

Report Id	Completed	Question	
10	True	As applicable to your source protection region/area, indicate if all relevant implementing bodies submitted a status update/annual report to the source protection authority for the previous reporting year. If "No" is selected for any implementing body(ies), then please complete the Comments field below with details including the name of the specific implementing body along with an explanation, if available, for not submitting a status update/annual report as required by a monitoring policy. *NOTE: Where a listed implementing body(ies) is not applicable/relevant to your source protection region/area, then simply select "No" and explain that it is not an applicable implementing body in your source protection region/area in the Comments field text box.	
Response			Answer
Risk Manag	gement Official		Yes
Municipality	У		Yes
Conservation	on Authority		Yes
Local Healt	ocal Health Unit		No
MECP - Wa	ECP - Waste Disposal Sites - Landfilling and Storage		
MECP - Wa	IECP - Wastewater/Sewage Works		
MECP - Pe	ECP - Pesticides		
MECP - Ha	IECP - Hauled Sewage/Biosolids		
MECP - Hauled Sewage/Biosolids Inspections			Yes
	MECP - Permit to Take Water		
		ater Inspections	Yes
MECP - Mu	ınicipal Reside	ntial Drinking Water Systems	Yes
	•	ntial Drinking Water Systems Inspections	Yes
0. 00	urce Protection	·	Yes
MECP - Waste Disposal Sites - Landfilling and Storage Inspections			Yes
		age Works Inspections	Yes
MECP - Co	nditions Sites		No

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM

MECP - Environmental Monitoring

MECP - Fuel

MECP - Great Lakes

MECP - NMA - ASM and NASM Inspections

Yes

No

Yes

Yes



MECP - Spills Response	Yes
MECP - Wells	No
OMAFRA	Yes
MNRF	Yes
MTO	Yes
MMAH	Yes
MGCS-TSSA	Yes
MENDM	No
Provincial Board/Commission	Yes
Federal Departments/Agencies/Commissions/Crown Corporations	No
Private Entity/Company	No
Association/Organization	No

Comment: Local Health Unit - Not applicable implementing body: cooperation on policy SWG-7 only.

MECP Condition Sites - Not applicable implementing body: no identified conditions sites in CTC.

MECP Environmental Monitoring - Not applicable implementing body, see policy LO-G-2 for cooperation with LOCG

MECP Wells - not applicable implementing body MENDM - Not applicable implementing body

Federal Departments/Agencies/Commissions/Crown Corporations - Not applicable implementing body

Private Entity/Company - Not applicable implementing body Association/Organization - Not applicable implementing body

Note: CTC has is hosting a introductory/refresher session for municipal planning staff across CTC on Drinking Source Water Protection in late March 2024. This session will go over the basics of source protection, including implementation and reporting.

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM Page 2 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
20	True	Did the Source Protection Authority indicate the status of all threat policies as contained in their source protection plan? Please provide details in the response field text box in the Policy Interface for policies with a "No Progress Made" and "No information available/no response received" implementation status especially for legally-binding policies that address significant drinking water threat activities and for any moderate/low threat policies that use prescribed instruments and Planning Act tools.	Implementatio n status of source protection plan policies
Answer:	Yes	policios that add procents a monamente and riamning riot tools.	policios
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
21	True	Did the source protection authority(ies) confirm the accuracy of the implementation status of all threat policies as contained in their source protection plan and located on the policy interface database for the current reporting year?	Monitoring Policy Implementatio
Answer:	Yes		n
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
22	True	Did all source protection authority(ies) confirm that if a policy is significant and legally binding and has not been implemented by a person or a body by the implementation date specified in the policy, that there are written comments that include a description of the failure and the reasons for the failure as per O.Reg 287/07 s.52(1) 1.?	Monitoring Policy Implementatio
Answer:	Yes		
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM Page 3 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question		
30	True	Number of risk management plans agreed to or established within the source protection area/region (to address existing and future threats) in this reporting period (i.e., annual total).		
		Current Year Cumulative Count		
		33 180		
Provincial 7	Γotal	33 180		
Comment:				
Report Id	Completed	Question		
31	True	Number of properties (i.e., parcels) with risk management plans agreed to or established in this reporting period.		
		Current Year Cumulative Count		
		34 212		
Provincial 7	Γotal	34 212		
Comment:				
Report Id	Completed	Question		
32		How many existing* significant drinking water threats have been managed through the established risk management plans in this reporting period (* meaning engaged in OR enumerated as existing significant threats)?		
		Current Year Cumulative Count		
		59 338		
Provincial 7	Γotal	59 338		
Comment:				

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM Page 4 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question		
40	True How many section 59 notices were issued in this reporting period for activities to which neither a prohibition (section 57) nor a risk management plan (section 58) policy applied, as per ss. 59(2)(a) of the Clean Water Act?			
		Current Year Cumulative Count		
		21 272		
Provincial 7	Γotal	21 272		
Comment:				
Report Id	Completed	Question		
41	True	How many section 59 notices were issued in this reporting period for activities to which a risk management plan (section 58) policy applied, as per ss. 59(2)(b) of the Clean Water Act?		
		Current Year Cumulative Count		
		9 79		
Provincial ¹	Γotal	9 79		
Comment:				
Report Id	Completed	Question		
61	True	State the total number of inspections (including any follow-up site visits) that were carried out for activities (existing or future) that are prohibited under section 57 of the Clean Water Act in this reporting period. If no inspections were conducted in the previous calendar year, please explain.		
		Current Year Cumulative Count		
		42 210		
Provincial 7	Γotal	42 210		
Comment:				

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM



Report Id	Completed	Question				
62	True	mong the inspections conducted for section 57, how many showed that activities were taking place on the ndscape even though they were prohibited (i.e., in contravention) under section 57 of the Clean Water Act in this porting period?				
		Current Year Cumulative Count				
		0 0				
Provincial 7	Γotal	0 0				
Comment:						
Report Id	Completed	Question				
63	True	w many new properties were identified with s.57 prohibited activities during the reporting year (do not include operties established outside of this reporting year)?				
		Current Year Cumulative Count				
		0 0				
Provincial 7	Γotal	0 0				
Comment:						
Report Id	Completed	Question				
70	True	How many existing significant drinking water threats have been prohibited as a result of section 57 prohibitions in this reporting period?				
		Current Year Cumulative Count				
		0 34				
Provincial 7	Γotal	0 34				
Comment:						

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM



Report Id	Completed	Question		
80	State the total number of inspections (including any follow-up site visits) that were carried out for activities that require a risk management plan under section 58 of the Clean Water Act in this reporting period. If no inspections were conducted in the previous calendar year, please explain.			
		Current Year Cumulative Count		
		143 433		
Provincial	Total	143 433		
Comment:				
Report Id	Completed	Question		
81	True Among the inspections conducted for section 58, how many were in contravention with section 58 of the Clean Water Act in this reporting period (i.e., person engaging in a drinking water threat activity without a risk management plan as required by the source protection plan)?			
		Current Year Cumulative Count		
		3 4		
Provincial	Total	3 4		
Comment:	comment:			

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM Page 7 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question					
82	True	Among the inspections for section 58, how many were in non-compliance with the specific contents of the risk management plan in this reporting period? (NOTE: Please only include those inspections that showed non-compliance with measures/conditions to manage the actual threat activity.)					
	Current Year Cumulative Count						
		0	1				
Provincial ⁻	otal	0	1				
Comment:							
Report Id	Completed	Question					
83	True State the total number of notices issