							

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables	Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)							
				ID	Measure	Target/Trend								
			<p>provincial implementation approach. In other words, decisions/actions on pesticide permits to protect drinking water sources apply throughout the province regardless of the presence or absence of a source protection plan policy. A total of 16 applications for pesticides instruments required detailed screening for source protection in 2017 that affected 18 source protection areas meaning that some of the permits overlapped multiple source protection areas. The permits were associated with site locations where the application of pesticides may be a significant drinking water threat, however with further screening none of the 16 applications met the vulnerability score criteria to be considered a significant drinking water threat. In addition, no prescribed instruments with a significant drinking water threat were issued in source protection areas.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">MOECC: Water Taking</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection</th> <th>ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Number of PIs issued in WHPA Q1 where SDWT is <i>managed</i> through conditions</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In 2017, there were 53 Permit To Take Water applications for proposed water takings (new and renewals) within WHPA-Q1 or IPZ-Q (regardless if the stress level was high, moderate or low), which underwent detailed review for source protection. All permit applications go under either a scoped review or detailed technical assessment. The type of review is dependent upon the nature of the taking and the level of risk associated with the activity.</p> <p>A total of 21 decisions were made on incoming Permit To Take Water applications for new or increased water takings in WHPA-Q1s. 20 of the 21 applications were for short-term (1-2 years) construction dewatering projects or short-term pumping tests (<7 days). In addition to long-term groundwater takings, short-term construction dewatering and pumping test applications will also meet the definition of a significant threat. The ministry is satisfied that standard terms and conditions already included in Permits To Take Water will manage the threat to municipal takings from Category 2 applications due to their short-term, non-recurring nature. However, if ministry staff evaluating these applications have concerns that the standard terms and conditions do not adequately manage a Category 2 taking, the advice of a qualified person (P.Ge. or P.Eng.) within their unit should be sought as to whether the taking can be managed as a Category 2 application or if the additional technical information and/or review is required. 1 of the applications in Credit River, Toronto Region, and Central Lake Ontario source protection region, and applied for an increased taking for vegetable washing/processing, the applicant applied for an increased taking to correct an error on the preceding permit. The preceding permit was an application for "new taking", also issued in 2017. A site inspection took place in 2013, at the time it was determined that the operation was taking water without a Permit To Take Water. The company was instructed to apply for a Permit To Take Water in 2014, in 2015 an application was submitted to the ministry for review. The application was returned to the proponent due to substantial deficiencies in the application. The data for the original application was collected by an unqualified person. In the proponents amendment application the consultant notes that the water taking system has not been altered in any way and water-taking capacity has not been increased since the original Permit To Take Water application. The reason for the permit alteration is that the digital flow meter was not programmed properly. It was established that all previous readings were lower than the true flow rate by a factor of 3.18. The amendment allows for the operation to operate as it has since the existing Permit To Take Water was issued and in compliance. All the Permit To Take Water applications that were identified in question #4.2 as significant drinking water threats were issued in 2017: 20 were for short-term construction dewatering/pumping tests and there was only one permit issued (in CTC) for longer-term taking (refer to 4.2 for application details). Source protection was taken into consideration during the application review. The consultant used the information of the Bradford Water Supply source protection documents to estimate the potential performance of the aquifer for the next three years and proposed to calculate the aquifer parameters</p>	MOECC: Water Taking		Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs	0	Number of PIs issued in WHPA Q1 where SDWT is <i>managed</i> through conditions		N/A			
MOECC: Water Taking														
Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs													
	0	Number of PIs issued in WHPA Q1 where SDWT is <i>managed</i> through conditions												
	N/A													

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables			Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)											
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend	ID	Measure	Target/Trend												
			<p>based on collected data in the next three years. A technical report will be submitted in support of the renewal application of this Permit, presenting the analysed data and a impact assessment of water taking. Conditions were added to the permit that required the Permit Holder to implement a monitoring and mitigation program/reporting. Any request to amend or renew the permit requires the Permit Holder to have a Qualified Person prepare and submit a technical report that assesses all data and records collected. Permits may be issued up to 10 years, this permit was only issued for a three year term. This will allow for a shorter review cycle and a more regular assessment of the water taking activity.</p>																	
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">MOECC: Hauled Sewage</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection</th> <th colspan="2">ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Number of PIs issued where SDWT is <i>managed</i> through conditions</th> <th>Number of PIs refused because SDWT is <i>prohibited</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			MOECC: Hauled Sewage			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs		Number of PIs issued where SDWT is <i>managed</i> through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is <i>prohibited</i>	0	N/A	N/A				
MOECC: Hauled Sewage																				
Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs																			
	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is <i>managed</i> through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is <i>prohibited</i>																		
0	N/A	N/A																		
			<p>As of January 2015, all hauled sewage Environmental Compliance Approval applications submitted to MOECC District/Area offices are screened to determine if any source protection vulnerable areas intersect with the site. For sites that do intersect with a source protection vulnerable area additional screening is undertaken to determine if land application and/or storage activities in any part of the site could be a low, moderate or significant drinking water threat. The screening information is provided to District offices who are then to follow the Operations Division Standard Operating Policies when reviewing the Environmental Compliance Approval applications. The Ministry will not approve the land application or storage of hauled sewage in any portions of a site where the activity would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>A total of 117 applications for hauled sewage disposal sites were submitted to MOECC District/Area offices during the 2017 calendar year. Thirty-one (26%) of the Environmental Compliance Approval applications were for sites located outside of any Source Protection Area or Region, the remaining 86 (74%) were located within the boundaries of a Source Protection Region or Area as summarized above. One hauled sewage site ECA application that was submitted for an operation located within the Saugeen Grey Sauble Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region had a portion of the property intersect with an area where the land application of hauled sewage would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat. An environmental compliance approval was issued for the proposed spreading site, however the environmental compliance approval only permitted hauled sewage to be land applied in areas of the site outside of where the land application of hauled sewage would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat. One hauled sewage site ECA application that was submitted for an operation located within the Saugeen Grey Sauble Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region had a portion of the property intersect with an area where the land application of hauled sewage would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat. An environmental compliance approval was issued for the proposed spreading site, however the environmental compliance approval only permitted hauled sewage to be land applied in areas of the site outside of where the land application of hauled sewage would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>One hauled sewage site ECA application that was submitted for an operation located within the Saugeen Grey Sauble Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region had a portion of the property intersect with an area where the land application of hauled sewage would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat. An environmental compliance approval was issued for the proposed spreading site, however the environmental compliance approval only permitted hauled sewage to be land applied in areas of the site outside of where the land application of hauled sewage would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat.</p>																	
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">MOECC: Biosolids (Processed Organic Waste)</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3">ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			MOECC: Biosolids (Processed Organic Waste)			ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs											
MOECC: Biosolids (Processed Organic Waste)																				
ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs																				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables			Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend	ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited				
			0	N/A	N/A				
			<p>As of January 2015, all processed organic waste (aka biosolids site) Environmental Compliance Approval applications submitted to MOECC District/Area offices are screened to determine if any source protection vulnerable areas intersect with the site. For sites that do intersect with a source protection vulnerable area additional screening is undertaken to determine if land application and/or storage activities in any part of the site could be a low, moderate or significant drinking water threat. The screening information is provided to District/Area offices who are then to follow the Operations Division Standard Operating Policies when reviewing the Environmental Compliance Approval applications. The Ministry will not approve the land application of processed organic waste (biosolids) located within 100m of a municipal well.</p> <p>In 2017, four biosolid spreading site Environmental Compliance Approval applications were received by District/Area for sites that fell within a source protection area or source protection region as summarized above.</p> <p>None of the biosolid spreading site Environmental Compliance Approval applications submitted to MOECC District/Area offices in 2017 intersected with areas where the proposed activity would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat.</p> <p>None of the biosolid spreading site Environmental Compliance Approval applications submitted to MOECC District/Area offices in 2017 intersected with areas where the proposed activity would be considered to be a significant drinking water threat.</p>						
			<p>MOECC: Municipal Drinking Water Licences and Drinking Water Works Permits (Fuel storage)</p>						
			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs					
				Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions					
			0	N/A					
			<p>All Safe Drinking Water Act instrument holders with approvals located where fuel storage may be a significant threat were engaged by the ministry in 2016 and their fuel storage was assessed to confirm if a significant drinking water threat exists. Incoming applications to amend an instrument are screened to determine if fuel storage or handling activities are being proposed or altered. Such applications are reviewed in detail to ensure conformance with significant drinking water threat policies. In addition, where fuel storage and handling has been identified as high risk in a drinking water system and conditions have been added to the prescribed instrument (municipal drinking water licence), all applications received for that system are screened in detail to ensure that fuel storage and handling activities remain in conformance with significant drinking water threat policies.</p>						
			<p>OMAFRA: Nutrient Management Strategies (NMS)</p>						
			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs					
				Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions		Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited			
			0	N/A	N/A				
			<p>Prescribed instruments will not be refused where there is a prohibited activity as long as the vulnerable area is removed from the prescribed instrument (i.e. proposed storage location moved out of WHPA A).</p>						
			<p>OMAFRA: Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Plans</p>						
			ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs						

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables			Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend				
			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited				
			0	N/A	N/A				
			For SGBLS - This number is higher than the total that were reviewed because one of the PIs was for a NASM plan submitted in early 2016 but was not approved until 2017. The review started in 2016 but condition was not added until 2017.						
			OMAFRA will not refuse a NASM plan where there is a prohibited activity as long as the vulnerable area is removed from the NASM application area (i.e. WHPA A removed from NASM application area)						
			OMAFRA: Nutrient Management Plans (NMPs)						
			Since NMPs are issued and reviewed by the PI holders themselves and not by OMAFRA, actions taken on incoming NMPs are not tracked and reported separately. See reportable #18 below or OMAFRA's PI annual reporting form for more details.						
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Aggregate Licenses (AL)						
			ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs						
			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited				
			N/A	N/A	N/A				
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Aggregate Permits (AP)						
			ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs						
			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited				
			N/A	N/A	N/A				
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Wayside Permits (WP)						
			ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs						
			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited				
			N/A	N/A	N/A				
			MTO: Aggregates – road construction (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Wayside Permits (WP)						
			ACTIONS TAKEN ON PIs						
			Number of applications that underwent detailed review for source protection	Number of PIs issued where SDWT is managed through conditions	Number of PIs refused because SDWT is prohibited				
			N/A	N/A	N/A				
			Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)						
	SPPB	15	Provide a brief description of each provincial ministry's process for ensuring PIs that were previously issued or otherwise created before the plan took effect (i.e., existing PIs) conform with the significant drinking water threat policies in the table below.						

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
			ID	DESCRIPTION	Measure	Target/Trend		
			MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA	DESCRIPTION				
			MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage	The ministry is currently identifying existing instruments where a waste disposal sites is located in an area that could be a significant drinking water threats activities. If an approved activity is deemed a significant drinking water threat, the ministry will review the activity and the environmental compliance approval to determine if changes are needed to meet the intent of the source protection policies. The ministry addresses drinking water threat activities that are regulated by ministry approvals and permits on a consistent province-wide basis and as such intends to review within 3 years from the time the plan took effect and amended within 12 months of the review, or such other date as the Director determines based on a prioritized review of Environmental Compliance Approvals that govern significant drinking water threat activities.				
			MOECC: Wastewater/sewage	Ministry staff have developed a screening process to identify previously issued Environmental Compliance Approvals for sewage works located in vulnerable areas where prescribed instrument policies may apply. If an approved activity is deemed a significant drinking water threat, the ministry will review the Environmental Compliance Approval to determine if the terms and conditions of the approval are protective of drinking water sources. If updates to an approval are required, the ministry will contact the owner/operator of the works or site to discuss the next steps. The ministry addresses drinking water threat activities that are regulated by ministry approvals and permits on a province-wide basis and as such intends to review within 3 years from the time the plan took effect and amended within 12 months of the review, or such other date as the Director determines based on a prioritized review of Environmental Compliance Approvals that govern significant drinking water threat activities.				
			MOECC: Pesticides	Overall, across some MOECC program areas, the ministry is currently identifying instruments that are in place in areas where these would be significant drinking water threats activities, so that they can be reviewed to determine if changes are needed to meet the intent of the source protection policies. The ministry has established a three-year timeline from the effective date of each source protection plan to complete this work. Pesticide Permits: Since pesticide permits are issued on a seasonal basis, all existing permits expire at the end of each season. Where incoming applications seek renewal, detailed screening of the application occurs and the applicable prescribed instrument policies and MOECC's standard operating policy is applied. Consequently, actions taken on previously issued permits are not being tracked and reported separately; considered implemented.				
			MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids	The information provided below relates to Environmental Protection Act approvals issued by MOECC District offices for hauled sewage disposal sites and processed organic waste (aka biosolids) sites. The ministry established a three-year timeline from the effective date of each source protection plan to complete its review of existing prescribed instruments. Hauled Sewage: In most instances, hauled sewage spreading site/storage/dewatering trench site approvals issued by District/Area offices are for a 1-3 year time period and require renewal to allow continued use. For these instruments, the ministry allows the approvals to expire and then the new standard operating policy is applied if/when an application for renewal is submitted. In some cases, however, hauled sewage site approvals are issued for a longer period of time. For these sites, the ministry reviewed the hauled sewage site information to identify any sites that may be located in areas where the land application of hauled sewage could be considered to be a significant drinking water. None of these sites were flagged as a potential significant drinking water threat. Processed Organic Waste (Biosolids): Environmental Protection Act approvals for the land application of processed organic waste on agricultural land were transferred over a 5 year period (2011-2016) to the Nutrient Management Act where they are regulated as a Non Agricultural Source Material. As of January 1, 2016, all land application of Non Agricultural Source Material must take				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
				<p>place under a Non Agricultural Source Material Plan. OMAFRA is responsible for the review of all existing Non Agricultural Source Material Plan approvals issued under the Nutrient Management Act.</p> <p>A review of the few remaining Environmental Protection Act approved processed organic waste spreading site approvals issued by MOECC District offices was completed and no sites with existing instruments were identified as located in an area where they could be a potential significant drinking water threat.</p>				
			MOECC: Water Taking	MOECC Standard Operating Policy for the Permit To Take Water program was developed in 2016. The Standard Operating Policy provides the staff with direction and guidance to screen/review/amend/approve previously issued (i.e., existing) Permits To Take Water and new Permit To Take Water applications to conform with the source protection prescribed instrument policies where a water taking is or would be a significant water quantity threat (significant drinking water threat - i.e., water takings without returning the water taken to the same aquifer). To date the only existing (i.e., previously issued) permits within a WHPA-Q1 with a significant stress/risk level are the permit(s) for the municipal taking. The Ministry will support municipalities as they work to determine if management measures are required for the long term sustainability of their taking. At this time, formal amendments to existing Permits To Take Water have not been initiated.				
			MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits (Fuel storage)	The Ministry has undertaken an exercise to identify all high risk fuel storage and handling associated with municipal residential drinking water systems. Where fuel storage and handling is a significant threat, conditions have been added to the prescribed instrument (municipal drinking water licence) to address fuel storage risk.				
			OMAFRA: Nutrient Management	OMAFRA has identified the existing prescribed instruments that will need to be reviewed. The 'existing' date was determined to be January 1, 2016 as this is when we were confident that our process was detailed enough for reviewing all new prescribed instruments. Every owner of a prescribed instrument has been contacted and informed that they have a nutrient management strategy or a Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) plan in an area to which local source water protection policies may apply. They must work with a certified person to evaluate their prescribed instrument, make any necessary modification to address local source water protection policies and resubmit the instrument for approval. OMAFRA will evaluate the amended prescribed instrument and issue an approval with conditions when the prescribed instrument is complete, compliant with Ontario Regulation 267/03 and conforms with significant drinking water threat policies.				
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)	MNRF is in the process of reviewing existing instruments under the Aggregate Resources Act (e.g. licences and permits which authorize pits and quarries) issued prior to the effective date of the Source Protection Plan to determine if the applicable sites are storing and handling fuel in the vulnerable areas identified in the policy.				
			MTO: Aggregates – road construction (Fuel storage)	There were no existing prescribed instrument applications affected by source protection policies. All (existing and future) MTO aggregate/wayside permits, as well as existing dormant permits activated for a provincial highway contract, must contain fuel handling and storage conditions in the site plan, as prescribed by regulation. This includes installation of fuel storage tanks in accordance with the CSA B139 Installation Code for Oil Burning Equipment and compliance with the strict conditions specified by the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) Liquid Fuels Handling Code, 2007, as amended. Furthermore, MTO does not allow permanent or long term storage of fuel at MTO permit sites. Such requirements ensure the activity is managed in a manner that reduces the risk of contamination.				
			Reporting Frequency: One-time					
	SPPB	16	The tables below assist with tracking the actions taken on previously issued (i.e., existing) PIs for significant drinking water threat activities indicated. The tables below can be completed using the data provided by the applicable ministries through their respective PI		I	Percent progress made (cumulative) in completing	All (100%) of prescribed instrument	S (#1, #2) M (#5, #6, #7) L (#9, #10)

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables					Performance Measures		Outcomes ² (S, M, L)	
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend						
			<p>electronic/paper reporting forms. The data in the tables are reported on a cumulative basis meaning the counts are provided as a running tally of actions taken on previously issued or otherwise created PIs since the effective date of the SPP.</p>								
			<p>MOECC: Waste disposal site – landfilling and storage (transfer/processing sites)</p>								
			Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review : <u>5</u>					Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)		
			<p>OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT</p>								
			Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D)	Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of PIs revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)		
			4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	80
			<p>The Quinte Source Protection Region had the only revoked waste disposal site (landfilling and storage) environmental compliance approval in the province in 2017. The approval was revoked due to landfill closure. However, it is a condition site. The MOECC assessed the possible avenues to address this site and decided that it would be managed via a Director's Order and not through a Prescribed Instrument (such as an environmental compliance approval).</p>								
			<p>MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater</p>								
			Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and require review: <u>20</u>					Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)		
			<p>OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT</p>								
			Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D)	Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of PIs revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)		
			12	5	7	0	0	0	5	12	60
			<p>In 2017, the province-wide baseline number of prescribed instruments governing wastewater/sewage works identified as requiring detailed review was 633. Of these 633, 4 were for wastewater/sewage works governed under Renewable Energy Approvals. These 4 were identified during a primary screening was done of 170 province-wide Renewable Energy Approvals. The Renewable Energy Approvals assessed are in the following Source Protection Regions/Areas and impact their respective counts - Ausable Bayfield Maitland Valley (1 Renewable Energy Approval), Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula (1 Renewable Energy Approval), Sudbury (1 Renewable Energy Approval) and Thames, Sydenham and Region (1 Renewable Energy Approval). NOTE: Renewable Energy Approvals are only assessed for threats from sewage, not waste.</p> <p>The baseline number is the number of Prescribed Instruments identified in 2017 only and does not include those identified in the 2016 Annual Reports.</p> <p>The province-wide number of prescribed instruments governing wastewater/sewage works which underwent a detailed review in 2017 was 301.</p> <p>Of these 301 detailed reviews, 4 were for wastewater/sewage works governed under Renewable Energy Approvals identified. See Question 6.1 for further Renewable Energy approval details and breakdown by Source Protection Region/Area.</p>								

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables				Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)																					
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend																										
			<p>In 2017, the province-wide number of prescribed instruments governing wastewater/sewage works which were found to be significant drinking water threats after undergoing a detailed review was 104. Of these 104, none were for wastewater/sewage works governed under a Renewable Energy Approval. See Section 6.1 further Renewable Energy details.</p> <p>The province-wide number of prescribed instruments governing wastewater/sewage works which were found not to be significant drinking water threats after undergoing a detailed review in 2017 was 196. Of these 196, 4 were for wastewater/sewage works governed under a Renewable Energy Approval. See Section 6.1 further details on Renewable Energy Approvals.</p>																												
			<p>MOECC: Pesticides</p> <p>NOTE: Since pesticide permits are issued on a seasonal basis, all previously issued permits expire. Where incoming applications seek renewal, detailed screening of the application occurs and the applicable PI policies applied. Consequently, actions taken on previously issued permits are not being tracked and reported separately.</p>																												
			<p>MOECC: Water Taking</p> <p>Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and <i>require</i> review: <u>N/A - only moderate risk level</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)</th> <th rowspan="2">Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)</th> <th rowspan="2">Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)</th> <th colspan="4">OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT</th> <th rowspan="2">Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)</th> <th rowspan="2">Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I))</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Number of Pis amended or replaced (column D)</th> <th>Number of Pis where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)</th> <th>Number of Pis revoked (column F)</th> <th>Final Decision Pending (column G)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT				Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I))	Number of Pis amended or replaced (column D)	Number of Pis where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of Pis revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT							Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number (column I))																				
			Number of Pis amended or replaced (column D)	Number of Pis where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of Pis revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)																									
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A																							
			<p>MOECC Standard Operating Policy for the Permit To Take Water program was developed in 2016. The Standard Operating Policy provides the staff with direction and guidance to screen/review/amend/approve previously issued (i.e., existing) Permit To Take Water and new Permit To Take Water applications to conform with the source protection prescribed instrument policies where a water taking is or would be a significant water quantity threat (significant drinking water threat - i.e., water takings without returning the water taken to the same aquifer). To date, these were identified in 2016 as nine drinking water systems that service small and medium communities. The only existing (i.e., previously issued) permits within a WHPA-Q1 with a significant stress/risk level are the permit(s) for the municipal taking. The Ministry will support municipalities as they work to determine if management measures are required for the long term sustainability of their taking. At this time, formal amendments to existing Permits To Take Water have not been initiated.</p> <p>There were no previously issued PIs that completed detailed review in the calendar year 2017 only.</p> <p>There were no previously issued PIs that were determined to be a SDWT in the calendar year 2017 only.</p> <p>There were no previously issued PIs that were amended or replaced for source protection purposes in the calendar year 2017 only.</p> <p>There were no previously issued PIs that were determined NOT to be a SDWT in the calendar year 2017 only.</p>																												
			<p>MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids Sites</p> <p>NOTE 1: <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> approvals for the land application of processed organic waste on agricultural land were transferred to the <i>Nutrient Management Act</i>. All previous approvals ceased to apply on their expiry date or up to January 1, 2016. As a result, actions taken on these previously issued approvals are not being tracked and reported separately.</p>																												

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables					Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend						
			<p>NOTE 2: Previously issued PIs for hauled sewage disposal sites and land application of processed organic waste (biosolids) on non-agricultural land expire every few years. Whenever incoming applications are received to renew these sites, detailed screening of the application occurs and the applicable PI policies applied. As a result, actions taken on previously issued hauled sewage and biosolids spreading site approvals are not being tracked and reported separately.</p>								
			<p>MOECC: Municipal Drinking Water Licences and Drinking Water Works Permits (Fuel storage)</p>								
			Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and <i>require</i> review: <u>6</u>					Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)		
			<p>OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT</p>								
			Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D)	Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of PIs revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)		
			1	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	100
			<p>Our baseline includes the 397 prescribed instrument holders that were sent letters in 2016 requesting assessment of fuel storage to confirm if a significant drinking water threat was present. No additional letters were sent in 2017. The total number of instrument holders that received a detailed review over 2016 and 2017 was 39 (39 of the initial 397 prescribed instrument holders who received a letter). The review of these instruments occurred over 2016 and 2017. This number differs from the number reported in 2016 as new information was received from instrument holders that warranted a more detailed review to confirm if a significant threat existed. Ministry staff thoroughly reviewed the assessments from the 397 instrument holders, gathering additional information from municipalities where necessary. A more detailed review was required for 39 of those facilities (see question 6.2). The final conclusion was that 382 of the municipal drinking water systems did not involve fuel storage or handling that was a significant drinking water threat.</p>								
			<p>OMAFRA: Nutrient Management Plans (NMPs)</p> <p>Since NMPs are issued and reviewed by the PI holders themselves and not by OMAFRA, actions taken on previously issued NMPs are not tracked and reported separately. OMAFRA has, however, sent out notices to NMP holders to inform them of their source protection obligations. See reportable #18 below or OMAFRA's PI annual reporting form for more details.</p>								
			<p>OMAFRA: Nutrient Management Strategies (NMS)</p>								
			Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and <i>require</i> review: <u>1</u>					Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)		
			<p>OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be SDWT</p>								
			Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D)	Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of PIs revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)		

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables							Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)		
			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Awaiting action	0	ID		Measure	Target/Trend
			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Awaiting action	0				
<p>A total of 38 existing nutrient management strategies were identified in 2016 and included in the 2016 annual report that was submitted in February 2017. In 2017, there was an additional nutrient management strategy identified in Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula. This bring the baseline total of existing nutrient management strategies that may be subject to significant drinking water threat policies and which requires a review to 39.</p> <p>A total of 35 nutrient management strategies out of a cumulative total of 39 have completed the detailed review for source protection purposes in 2017.</p> <p>A total of 7 previously issued nutrient management strategies (out of a total of 35 that completed detailed review) have been determined to be a significant drinking water threat in 2017.</p> <p>A total of 28 nutrient management strategies that were reviewed (out of a total of 35 that completed detailed review) for source protection were determined NOT to be a significant drinking water threat in 2017.</p> <p>Numbers will be the same as 6.3, due to the fact that the prescribed instruments determined to be a significant drinking water threat (i.e. manure storage) have not been amended yet, so yet to determine if conditions are required.</p>															
OMAFRA: Non-Agricultural Source Material Plans (NASM Plans)															
Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and <i>require</i> review: <u> N/A </u>															
OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT															
Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D)	Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of PIs revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)	Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)							
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Aggregate Licenses (AL)															
Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and <i>require</i> review: <u> N/A </u>															
OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT															
Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	Number of PIs changed amended or replaced (column D)	Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of PIs revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)	Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)							
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) – Site Plans/Aggregate Permits (AP)															
Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and <i>require</i> review: <u> N/A </u>															
OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT															
Number of PIs that completed detailed	Number of PIs determined to be a	Number of PIs determined not to be a	Number of PIs amended or	Number of PIs where no additional conditions were	Number of PIs revoked	Final Decision Pending (column G)	Total number of PIs reviewed and on which	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and							

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables							Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)		
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend										
			review (column A)	SDWT (column B)	SDWT (column C)	<i>replaced</i> (column D)	<i>needed</i> (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	(column F)		actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)				
			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage) - Site plans/Wayside Permits (WP)															
Baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and <i>require</i> review: <u>N/A</u>															
OUTCOMED for PIs determined to be a SDWT															
Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	Number of IPs changed amended or replaced (column D)	Number of PIs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of PIs revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)	Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)							
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
MTO: Aggregates – road construction (Fuel Storage) - Site plans/Wayside Permits (WP)															
baseline number of PIs that may be subject to SDWT policies and <i>require</i> review: <u>N/A</u>															
OUTCOMES for PIs determined to be a SDWT															
Number of PIs that completed detailed review (column A)	Number of PIs determined to be a SDWT (column B)	Number of PIs determined not to be a SDWT (column C)	Number of PIs amended or replaced (column D)	Number of WPs where no additional conditions were needed (i.e., existing terms and conditions sufficient) (column E)	Number of WPs revoked (column F)	Final Decision Pending (column G)	Total number of PIs reviewed and on which actions taken (columns C+D+E+F+G) (column H)	Cumulative Progress Made (%) on PIs reviewed and actioned (column H/Baseline number) (column I)							
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Reporting Frequency: Ongoing or until such time as the review/conformity exercise is completed for previously issued PIs															
SPPB		17	For the purposes of section 61 of O. Reg. 287/07 (exemption from RMP policy), complete the table below to indicate the number of notices or PIs issued by the applicable provincial ministries that state the PI conforms to the significant drinking water threat policies in the SPP (i.e., statement of conformity confirms the instrument holder is exempt from requiring a Risk Management Plan). Also, state the prescribed drinking water threat activity to which the statements of conformity pertain. (NOTE: <i>May apply to instruments under the Safe Drinking Water Act, Pesticides Act, Nutrient Management Act or Aggregate Resources Act</i>).									N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Number of notices or PI issued				Applicable prescribed drinking water threat activity								
			MOECC: PIs issued under the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act</i>												
			0												
			Comments:												
			MOECC: PIs issued under the <i>Pesticides Act</i>												
			0												
			Comments:												

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			<p>OMAFRA: PIs issued under the <i>Nutrient Management Act</i></p> <p>0</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>MNR: PIs issued under the <i>Aggregate Resources Act</i></p> <p>0</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>MTO: PIs issued under the <i>Aggregate Resources Act for road construction</i></p> <p>0</p> <p>Comments:</p>					
Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)								
	SPPB	18	<p>In situations where a provincial ministry does not issue or create the prescribed instrument, briefly describe what is being done by the ministry to ensure the PI conforms with the significant threat policies that use the PI tool. (NOTE: <i>Applicable to only certain OMAFRA instruments issued under the Nutrient Management Act.</i>)</p> <p>RESPONSE: <i>For the description, see OMAFRA PI electronic/paper reporting form reportable #8, and MOECC PI electronic/paper reporting form for hauled sewage / biosolids / ASM / NASM reportables #7-8. (SPAs do not need to copy the description here but may opt to provide a summary if desired).</i></p> <p>Guidance is currently being developed for RMOs, farmers and certified individuals that prepare NMPs to use to help determine if a PI conforms to the SDWT policies.</p>					
Reporting Frequency: One-time (but may be needed again if and when any changes are made)								
NOTE: <i>The responses to the group of reportables below on inspections and compliance are to be provided by ministries responsible for their respective program areas (i.e., waste disposal sites, sewage works/wastewater, pesticides, water taking, aggregates – fuel storage, nutrient management, water works permitting, and drinking water municipal licences) affected by PI policies. The term inspections as used in the following reportables refer to those conducted on a planned (i.e., proactive) and/or responsive (i.e., complaint-based) basis.</i>								
Prescribed Instruments – Inspections and Compliance NOTE: Reportables #19-#21 are shaded in grey as they are not required to be completed by the SPA. Instead, the responses are available in the ministry reporting templates. These reportables are retained in the supplemental form for reference and reporting purposes for SPAs wishing to share this information with their respective SPCs. Where this is the	SPPB	19	<p>Briefly describe how provincial ministry staff involved in inspections related to PIs have been trained in source protection for each of the program areas in the table below.</p>		J	Percentage of relevant ministry program areas with PIs that incorporate source protection considerations into their respective inspection priorities.	All relevant PI provincial ministry program areas incorporate source protection considerations into how they prioritize and carry out inspections of prescribed instruments.	S (#1, #2) M (#5, #7) L (#8, #9, #10)
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA</th> <th>DESCRIPTION</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage</td> <td> <p>Environmental Officers need to complete extensive training programs and acquire Provincial Officer designation for the purpose of regulating and enforcing compliance under the Environmental Protection Act, Ontario Water Resources Act, Environmental Assessment Act, Nutrient Management Act and Pesticides Act.</p> <p>Starting in late 2014, general training on source protection, as well as Operations Division’s implementation activities, was delivered to staff at large. Training sessions were held in each Region, and all staff were invited to attend. All new Environmental Officers are required to complete MOECC Foundations training, where they receive general Source Protection training that covers the following topics: Clean Water Act, scope of source protection program, source protection program structure and process, key players, assessment reports, source protection plans, risk management plans, vulnerable areas, water budgets and water quantity vulnerability analysis, prescribed drinking water threat activities, conditions and local threats, source protection tools, prescribed instrument and monitoring policies etc.</p> <p>Environmental Officers need to follow the ministry Inspection Guidance Manuals that outline the roles and responsibilities for provincial officers in conducting inspections. The General Inspection Guidance Manual (Part A) is intended to assist in carrying out all types of inspections. The specific Inspection Guidance Manuals (Part B) have been generated for individual inspection types including waste disposal site inspections.</p> <p>Peer Training No</p> <p>Workshops No</p> <p>Online Training No</p> <p>Technical guidance No</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA				
MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA	DESCRIPTION							
MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage	<p>Environmental Officers need to complete extensive training programs and acquire Provincial Officer designation for the purpose of regulating and enforcing compliance under the Environmental Protection Act, Ontario Water Resources Act, Environmental Assessment Act, Nutrient Management Act and Pesticides Act.</p> <p>Starting in late 2014, general training on source protection, as well as Operations Division’s implementation activities, was delivered to staff at large. Training sessions were held in each Region, and all staff were invited to attend. All new Environmental Officers are required to complete MOECC Foundations training, where they receive general Source Protection training that covers the following topics: Clean Water Act, scope of source protection program, source protection program structure and process, key players, assessment reports, source protection plans, risk management plans, vulnerable areas, water budgets and water quantity vulnerability analysis, prescribed drinking water threat activities, conditions and local threats, source protection tools, prescribed instrument and monitoring policies etc.</p> <p>Environmental Officers need to follow the ministry Inspection Guidance Manuals that outline the roles and responsibilities for provincial officers in conducting inspections. The General Inspection Guidance Manual (Part A) is intended to assist in carrying out all types of inspections. The specific Inspection Guidance Manuals (Part B) have been generated for individual inspection types including waste disposal site inspections.</p> <p>Peer Training No</p> <p>Workshops No</p> <p>Online Training No</p> <p>Technical guidance No</p>							

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
case, SPAs may need to provide an overall summary in the second column of each table.				Source Protection Program Branch training Yes Provincial Officer designation training Yes Specific program area inspections training Yes				
			MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater	Field officers who assess compliance with sewage prescribed instruments have received annual training specific to sewage works which may be, or are confirmed to be, a significant drinking water threat. Updated guidance, technical reference material and assistance when conducting inspections at sewage works with source water protection considerations is provided to all field inspectors. Peer Training No Workshops No Online Training Yes Technical guidance Yes Source Protection Program Branch training No Provincial Officer designation training No Specific program area inspections training Yes				
			MOECC: Pesticides	Regional Pesticide Specialists were also trained in 2014 and keep current with program developments and changes. Source Protection Programs Branch delivered training to Operations Division District Offices in the Fall of 2014 and new/updated training in the fall of 2017. Regional Pesticide Specialists continue to provide technical support related to pesticide inspections to District Offices. Peer Training No Workshops No Online Training No Technical guidance No Source Protection Program Branch training Yes Provincial Officer designation training No Specific program area inspections training Yes				
			MOECC: Water Taking	Environmental Officers need to complete extensive training programs and acquire Provincial Officer designation for the purpose of regulating and enforcing compliance under the Environmental Protection Act, Ontario Water Resources Act, Environmental Assessment Act, Nutrient Management Act and Pesticides Act. Starting in late 2014, general training on source protection, as well as Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division implementation activities, was delivered to staff at large. Training sessions were held in each Region, and all staff were invited to attend. All new Environmental Officers are required to complete MOECC Foundations training, where they receive general Source Protection training that covers the following topics: CWA, scope of SP program, SP program structure and process, key players, assessment reports, source protection plans, risk management plans, vulnerable areas, water budgets and water quantity vulnerability analysis, prescribed drinking water threat activities, conditions and local threats, source protection tools, prescribed instrument and monitoring policies etc. Environmental Officers need to follow the ministry Inspection Guidance Manuals that outline the roles and responsibilities for provincial officers in conducting inspections. The General Inspection Guidance Manual (Part A) is intended to assist in carrying out all types of inspections. The specific Inspection Guidance Manuals (Part B) have been generated for individual inspection types including the Permit To Take Water Inspection. There is an hour long online training module for Environmental Officers on "How to conduct a Permit To Take Water Inspection". This training is intended to prepare an Environmental Officer to conduct a thorough and accurate inspection and enable them to make more informed decisions about what information needs to be collected, reviewed, reported on, and included in a completed Permit To Take Water Inspection. Participants are be able to:				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Find relevant Legislation, Policies, Procedures and Guidance Documents. •List the five key resources required to conduct a detailed file review. •Search IDS for all sources of information regarding water takers. •Search the Environmental Registry for information regarding water taking applications. •List the six steps to a successful Permit To Take Water Inspection. •Understand critical areas to inspect during a site visit to assess whether adverse impacts may be occurring from the water taking. <p>Peer Training Yes Workshops Yes Online Training Yes Technical guidance Yes Source Protection Program Branch training Yes Provincial Officer designation training Yes Specific program area inspections training Yes</p>				
			MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids and ASM/NASM inspections	<p>No special training in the Clean Water Act/Source Protection is necessary for MOECC staff conducting inspections at hauled sewage sites or processed organic waste (aka biosolids) sites. Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change inspectors are not designated under the Clean Water Act and have no authority to conduct inspections or undertake any compliance promotion activities under that Act. Rather the prescribed instruments subject to inspection by MOECC Environmental Officers for the hauled sewage and processed organic waste subprograms are issued under the Environmental Protection Act. All MOECC inspectors are designated Provincial Officers under the Environmental Protection Act (among other legislation) who have received mandatory training in order to receive their designation. MOECC inspectors of hauled sewage/processed organic waste sites assess compliance with the terms/conditions within the applicable prescribed instrument(s) associated with the operation as well as other applicable regulatory requirements made under the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Water Resources Act. In the event any terms or conditions are contained in an instrument to address Source Protection policy requirements, compliance with those terms/conditions is addressed as part of the regular inspection activities. When ministry inspectors identify non-compliance with legal requirements during an inspection, various abatement actions may be taken to address non-compliance, ranging from providing guidance and information to issuing corrective orders.</p> <p>It should be noted that general training sessions have been made available to MOECC field inspectors on the fundamentals of the Clean Water Act as well as Source Protection implementation activities undertaken by the Ministry; however, completion of this training is not mandatory prior for field officers conducting inspection activities. New provincial officials do receive general Source Protection training as part of their officer designation training. Finally, Source Protection information is included as part of the annual inspection guidance provided to field staff. Specifically, Source Protection information is incorporated into the risk ranked lists that are provided to inspectors.</p> <p>Peer Training Yes Workshops No Online Training No Technical guidance Yes Source Protection Program Branch training No Provincial Officer designation training Yes Specific program area inspections training No</p> <p>No special training in the Clean Water Act/Source Protection is necessary for MOECC staff conducting inspections under the Nutrient Management Act. Ministry of the Environment and</p>				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)													
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend														
				<p>Climate Change inspectors are not designated under the Clean Water Act and have no authority to conduct inspections or undertake any compliance promotion activities under that Act. Rather the prescribed instruments subject to inspection by MOECC Environmental Officers for the Agricultural Source Material (ASM) and Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) subprograms are issued under the Nutrient Management Act. MOECC inspectors are designated Provincial Officers under the Nutrient Management Act (among other legislation) who have received mandatory training in order to receive their designation.</p> <p>MOECC inspectors of Agricultural Source Material and Non-Agricultural Source Material sites assess compliance with the terms/conditions within the applicable prescribed instrument(s) associated with the operation as well as other applicable regulatory requirements made under the Nutrient Management Act or other legislation such as the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Water Resources Act. In the event any terms or conditions are contained in an instrument to address Source Protection policy requirements, compliance with those terms/conditions is addressed as part of the regular inspection activities. When ministry inspectors identify non-compliance with legal requirements during an inspection, various abatement actions may be taken to address non-compliance, ranging from providing guidance and information to issuing corrective orders.</p> <p>It should be noted that general training sessions have been made available to MOECC field inspectors on the fundamentals of the Clean Water Act as well as Source Protection implementation activities undertaken by the Ministry; however, completion of this training is not mandatory prior for field officers conducting inspection activities. Finally, new provincial officials do receive general Source Protection training as part of their officer designation training.</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Peer Training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Workshops</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Online Training</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Technical guidance</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Source Protection Program Branch training</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Provincial Officer designation training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Specific program area inspections training</td><td>No</td></tr> </table>	Peer Training	Yes	Workshops	No	Online Training	No	Technical guidance	Yes	Source Protection Program Branch training	No	Provincial Officer designation training	Yes	Specific program area inspections training	No			
Peer Training	Yes																				
Workshops	No																				
Online Training	No																				
Technical guidance	Yes																				
Source Protection Program Branch training	No																				
Provincial Officer designation training	Yes																				
Specific program area inspections training	No																				
			MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits	<table border="0"> <tr><td>Peer Training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Workshops</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Online Training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Technical guidance</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Source Protection Program Branch training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Provincial Officer designation training</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Specific program area inspections training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </table>	Peer Training	Yes	Workshops	Yes	Online Training	Yes	Technical guidance	Yes	Source Protection Program Branch training	Yes	Provincial Officer designation training	No	Specific program area inspections training	Yes			
Peer Training	Yes																				
Workshops	Yes																				
Online Training	Yes																				
Technical guidance	Yes																				
Source Protection Program Branch training	Yes																				
Provincial Officer designation training	No																				
Specific program area inspections training	Yes																				
			OMAFRA: Nutrient Management	MOECC carries out inspections for nutrient management. See MOECC ASM and NASM response above																	
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)	<p>MNRF Aggregate Inspectors have received an overview of Source Protection and their role in inspecting aggregate licences/permits within WHPA-A, WHPA-B and IPZ-1 zones and the screening of new applications and amendments with regards to Source Protection policies.</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Peer Training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Workshops</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Online Training</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Technical guidance</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source Protection Program Branch training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Provincial Officer designation training</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Specific program area inspections training</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </table>	Peer Training	Yes	Workshops	Yes	Online Training	No	Technical guidance	No	Source Protection Program Branch training	Yes	Provincial Officer designation training	No	Specific program area inspections training	Yes			
Peer Training	Yes																				
Workshops	Yes																				
Online Training	No																				
Technical guidance	No																				
Source Protection Program Branch training	Yes																				
Provincial Officer designation training	No																				
Specific program area inspections training	Yes																				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)					
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend						
			<p>MTO: Aggregates – road construction (Fuel storage)</p> <p>MTO Aggregate inspectors are re-trained at least bi-annually as to the formal protocol to ensure that source water protection and vulnerable areas are considered in the preparation of technical hydrogeological reports at the permit application stage. Aggregate staff are also trained to use the standardized text with respect to fuel storage and handling. Aggregate inspectors are trained to focus on fuel handling and storage during annual compliance inspections.</p> <p>In May 2016, the MTO Highway Standards Branch (Soils and Aggregates Section) provided training to the MTO Regional Aggregate Sections and MTO Aggregate Inspectors on source water protection and implementation requirements of source protection policies prepared under the Clean Water Act, 2006 (CWA). The training will be repeated in 2018.</p> <p>The role of the source protection program and plan policies as well as their legal effect and operational implications are the focus of training. Training also includes an overview of prescribed threats (specifically fuel handling and storage) and the vulnerability science applied (WHPA, IPZ, etc.). The above protocol is reaffirmed and amendments to the protocol implemented.</p> <p>Peer Training Yes Workshops Yes Online Training No Technical guidance Yes Source Protection Program Branch training No Provincial Officer designation training No Specific program area inspections training Yes</p>										
			Reporting Frequency: One-time										
	SPPB	20	Briefly describe, in general terms, how source protection is taken into consideration when planning for and prioritizing inspections for the program areas in the table below.										
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA</th> <th>DESCRIPTION</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage</td> <td>The ministry’s current program delivery model for proactive compliance inspection program is based on risk analysis. During Year-Start Planning (February-March of each year), inspection priorities are set for each program area at by Divisional Program Leads. The ministry uses a risk based approach to setting each program’s priorities for inspection. Program diagnostics and analyses are conducted as part of the yearly compliance planning process and help inform inspection priorities in the upcoming year. This information along with program specific risk factors is used to identify compliance priorities for each program area. Source protection vulnerability is generally considered as one of the risk factors during risk analysis. District/Area offices use the Integrated Plan direction in conjunction with their own local knowledge and consideration of available resources to select the number and locations of facilities/sites for inspections.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater</td> <td>The MOECC’s compliance program includes an annual process to plan field inspections for each fiscal year. Planned inspections are determined based on a risk based methodology including many factors such as individual potential for environmental impacts and site history. Source Protection considerations have been incorporated into this annual risk based inspection planning process for municipal, industrial, commercial and private sewage inspections as a priority ‘area of focus’. This ensures that the specific risks associated with potential drinking water threats are included when planning field inspections. The lists of known prescribed instruments issued in vulnerable areas and any that have been determined to be a significant threat are included and considered during compliance assessment planning and prioritization activities.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA	DESCRIPTION	MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage	The ministry’s current program delivery model for proactive compliance inspection program is based on risk analysis. During Year-Start Planning (February-March of each year), inspection priorities are set for each program area at by Divisional Program Leads. The ministry uses a risk based approach to setting each program’s priorities for inspection. Program diagnostics and analyses are conducted as part of the yearly compliance planning process and help inform inspection priorities in the upcoming year. This information along with program specific risk factors is used to identify compliance priorities for each program area. Source protection vulnerability is generally considered as one of the risk factors during risk analysis. District/Area offices use the Integrated Plan direction in conjunction with their own local knowledge and consideration of available resources to select the number and locations of facilities/sites for inspections.	MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater	The MOECC’s compliance program includes an annual process to plan field inspections for each fiscal year. Planned inspections are determined based on a risk based methodology including many factors such as individual potential for environmental impacts and site history. Source Protection considerations have been incorporated into this annual risk based inspection planning process for municipal, industrial, commercial and private sewage inspections as a priority ‘area of focus’. This ensures that the specific risks associated with potential drinking water threats are included when planning field inspections. The lists of known prescribed instruments issued in vulnerable areas and any that have been determined to be a significant threat are included and considered during compliance assessment planning and prioritization activities.				
MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA	DESCRIPTION												
MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage	The ministry’s current program delivery model for proactive compliance inspection program is based on risk analysis. During Year-Start Planning (February-March of each year), inspection priorities are set for each program area at by Divisional Program Leads. The ministry uses a risk based approach to setting each program’s priorities for inspection. Program diagnostics and analyses are conducted as part of the yearly compliance planning process and help inform inspection priorities in the upcoming year. This information along with program specific risk factors is used to identify compliance priorities for each program area. Source protection vulnerability is generally considered as one of the risk factors during risk analysis. District/Area offices use the Integrated Plan direction in conjunction with their own local knowledge and consideration of available resources to select the number and locations of facilities/sites for inspections.												
MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater	The MOECC’s compliance program includes an annual process to plan field inspections for each fiscal year. Planned inspections are determined based on a risk based methodology including many factors such as individual potential for environmental impacts and site history. Source Protection considerations have been incorporated into this annual risk based inspection planning process for municipal, industrial, commercial and private sewage inspections as a priority ‘area of focus’. This ensures that the specific risks associated with potential drinking water threats are included when planning field inspections. The lists of known prescribed instruments issued in vulnerable areas and any that have been determined to be a significant threat are included and considered during compliance assessment planning and prioritization activities.												

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			MOECC: Pesticides	Inspection guidance is provided to District Offices as part of the Integrated Planning process. Regional Pesticide Specialists provide technical assistance to District Officers when undertaking Pesticides Inspections.				
			MOECC: Water Taking	The ministry's current program delivery model for proactive compliance inspection program is based on risk analysis. During Year-Start Planning (February-March of each year), inspection priorities are set for each program area at by Divisional Program Leads. The ministry uses a risk based approach to setting each program's priorities for inspection. Program diagnostics and analyses are conducted as part of the yearly compliance planning process and help inform inspection priorities in the upcoming year. This information along with program specific risk factors is used to identify compliance priorities for each program area. Source protection vulnerability is generally considered as one of the risk factors during risk analysis. District/Area offices use the Integrated Plan direction in conjunction with their own local knowledge and consideration of available resources to select the number and locations of facilities/sites for inspections. SP water quantity vulnerable area data has recently been available with the Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division of the ministry. Sites with active water taking permits located within SP water quantity vulnerable areas will be identified and compliance inspections will be planned based on risk analysis during Year-Start Planning process for FY 2018-19.				
			MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids and ASM/NASM inspections	The MOECC carries out annual proactive inspections at agricultural operations operating under approved Nutrient Management Strategies, Plans and Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Plans. Each year regulated operations are identified and each one is assigned an overall risk score. Several risk factors are considered and these vary somewhat depending on the sub-program involved; among the risk factors considered is Source Protection vulnerable area information. Sites that intersect with source protection vulnerable areas with the highest risk scores (ie. scores of 8 or greater) are assigned relatively higher inspection priority risk scores. This approach ensures that sites where regulated activities may be considered a significant drinking water threat are identified amongst the highest priority for inspection. Districts offices are instructed to select inspection targets from the risk ranked lists and are encouraged to select higher priority sites. Districts are responsible for the ultimate decision of which sites they chose to inspect and they rely on their local knowledge when making their final choices. The MOECC carries out annual proactive inspections at hauled sewage sites and processed organic waste sites. Each year regulated operations are identified and each one is assigned an overall risk score. Several risk factors are considered and these vary somewhat depending on the sub-program involved; among the risk factors considered is Source Protection vulnerable area information. Sites that intersect with source protection vulnerable areas with the highest risk scores (ie. scores of 8 or greater) are assigned relatively higher inspection priority risk scores. Districts are responsible for the ultimate decision of which sites they chose to inspect and they rely on their local knowledge when making their final choices. However, they are provided the risk ranked lists as a resource and are encouraged to select higher priority sites.				
			MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits	Safe Drinking Water Branch does not prioritize Municipal Drinking Water System inspections strictly based on source protection as the branch is mandated by the Compliance and Enforcement Regulation to inspect all municipal residential systems every year, without exception.				
			OMAFRA: Nutrient Management	MOECC does inspections for nutrient management – see MOECC response for ASM/NASM				
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)	MNRF utilizes a risk based compliance approach to plan for aggregate inspections based on a scale of High, Medium and Low priority. Licences and Permits that fall within source				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)														
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend															
				protection policy areas and/or have fuel storage within areas identified by a source protection policy are considered High Risk for the purposes of planning for inspections.																		
			MTO: Aggregates –road construction (Fuel storage)	All MTO permit sites are inspected every year by MTO staff and fuel storage is one of the prescribed elements that must be checked as part of the formal written compliance audit.																		
			Reporting Frequency: One-time (but maybe needed again if and when changes are made)																			
	SPPB	21	Briefly describe, in general terms, how each ministry program area ensures PI holders comply with their instrument for the program areas in the table below.																			
			MINISTRY PROGRAM AREA	DESCRIPTION																		
			MOECC: Waste Disposal Sites – landfilling and storage	<p>The ministry conducts planned inspections to assess compliance of waste management activities against the terms and conditions of the approval and related regulatory requirements. Inspections also assess conformance to applicable policies, guidelines and procedures. Ministry staff may also conduct reactive inspections if they become aware of a complaint or concern linked to a particular site. Where a waste disposal site inspection finds non-compliance, Incident Response reporting and related abatement action will commence. Various approaches may be used by inspectors to require proponents to bring an operation into compliance with legal requirements including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Voluntary abatement •Issuance of Order or Ticket •Referral to the Ministry’s Investigation and Enforcement Branch with a recommendation to undertake a prosecution. <p>The approach taken by the inspector will depend on the severity and nature of the violation as well as the compliance history of the party in question. Inspectors may refer to the Ministry’s following documents to assist them in determining the most appropriate compliance approach in any particular instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •General Inspection Guidance Manual Part A •Inspection Guidance Manual Part B - Subject Waste Generator •Compliance Policy: Applying Abatement and Enforcement Tools <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Inspection</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Order</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Voluntary abatement measures</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provincial offense notice (ticket)</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Referral to internal investigations department</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Self reporting</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table>	Inspection	Yes	Order	Yes	Voluntary abatement measures	Yes	Provincial offense notice (ticket)	Yes	Referral to internal investigations department	Yes	Self reporting	No	Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	Yes				
Inspection	Yes																					
Order	Yes																					
Voluntary abatement measures	Yes																					
Provincial offense notice (ticket)	Yes																					
Referral to internal investigations department	Yes																					
Self reporting	No																					
Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	Yes																					
			MOECC: Sewage works/wastewater	<p>The sewage program compliance activities conducted by the MOECC including but not limited to announced and unannounced field compliance assessments (inspections), incident/spill or complaint resolution activities, and primary and secondary screening during environmental compliance approval application and amendment processes all ensure that instrument holders comply with requirements.</p> <p>The approach taken by inspectors when any non-compliance is identified will depend on the severity and nature of the violation as well as the compliance history of the party in question. The Ministry’s “Compliance Policy - Applying Abatement and Enforcement Tools” (2007) is used to assist inspectors in determining the most appropriate compliance approach in any particular instance.</p> <p>The various approaches which may be used by inspectors to ensure compliance with legal requirements includes voluntary abatement, Provincial Officer’s Orders, Issuance of a ticket or referral to the Ministry’s Investigation and Enforcement Branch with a recommendation to undertake a prosecution.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Inspection</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table>	Inspection	Yes																
Inspection	Yes																					

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			Order	Yes				
			Voluntary abatement measures	Yes				
			Provincial offense notice (ticket)	Yes				
			Referral to internal investigations department	Yes				
			Self reporting	No				
			Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	Yes				
			MOECC: Pesticides	As part of the Pesticides Permit, conditions are included that require the submission of a Summary Report. The Summary Report is issued to the Ministry after the pesticide application has been completed. The Summary Report includes details not limited to: GPS shape files that indicate the geographic area where the pesticide was applied, UTM data indicating when sprayers/nozzles were turned on and off; flight plans; volumes of pesticides applied, etc. In addition, the ministry conducts inspections at approved sites to assess compliance with regulatory requirements. Ministry staff may also conduct reactive inspections if they become aware of a complaint or concern linked to a particular site. Where non-compliance with prescribed instrument requirements or other regulatory requirements are identified the ministry takes action to bring sites into compliance. Various approaches may be used by inspectors to ensure proponents bring an operation into compliance with legal requirements including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Voluntary abatement •Provincial Officer's Order •Issuance of a summons •Referral to the Ministry's Investigation and Enforcement Branch with a recommendation to undertake a prosecution The approach taken by the inspector will depend on the severity and nature of the violation as well as the compliance history of the party in question. Inspectors may refer to the Ministry's "Compliance Policy - Applying Abatement and Enforcement Tools" (2007) to assist them in determining the most appropriate compliance approach in any particular instance. Inspection Yes Order Yes Voluntary abatement measures Yes Provincial offense notice (ticket) No Referral to internal investigations department Yes Self reporting Yes Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments Yes				
			MOECC: Water Taking	The ministry conducts planned inspections to assess compliance of a water taking activity against the terms and conditions of an active Permit To Take Water and related regulatory requirements. Inspections also assess conformance to applicable policies, guidelines and procedures. Ministry staff may also conduct reactive inspections if they become aware of a complaint or concern linked to a particular site. Where a Permit To Take Water inspection finds non-compliance, Incident Response reporting and related abatement action will commence. Various approaches may be used by inspectors to require proponents to bring an operation into compliance with legal requirements including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Voluntary abatement •Issuance of Order or Ticket •Referral to the Ministry's Investigation and Enforcement Branch with a recommendation to undertake a prosecution The approach taken by the inspector will depend on the severity and nature of the violation as well as the compliance history of the party in question. Inspectors may refer to the				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
				Ministry's following documents to assist them in determining the most appropriate compliance approach in any particular instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •General Inspection Guidance Manual Part A •Inspection Guidance Manual Part B – Permit To Take Water •Compliance Policy: Applying Abatement and Enforcement Tools Inspection Yes Order Yes Voluntary abatement measures Yes Provincial offense notice (ticket) Yes Referral to internal investigations department Yes Self reporting Yes Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments Yes				
			MOECC: Hauled sewage/biosolids and ASM / NASM inspections	The ministry conducts inspections at agricultural operations to assess compliance with regulatory requirements. Ministry staff may also conduct reactive inspections if they become aware of a complaint or concern linked to a particular operation. Where non-compliance with prescribed instrument requirements or other regulatory requirements are identified the ministry takes action to bring sites into compliance. Various approaches may be used by inspectors to ensure proponents bring an operation into compliance with legal requirements. The ministry conducts inspections at agricultural operations to assess compliance with regulatory requirements. Ministry staff may also conduct reactive inspections if they become aware of a complaint or concern linked to a particular operation. Where non-compliance with prescribed instrument requirements or other regulatory requirements are identified the ministry takes action to bring sites into compliance. Various approaches may be used by inspectors to ensure proponents bring an operation into compliance with legal requirements including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Voluntary abatement •Provincial Officer's Order •Issuance of a Part 1 summons (note, tickets are not an option under the Nutrient Management Act) •Referral to the Ministry's Investigation and Enforcement Branch with a recommendation to undertake a prosecution The approach taken by the inspector will depend on the severity and nature of the violation as well as the compliance history of the party in question. Inspectors may refer to the Ministry's "Compliance Policy - Applying Abatement and Enforcement Tools" (2007) to assist them in determining the most appropriate compliance approach in any particular instance. Inspection Yes Order Yes Voluntary abatement measures Yes Provincial offense notice (ticket) No Referral to internal investigations department Yes Self reporting No Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments No <p>MOECC inspectors of hauled sewage/processed organic waste (aka biosolids) sites assess compliance with the terms/conditions within the applicable prescribed instrument(s) associated with the operation as well as other applicable regulatory requirements made under the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Water Resources Act. In the event any terms or conditions are contained in an instrument to address Source Protection policy requirements, compliance with those terms/conditions is addressed as part of the regular inspection activities. When ministry inspectors identify non-compliance with legal</p>				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)													
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend														
				<p>requirements during an inspection, various abatement actions may be taken to address non-compliance, ranging from providing guidance and information to issuing corrective orders. The ministry conducts inspections at approved sites to assess compliance with regulatory requirements. Ministry staff may also conduct reactive inspections if they become aware of a complaint or concern linked to a particular site. Where non-compliance with prescribed instrument requirements or other regulatory requirements are identified the ministry takes action to bring sites into compliance. Various approaches may be used by inspectors to ensure proponents bring an operation into compliance with legal requirements including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Voluntary abatement •Provincial Officer's Order •Issuance of a ticket or Part 1 Summons •Referral to the Ministry's Investigation and Enforcement Branch with a recommendation to undertake a prosecution <p>The approach taken by the inspector will depend on the severity and nature of the violation as well as the compliance history of the party in question. Inspectors may refer to the Ministry's "Compliance Policy - Applying Abatement and Enforcement Tools" (2007) to assist them in determining the most appropriate compliance approach in any particular instance.</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Inspection</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Order</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Voluntary abatement measures</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Provincial offense notice (ticket)</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Referral to internal investigations department</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Self reporting</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments</td><td>No</td></tr> </table>	Inspection	Yes	Order	Yes	Voluntary abatement measures	Yes	Provincial offense notice (ticket)	Yes	Referral to internal investigations department	Yes	Self reporting	No	Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	No			
Inspection	Yes																				
Order	Yes																				
Voluntary abatement measures	Yes																				
Provincial offense notice (ticket)	Yes																				
Referral to internal investigations department	Yes																				
Self reporting	No																				
Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	No																				
			MOECC: Municipal drinking water licences/works permits	<p>Municipal drinking water systems are inspected annually to confirm compliance with the requirements set out in their prescribed instrument (Municipal Drinking Water Licence and Drinking Water Works Permit).</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Inspection</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Order</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Voluntary abatement measures</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Provincial offense notice (ticket)</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Referral to internal investigations department</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Self reporting</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </table>	Inspection	Yes	Order	Yes	Voluntary abatement measures	Yes	Provincial offense notice (ticket)	No	Referral to internal investigations department	Yes	Self reporting	No	Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	Yes			
Inspection	Yes																				
Order	Yes																				
Voluntary abatement measures	Yes																				
Provincial offense notice (ticket)	No																				
Referral to internal investigations department	Yes																				
Self reporting	No																				
Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	Yes																				
			OMAFRA: Nutrient Management	No response provided by OMAFRA. MOECC carries out inspections for nutrient management. See MOECC ASM and NASM above.																	
			MNRF: Aggregates (Fuel storage)	<table border="0"> <tr><td>Inspection</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Order</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Voluntary abatement measures</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Provincial offense notice (ticket)</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Referral to internal investigations department</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Self reporting</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </table>	Inspection	Yes	Order	No	Voluntary abatement measures	No	Provincial offense notice (ticket)	No	Referral to internal investigations department	No	Self reporting	Yes	Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	Yes			
Inspection	Yes																				
Order	No																				
Voluntary abatement measures	No																				
Provincial offense notice (ticket)	No																				
Referral to internal investigations department	No																				
Self reporting	Yes																				
Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments	Yes																				
			MTO: Aggregates – road construction (Fuel storage)	Every MTO permit site, whether active or not, is inspected annually by MTO aggregates staff and a Compliance Assessment Report is filed with the MTO for the purpose of assessing compliance with the Aggregate Resources Act, Regulations, AROPS, the site plan, and any conditions of the permit. Fuel storage is one of the prescribed elements that is verified in the compliance assessment.																	

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
				<p>When an MTO permit is actively being used by an MTO contractor, MTO Aggregate Inspectors have the legal authority to verify and enforce compliance with site plan and operational requirements, including fuel storage conditions. Contract Administrators are also required to verify that site plan conditions are being adhered to for the duration of an MTO contract. MTO aggregates staff have been designated by MNR as Aggregate Inspectors and have the legal authority to enforce the Aggregate Resources Act. They may issue a Notice of Inspection if a contravention related to Fuel storage is observed. MTO may also suspend the aggregate permit until compliance is achieved. Furthermore, MTO may use tools, including financial penalties, available in the construction contract to require the contractor to comply with the Aggregate Permit site plan conditions, including fuel storage conditions.</p> <p>Inspection Yes Order Yes Voluntary abatement measures No Provincial offense notice (ticket) No Referral to internal investigations department No Self reporting Yes Primary/Secondary screening of PI Applications/Amendments Yes</p>				
			Reporting Frequency: One-time (but may be needed again if and when any changes are made)					
Land Use Planning (LUP) <i>NOTE:</i> Reportables #22a-b are shaded in grey as they are not required to be completed by the SPA. Instead, the responses to these reportables are found in the MMA electronic/paper reporting form. These reportables are retained in the supplemental form for reference and reporting purposes for SPAs wishing to share this information with their respective SPCs. Where this is the case, SPAs may need to provide an overall summary.	SPPB	22a	<p>Where the Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MMA) is the planning approval authority for day-to-day <i>Planning Act</i> decisions within source protection areas, or where MMA is the approval authority for the official plan and zoning by law conformity exercises municipalities are required to undertake, please provide a description of how MMA ensures their <i>Planning Act</i> decisions conform with the approved source protection plans (specifically, the policies on List A - Significant threat policies that affect decisions under the <i>Planning Act</i> and <i>Condominium Act</i>, 1998)?</p> <p>RESPONSE: Through the review and approval of Official Plans, MMA, in consultation with MOECC, ensures Official Plan policies conform to the significant drinking water threat policies and have regard to other policies. In addition, MMA ensures designated vulnerable areas, as identified in approved assessment reports are identified in Official Plan schedules and protected, improved or restored as is required to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.</p>	H	See measure "H"	Same target/trend as measure "H".	S (#1, #2) M (#4, #5, #6, #7) L (#10)	
	SPPB	22b	<p>In what other ways does MMA integrate source protection considerations into their business or operational processes? Please provide a brief description of each.</p> <p>RESPONSE: MMA takes source protection into consideration in its review of new planning documents (official plans, comprehensive zoning bylaws) and development applications as applicable.</p>					
			Reporting Frequency: One-time					
	SPA	23a	<p>In total, how many municipalities (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) within the SPR/A are required to complete:</p> <p>Official Plan (OP) conformity exercises for source protection? <u> 7 </u> Zoning by-law (ZBL) conformity exercises for source protection? <u> 7 </u></p> <p>*NOTE: Applies to every municipality affected by land use planning or Part IV type policies.</p>	K	Percent of municipalities that are subject to significant drinking water threat policies have incorporated source protection into their planning documents.	100% of municipalities that are subject to significant drinking water threat policies have incorporated source protection into their planning documents.	S (#1, #2) M (#4, #5, #6, #7) L (#10)	
		Reporting Frequency: One-time						
	SPA	23b	<p>Of these municipalities, how many have:</p> <p>(i) Completed their OP conformity exercise <u> 2 </u> (ii) Completed their ZBL conformity exercises <u> 1 </u> (iii) Completed OP conformity exercise but under appeal <u> 0 </u> (iv) Completed ZBL conformity exercise but under appeal <u> 0 </u> (v) OP conformity exercise in process <u> 5 </u> (vi) ZBL conformity exercise in process <u> 1 </u></p>					

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables	Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
				ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			(vii) Not started their OP conformity exercise <u> 0 </u> (viii) Not started their ZBL conformity exercise <u> 5 </u> Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually) or until such time all applicable municipalities have completed their conformity exercise				
Education & Outreach (E&O) <i>(NOTE: Do not count signage policies as part of this reportable as there is a separate reportable for signage policies below.)</i>	SPA & SPPB	24a	(i) What method(s) are being used to implement E&O policies in the SPR/A? Choose all that apply. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> development and distribution of educational materials for general public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> development and distribution of educational materials for target audiences including developers, builders, landowners, farmers, etc. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in-person workshops <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> site visits <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> source protection content for websites <input type="checkbox"/> educational videos (e.g., YouTube) <input type="checkbox"/> podcasts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> collaboration with other bodies (e.g., ministries, local organizations, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> other. Please specify _____ <input type="checkbox"/> methods for implementing E&O not yet determined (ii) Identify the ways in which outreach efforts were conducted to reach target audiences about source water protection? Choose all that apply. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> social media promotion (e.g., use of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> traditional media advertising (e.g., print media, radio, television) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> site visits <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> integration with other outreach programs or campaigns (e.g., Community Environment Days, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> articles in publications <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> information kiosks at events/festivals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> other. Please specify <u>website updates</u> Reporting Frequency: First 3-5 years of reporting	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	SPA & SPPB	24b	(i) Describe how the SPA is evaluating the implementation of its E&O policies? RESPONSE: The responsibility for implementing and tracking education and outreach efforts lies with the municipalities. The municipalities reported they are tracking webpage views, program awareness/level of knowledge of landowners contacted at site visits and at events, and complaints received. Tracking whether landowners subject to education and outreach policies attend education and outreach events. (ii) What are the results of that evaluation? If possible, in the description of results, please indicate if the E&O policies resulted in gains in source protection knowledge and any commitments made to change behaviour that is protective of source water. RESPONSE: Change in behaviour assessment cannot be done at this point. 473 source protection website page views in Hamilton. Residents in WHPAs are more aware of program. Halton determined there is a generally low understanding of the program and a recognition of the importance of protecting drinking water sources. Reporting Frequency: First 3-5 years of reporting				
	SPA & SPPB	25	What did the E&O policy(ies) that were implemented target in the SPR/A? Please select all that apply from the list below. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threats (significant) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threats (moderate-low) <input type="checkbox"/> Transport pathways <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spills prevention/spill events <input type="checkbox"/> Drinking water issues <input type="checkbox"/> Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Local threat				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables	Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)																														
				ID	Measure	Target/Trend																															
			<input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify _____ Reporting Frequency: First 3-5 years of reporting																																		
	SPA & SPPB	26	<p>[OPTIONAL]: If and where there are E&O initiatives that were particularly successful that the SP Authority wishes to highlight in the supplemental annual progress reporting form, include its details here. Please limit the description to only those known E&O initiatives the SPA feels were exceptional/quite successful.]</p> <p>Provide a brief description of a successful E&O initiative that has had or is having a positive impact below. In the description, where available, include the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicate target population (e.g., farmers, business, residents, municipalities, etc.) Percentage of the target audience reached Outcomes that were achieved Whether these initiatives reached persons and/or businesses within geographic areas where threats could be significant or to wider areas (i.e., specific to areas with significant drinking water threats or general E/O) <p>RESPONSE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Hamilton has extended source protection messaging to private well users in the rural community through the publication of the Hamilton Rural Well Water Quality Report 2017 (https://d3fpllf1m7bbt3.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-03-22/rural-well-water-quality-report-march-2017.pdf). The report has been distributed to all rural Hamilton residences without municipal water service or connected to a non-municipal drinking water system and is available at well water sample bottle pick up locations. It includes good messaging on the protection of individual water systems and the source protection program. and the source protection program. The development and distribution of Spill Response Stickers by Halton Region was well received by landowners. Prior to receiving the spill response stickers, landowners were generally unaware of actions to take in the event of a spill or leak. <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>																																		
Signage	SPA & SPPB	27	<p>Complete the table below to indicate the number of source water protection signs that have been installed in the SPR/A for the reporting periods noted.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>REPORTING PERIOD</th> <th>Number of signs installed on provincial highways (Column A)</th> <th>Number of signs installed on municipal roads (Column B)</th> <th>Number of signs at other locations (if applicable) (Column C)</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year)⁶</td> <td>0</td> <td>20</td> <td>0</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> <td>0</td> <td>22</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>20 municipal signs prior to 2016 and 2 provincial signs in 2017</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: First 3-5 years of reporting</p>	REPORTING PERIOD	Number of signs installed on provincial highways (Column A)	Number of signs installed on municipal roads (Column B)	Number of signs at other locations (if applicable) (Column C)	TOTAL	Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year) ⁶	0	20	0	20	Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)	2	0	0	2	Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)					Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)					TOTAL	2	20	0	22	L	Total number of source water protection signs installed within 5-10 years of plan approval.	Increasing number of source protection signs installed in the first 5-10 years of plan implementation (on a cumulative basis).	S (#1, #2) M (#3, #4, #6) L (#8, #9, #10)
REPORTING PERIOD	Number of signs installed on provincial highways (Column A)	Number of signs installed on municipal roads (Column B)	Number of signs at other locations (if applicable) (Column C)	TOTAL																																	
Year 1 (from effective date of SPP to December 31 of same year) ⁶	0	20	0	20																																	
Year 2 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 1)	2	0	0	2																																	
Year 3 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 2)																																					
Year 4 (January 1 to December 31 of calendar year following Year 3)																																					
TOTAL	2	20	0	22																																	
Incentives	SPA & SPPB	28	<p>[OPTIONAL] If applicable to the SPR/A, complete the table below indicating the type of incentive(s) (e.g., PI application fees waived, funding, other non-financial incentives, etc.) that was made available (whether as a policy in the SPP or not), the source that provided the incentive(s), the prescribed drinking water threat activity(ies) to which it relates, the degree to which the incentive(s) assisted with</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A																														

⁶ For CTC, Halton-Hamilton, and Thames Sydenham and Region, the Year 1 reporting period is from December 31, 2015 (i.e., the effective dates of these three SPPs) to December 31, 2016.

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)																								
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend																									
			<p>the implementation of SPP policies that address significant drinking water threat activity(ies), and include any comments. Use a single row to describe each type of incentive and insert additional rows if necessary in the table below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of Incentive</th> <th>Source of Incentive (i.e., Municipality, Conservation Authority, Provincial Ministry(ies), Other (please specify))</th> <th>Prescribed Drinking Water Threat(s) Addressed</th> <th>Degree to which incentive(s) assisted with the implementation of SPP policies addressing significant drinking water threats</th> <th>Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Well Decommissioning Grant Program</td> <td>Halton Region and Hamilton</td> <td>Transport Pathways</td> <td> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree </td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Halton's Toilet Rebate Program</td> <td>Halton Region</td> <td>Water conservation</td> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree </td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Halton's Rain Barrel Sales Event</td> <td>Halton Region</td> <td>Water conservation</td> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree </td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cross-Connection and Backflow Prevention Programs</td> <td>Hamilton</td> <td>Sewage treatment plant bypasses</td> <td> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree </td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Reporting Frequency: Annually or when warranted</p>		Type of Incentive	Source of Incentive (i.e., Municipality, Conservation Authority, Provincial Ministry(ies), Other (please specify))	Prescribed Drinking Water Threat(s) Addressed	Degree to which incentive(s) assisted with the implementation of SPP policies addressing significant drinking water threats	Comments	Well Decommissioning Grant Program	Halton Region and Hamilton	Transport Pathways	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree		Halton's Toilet Rebate Program	Halton Region	Water conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree		Halton's Rain Barrel Sales Event	Halton Region	Water conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree		Cross-Connection and Backflow Prevention Programs	Hamilton	Sewage treatment plant bypasses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree				
Type of Incentive	Source of Incentive (i.e., Municipality, Conservation Authority, Provincial Ministry(ies), Other (please specify))	Prescribed Drinking Water Threat(s) Addressed	Degree to which incentive(s) assisted with the implementation of SPP policies addressing significant drinking water threats	Comments																												
Well Decommissioning Grant Program	Halton Region and Hamilton	Transport Pathways	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree																													
Halton's Toilet Rebate Program	Halton Region	Water conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree																													
Halton's Rain Barrel Sales Event	Halton Region	Water conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree																													
Cross-Connection and Backflow Prevention Programs	Hamilton	Sewage treatment plant bypasses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full degree <input type="checkbox"/> Significant/large degree <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate degree <input type="checkbox"/> Some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Limited degree																													
	SPA & SPPB	29	<p>[OPTIONAL: If and where there are successful incentive programs in the SPR/SPA that the SP Authority wishes to highlight in the supplemental annual progress reporting form, include its details here. Please limit the description to only those incentive programs the SPA feels were exceptional /quite successful.]</p> <p>Provide a brief description of incentives that have had or are having a positive impact below. In the description include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes achieved • How widely available was the incentive? • Whether incentives reached persons and/or businesses within geographic areas where threats could be significant or to wider areas <p>RESPONSE: N/A</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Annually or when warranted</p>																													
Sewage System Inspections – Ontario Building Code (OBC)	SPA	30a	<p>How many on-site sewage systems in the SPA require inspections in accordance with the Ontario Building Code (OBC) (i.e., once every five years)? <u>112</u></p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Annual</p>		M	Percentage of on-site sewage systems that are inspected as part of the mandatory septic inspections program where they are a significant threat.	100% of on-site sewage systems where they are a significant threat are inspected once every 5 years.	S (#2) M (#5, #6) L (#9, #10)																								
	SPA	30b	<p>Of these, how many on-site sewage systems were inspected (i.e., cumulative running tally of systems inspected)? <u>107</u></p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>																													
	SPA	30c	<p>How many of the on-site sewage systems inspected required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minor maintenance work (e.g., pump out, etc.)? <u>107</u> • major maintenance work (e.g., tank replacement, etc.)? <u>2</u> 																													

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)												
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend													
Environmental monitoring for drinking water issues	SPA	31	Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)		N	Number of identified issues showing improvements in its concentration(s) and/or trend(s).	Improvements over time in the concentration or loadings of contaminant(s)/issue(s) of concern in sources of drinking water.	S (#1, #2) M (#4, #5, #6, #7) L (#10)												
			If applicable to the SPR/A, complete the table below where information about drinking water issues is available. Begin by identifying the drinking water system(s) and any associated drinking water issue(s)/parameter(s) (chemical or pathogen) that have been identified, then indicate whether an Issue Contributing Area (ICA) was delineated for the identified issue(s), and any observations in the concentration or trend for each issue. Optional: Describe the actions/behavioural changes in the ICA that might be contributing to the changes. Insert additional rows as necessary in the table below for each drinking water system. Municipalities and SPAs may use data from the Drinking Water Surveillance Program to help inform the response to this reportable.																	
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Drinking Water System (Column A)</th> <th>Drinking Water Issue/Parameter (Column B)</th> <th>ICA delineated for this issue? (Yes/No) (Column C)</th> <th>Observations (Column D)</th> <th>Actions/Behavioural Changes Contributing to Change in Observations (Optional) (Column E)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Cedarvale (Halton Hills)</td> <td>chloride</td> <td>yes</td> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> Increasing concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> Decreasing concentration/trend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No change in concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough data/information is available to determine changes in concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> No longer monitoring issue/parameter as not an issue </td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Drinking Water System (Column A)					Drinking Water Issue/Parameter (Column B)	ICA delineated for this issue? (Yes/No) (Column C)	Observations (Column D)	Actions/Behavioural Changes Contributing to Change in Observations (Optional) (Column E)	Cedarvale (Halton Hills)	chloride	yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Increasing concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> Decreasing concentration/trend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No change in concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough data/information is available to determine changes in concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> No longer monitoring issue/parameter as not an issue				
Drinking Water System (Column A)	Drinking Water Issue/Parameter (Column B)	ICA delineated for this issue? (Yes/No) (Column C)	Observations (Column D)	Actions/Behavioural Changes Contributing to Change in Observations (Optional) (Column E)																
Cedarvale (Halton Hills)	chloride	yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Increasing concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> Decreasing concentration/trend <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No change in concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough data/information is available to determine changes in concentration/trend <input type="checkbox"/> No longer monitoring issue/parameter as not an issue																	
Transport pathways	SPA	32a	Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A												
			How many notices about transport pathways (meaning a condition of land resulting from human activity (e.g., pits and quarries, improperly abandoned wells, geothermal system, etc.) that increases the vulnerability of a raw water supply of a drinking water system) did the SPA receive from municipalities in this reporting period (as per O. Reg. 287/07, ss. 27(3))? <u> 0 </u>																	
			Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)																	
Transport pathways	SPA	32b	What actions did the SPR/A take as a response to receiving these notices (e.g., SPR/A provided information to municipalities about changes in vulnerability, etc.)? Please describe below.		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A												
			RESPONSE: N/A																	
			Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)																	
Transport pathways	SPA	33	[OPTIONAL]: Provide specific information on actions taken by any person or body to reduce the impacts that transport pathways could have on sources of drinking water (e.g., number of wells properly abandoned by municipalities and/or private landowners in accordance with O. Reg. 903, etc.)?		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A												
			RESPONSE: N/A																	
			Reporting Frequency: Annually or when warranted																	
Positive impact examples for each of the following policy tools or topics (e.g., road salt management, transport pathways, spills response, water quantity, Great Lakes, any "other" policy)	SPA & SPPB	34	[OPTIONAL]: If and where there are successful examples for each of the following initiatives in the SPR/A that the authority wishes to highlight, include its details in the table below. Please limit the descriptions provided (e.g., one example for each topic or more could be included when the SPA feels they are exceptional/quite successful).]		N/A	No measure. Could use in public reporting vignettes to highlight successful initiatives.	N/A	N/A												
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Policy Tools/Topics</th> <th>Description of Successful Initiatives</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Stewardship Programs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Best Management Practices</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pilot Programs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Research</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Specify Action (e.g., road salt management, municipal by-laws, legislative or regulatory amendments, mapping, review of fuel codes, new airport facility design standards)</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Policy Tools/Topics	Description of Successful Initiatives	Stewardship Programs		Best Management Practices		Pilot Programs		Research		Specify Action (e.g., road salt management, municipal by-laws, legislative or regulatory amendments, mapping, review of fuel codes, new airport facility design standards)	
			Policy Tools/Topics	Description of Successful Initiatives																
			Stewardship Programs																	
			Best Management Practices																	
			Pilot Programs																	
Research																				
Specify Action (e.g., road salt management, municipal by-laws, legislative or regulatory amendments, mapping, review of fuel codes, new airport facility design standards)																				

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables		Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
					ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			to manage runoff of chemicals from de-icing of aircraft, instrumentation, etc.)					
			Climate Change (e.g., data collection)					
			Spill prevention/spill contingency/emergency response plan updates					
			Transport pathways					
			Water quantity					
			Great Lakes					
			Other policies (i.e., strategic action, etc.)					
			Reporting Frequency: Annually or when warranted					
Municipal integration of source protection	SPA	35a	In total, how many municipalities (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) within the SPR/A are subject to SPP policies (any policy tool)? <u>12</u>		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Reporting Frequency: One-time					
	SPA	35b	Complete the table below by indicating the number of municipalities (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) within the SPR/A that have integrated/are integrating ⁷ source protection knowledge/science into the following municipal program areas/activities.					
			Municipal Program Areas/Activities	Number of municipalities that have integrated/are integrating source into program areas/activities				
				Based on reporting by 10 municipalities				
			Road salt storage/application	9				
			Snow storage	8				
			Pesticide storage/application	3				
			Hazardous waste storage	3 of 9				
			Organic solvents storage	3				
		Municipal fuel storage (e.g., for heating, maintenance vehicles, etc.)	6					
		Municipal well maintenance and operations	3 of 6					
		Municipal water quantity	5 of 8					
		Stormwater infrastructure maintenance	4 of 6					
		Other. Please provide a description below.	2					
		Hamilton - Under the requirements of Transfer of Review program for ECA applications, the Engineering & Growth Management Divisions that handle ECA's for the linear infrastructure were made aware of the Vulnerable areas and relevant policies were communicated to the group. The Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines (approved by Council) are required to assess the ecological impact at the time of a development application, using the HVA and SGRA maps.						
		Halton Region - Source Protection review completed when submitting Environmental Compliance Approval applications						
		Reporting Frequency: Annually or when warranted						

⁷ Integration means that specific changes have been/are being made to these municipal program areas as a direct result of SPP policies or as a result of more broad integration of the science from source protection.

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables			Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend				
	SPA	36a	Of the total number of municipalities within the SPR/A that are subject to SPP policies and have a legal responsibility for day-to-day land use planning or municipal building permit decisions, how many are integrating source protection requirements into the following program areas?						
			Number of municipalities within SPR/A with day-to-day responsibility for land use planning decisions (column A)	Number of municipalities integrating source protection requirements into land use planning decisions (column B)	Percent Integrating Source Protection Column B / Column A				
			8 with Vulnerable Areas	8	100				
			Number of municipalities within SPR/A with day-to-day responsibility for building permit decisions (column A)	Number of municipalities integrating source protection requirements into building permit decisions (column B)	Percent Integrating Source Protection Column B / Column A				
			8 with Vulnerable Areas	8	100				
			Reporting Frequency: Annually until all subject municipalities have integrated policies						
	SPA	36b	Indicate the number or estimated percentage of subject municipalities (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) that are integrating source protection into the business processes listed in the table below.						
			Business Processes	Number or estimated percentage of subject municipalities integrating source protection					
			Staff involved with land use planning and/or section 59 policies trained in source protection	100					
			Staff guidance documents updated/produced for evaluating land use planning applications conforming with/having regard to SPP policies	89					
			Planning design and technical guidelines updated/produced for source protection considerations for applicants	50					
			Strategy and timeline established to undertake OP & ZBL conformity exercise	100					
			Planning documents updated	29					
			Planning maps/schedules updated to show vulnerable areas	75					
			Siting/placement of activities away from vulnerable areas	75					
			Complete planning application requirements (i.e., supporting documentation such as stormwater management plan, master environmental servicing plan, lot grading plan, etc. needed)	56					
			Procedures in place to flag where section 59 policies apply including mechanism/process to facilitate exchange of information about development application process and the issuance of section 59 notices	100					
			Steps taken (e.g., municipal by-law, conservation authority regulation, etc.) to reduce the number of applications that require RMO screening	100					
			Public works operations	78					
			Other. Please provide a description. Communications – children’s water festivals, Hamilton Rural Well Water Quality Report 2017 (Public Health), International GIS Day, Water Watch Newsletters, Waste Management Guide, Drinking Water Source Protection Webpages Municipal environmental assessments Stormwater Quality Improvement pilot project Investigation of new technologies to reduce phosphorus levels in stormwater Pre-Consultation Meeting Process and Site Plan Control By-law to ensure source protection review and evaluation occurs prior to building permit issuance	50					
			No Changes Made. If no changes made, please explain: _____						

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables	Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
				ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
			Reporting Frequency: One-time (but may be needed again if and when further changes are made to business processes to integrate source protection)				
Examples of successful municipal actions to protect source water	SPA	37	<p>[OPTIONAL: <i>If and where there are examples of successful municipal actions in the SPR/A that the authority wishes to highlight in the supplemental annual progress reporting form, include its details here. Please limit the descriptions provided to those the SPA feels are exceptional/very successful municipal actions.]</i></p> <p>Are there some unique examples of successful municipal actions within the SPR/A that are being/have been undertaken to protect source water either directly because of plan policies or as a result of more broad integration of the science from source protection? If yes, please provide details below.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>Positive outcomes in the City of Hamilton come from the substantial resources invested in programs like the Woodward Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrades, the Randle Reef Sediment Remediation Project, the Dundas Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrades, the Real-Time Control System and the Cross-Connection Control Project. These programs became a priority due to awareness about quality of source water and sustainable water services. There are also research projects that the Municipality is involved in, such as a cyanobacteria study, that focus, among other factors, on seasonality and climate change aspects and their impact on the municipal intake.</p> <p>During the County of Wellington’s Official Plan amendment process, it was decided to broadly require a Drinking Water Threat Disclosure Report in municipal wellhead protection areas where SDWTs may be present. This requirement was in part a response to Halton-Hamilton policies and in part building on existing Official Plan policies since 2008. Since adoption of the Official Plan amendment (OPA 98), there have been four submissions related to this requirement in the County, however, none in Halton-Hamilton Source Protection Region.</p> <p>The Town of Oakville is one of five pilot Canadian municipalities participating in the national Municipal Natural Assets Initiative to better understand the value and function of natural assets in providing municipal stormwater services. The town’s project is focusing on an older area of Oakville near the lakefront with remnant streams draining to Lake Ontario. The value of natural assets when compared to any gray infrastructure in providing conveyance and storage/infiltration is much more cost-effective as well as achieving other benefits, e.g. water quality improvement, biodiversity/ecological function, wellness, and cooling among others.</p>	N/A	No measure. Could use in public reporting vignettes to highlight successful initiatives.	N/A	N/A
Examples of successful residential or business actions to protect source water	SPA	38	<p>[OPTIONAL: <i>If and where there are examples of successful residential and/or business actions in the SPR/A that the authority wishes to highlight in the supplemental annual progress reporting form, include its details here. Please limit the description provided to those the SPA feels are exceptional/ very successful examples.]</i></p> <p>Are there examples of local residents and/or businesses (including agriculture, salt applicator, fuel providers) who are taking successful concrete actions (e.g., engaged in more “green” behaviours that could protect water sources such as purchasing road salt alternatives, taking precautions when storing or disposing hazardous waste, organic solvents, etc.) to protect source water in their community(ies)? If yes, please provide details below.</p> <p>RESPONSE: N/A</p>				
Enumerated threats: progress made in addressing significant threats engaged in at time of SPP approval (i.e., enumerated as 'existing')	SPA	39a	<p>Complete the table below by first indicating which of the listed significant drinking water threats were being engaged in (i.e., enumerated as ‘existing’ significant threats/threats) at the time of SPP approval. Then, using the formula for the running tally of enumerated threats as explained below, complete the columns in the table with the information for each SDWT indicated as existing in the SPR/A.</p> <p>Lead SPAs will be maintaining a running tally of progress made in addressing significant threats that were on the ground before plans were approved. See Guidance document for additional details. The running tally consists of the formula: A+B-C-D where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A = Original estimate of SDWT engaged in/enumerated when SPP approved • B = Additional SDWT identified after first SPP approved as a result of field verification (i.e., <u>not</u> part of original estimate of SDWT) • C = SDWT included in enumeration estimates at time of plan approval but subsequently determined through field verification that: (i) it was not actually engaged in at a particular location after all OR (ii) it was no longer engaged in (e.g., land may still have an agricultural operation but owner no longer applying pesticides for their own reasons) 	O	Percent of significant drinking water threats that existed in the area when the SPP was approved and that have been addressed (i.e., eliminated or managed).	100% of significant drinking water threats that existed in the area when the SPP was approved and that have been addressed (i.e.,	M (#5, #6) L (#8, #10)

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables						Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)																																																																																																																																																																																								
			ID	Measure	Target/Trend																																																																																																																																																																																															
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D = SDWT addressed because policy is implemented* (*Note: Where multiple policy tools address any given threat sub-category, implemented means that actions associated with at least one policy tool have been completed/are in place.) SPAs may use their local discretion in which policy tool they wish to reflect as being implemented. 								eliminated or managed).																																																																																																																																																																																									
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Threat ID</th> <th>Prescribed Drinking Water Threat / Local Threat / Conditions</th> <th>A</th> <th>B</th> <th>C</th> <th>D</th> <th>No. of existing threats still to be addressed (A+B-C-D)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.</td> <td>136</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>108</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of agricultural source material to land.</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The storage of agricultural source material</td> <td>3</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The management of agricultural source material</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The application of non-agricultural source material to land</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of non-agricultural source material</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The application of commercial fertilizer to land</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of pesticide to land</td> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of pesticide</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of road salt</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of road salt</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The storage of snow</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of fuel</td> <td>18</td> <td>4</td> <td>6</td> <td>1</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of an organic solvent</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>18</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The management of runoff that contains chemicals used in the de-icing of aircraft</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>19</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard O. Reg. 385/08, s. 3.</td> <td>7</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Water taking from an aquifer without returning the water to the same aquifer or surface water body</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>21</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Reducing recharge of an aquifer</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local threat #1 (if applicable, please specify) _ Conveyance of oil in a pipeline that crosses open waterbodies _____</td> <td>22</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>22</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Local threat #2 (if applicable, please specify) _____</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Local condition #1 (if applicable, please specify) _____</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Local condition #2 (if applicable, please specify) _____</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>201</td> <td>7</td> <td>14</td> <td>136</td> <td>58</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Threat ID	Prescribed Drinking Water Threat / Local Threat / Conditions	A	B	C	D	No. of existing threats still to be addressed (A+B-C-D)	1	<input type="checkbox"/> The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act.						2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.	136	0	3	108	25	3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of agricultural source material to land.	3	1	1	0	3	4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The storage of agricultural source material	3	0	0	0	3	5	<input type="checkbox"/> The management of agricultural source material						6	<input type="checkbox"/> The application of non-agricultural source material to land						7	<input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of non-agricultural source material						8	<input type="checkbox"/> The application of commercial fertilizer to land						9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer	1	0	1	0	0	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of pesticide to land	5	1	2	0	4	11	<input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of pesticide						12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of road salt	5	0	0	5	0	13	<input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of road salt						14	<input type="checkbox"/> The storage of snow						15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of fuel	18	4	6	1	15	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid	1	1	0	0	2	17	<input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of an organic solvent						18	<input type="checkbox"/> The management of runoff that contains chemicals used in the de-icing of aircraft						19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard O. Reg. 385/08, s. 3.	7	0	1	0	6	20	<input type="checkbox"/> Water taking from an aquifer without returning the water to the same aquifer or surface water body						21	<input type="checkbox"/> Reducing recharge of an aquifer							<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local threat #1 (if applicable, please specify) _ Conveyance of oil in a pipeline that crosses open waterbodies _____	22	0	0	22	0		<input type="checkbox"/> Local threat #2 (if applicable, please specify) _____							<input type="checkbox"/> Local condition #1 (if applicable, please specify) _____							<input type="checkbox"/> Local condition #2 (if applicable, please specify) _____							TOTAL	201	7	14	136	58				
Threat ID	Prescribed Drinking Water Threat / Local Threat / Conditions	A	B	C	D	No. of existing threats still to be addressed (A+B-C-D)																																																																																																																																																																																														
1	<input type="checkbox"/> The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act.																																																																																																																																																																																																			
2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.	136	0	3	108	25																																																																																																																																																																																														
3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of agricultural source material to land.	3	1	1	0	3																																																																																																																																																																																														
4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The storage of agricultural source material	3	0	0	0	3																																																																																																																																																																																														
5	<input type="checkbox"/> The management of agricultural source material																																																																																																																																																																																																			
6	<input type="checkbox"/> The application of non-agricultural source material to land																																																																																																																																																																																																			
7	<input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of non-agricultural source material																																																																																																																																																																																																			
8	<input type="checkbox"/> The application of commercial fertilizer to land																																																																																																																																																																																																			
9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer	1	0	1	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																														
10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of pesticide to land	5	1	2	0	4																																																																																																																																																																																														
11	<input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of pesticide																																																																																																																																																																																																			
12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The application of road salt	5	0	0	5	0																																																																																																																																																																																														
13	<input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of road salt																																																																																																																																																																																																			
14	<input type="checkbox"/> The storage of snow																																																																																																																																																																																																			
15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of fuel	18	4	6	1	15																																																																																																																																																																																														
16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid	1	1	0	0	2																																																																																																																																																																																														
17	<input type="checkbox"/> The handling and storage of an organic solvent																																																																																																																																																																																																			
18	<input type="checkbox"/> The management of runoff that contains chemicals used in the de-icing of aircraft																																																																																																																																																																																																			
19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard O. Reg. 385/08, s. 3.	7	0	1	0	6																																																																																																																																																																																														
20	<input type="checkbox"/> Water taking from an aquifer without returning the water to the same aquifer or surface water body																																																																																																																																																																																																			
21	<input type="checkbox"/> Reducing recharge of an aquifer																																																																																																																																																																																																			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local threat #1 (if applicable, please specify) _ Conveyance of oil in a pipeline that crosses open waterbodies _____	22	0	0	22	0																																																																																																																																																																																														
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local threat #2 (if applicable, please specify) _____																																																																																																																																																																																																			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local condition #1 (if applicable, please specify) _____																																																																																																																																																																																																			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local condition #2 (if applicable, please specify) _____																																																																																																																																																																																																			
	TOTAL	201	7	14	136	58																																																																																																																																																																																														
			Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)																																																																																																																																																																																																	

Reportable theme	Who ¹ compiles this information?	ID	Reportables	Performance Measures			Outcomes ² (S, M, L)
				ID	Measure	Target/Trend	
	SPA	39b	<p>Please provide comments below to explain the overall progress made in addressing these significant threats. Include the percentage of overall progress made in the comments provided. The percentage of overall progress made in addressing local threats and conditions that are taking place on the landscape is determined by taking the total number in column D (i.e., SDWT addressed because policy is implemented) from the table above (reportable #39a) and dividing it into the number that is derived by adding the total numbers in columns A and B and then subtracting this sum total from the total in column C. In other words, overall progress made = D/A+B-C.</p> <p>COMMENTS: In 2016/17 - 70 % of the significant threats identified following verification have been addressed through policy implementation. This is 19 % more than what was reported in 2016 primarily due to the implementation of education and outreach and pipeline policies.</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>				
Assessment report information gaps (as per ss. 52(1), p. 2 of O. Reg. 287/07)	SPA	40	<p>Provide a summary of steps taken to further assess or implement the work plans described in technical rules #30.1 (Water Budget Tier 3), #50.1 (GUDI for WHPA-E or F), and #116 (ICA) through amendments carried out under section 34 or section 36 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p> <p>RESPONSE: N/A</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Annually until all applicable work plans have been implemented.</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other reporting items (as per ss. 52(1), p. 4 of O. Reg. 287/07)	SPA	41	<p>Does the SPA have any other item on which it wishes to report? If so, please explain.</p> <p>RESPONSE: N/A</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Annually when applicable</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Source protection outcomes	SPA	42	<p>What positive outcomes (e.g., less water consumption, changes in behaviour, reduction in phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations, less chloride from road salt, reduction in algal blooms, human health protected, etc.), if any, have potentially resulted from the implementation of SPP policies? Please describe the outcomes below.</p> <p>RESPONSE: N/A</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>	P	Percentage of SPCs indicating that plan implementation may be a contributing factor to positive drinking water outcomes.	Increasing over time.	M (#4, #5, #6) L (#9, #10)
Achievement of SPP objectives (as per ss. 46(3) of the CWA)	SPA	43a	<p>In the opinion of the Source Protection Committee (SPC), to what extent have the objectives of the SPP been achieved in this reporting period?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Progressing Well/On Target - The majority of the source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory - Some of the source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Limited Progress made - A few of source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well.</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>	Q	Percentage of SPCs indicating that the objectives of the source protection plan are progressing well/on target.	Increasing over time.	S (#1, #2) M (#4, #5, #6, #7) L (#9, #10)
	SPA	43b	<p>Please provide comments to explain how the SPC arrived at its opinion. Include a summary of any discussions that might have been had amongst the SPC members, especially where no consensus was reached.</p> <p>COMMENTS: The SPC was provided draft copies of the Annual Progress Report and the Supplemental Form on February 20, 2018. They met on March 6, 2018 to discuss plan implementation and their response for Part II of the Annual Progress Report.</p> <p>Reporting Frequency: Ongoing (annually)</p>				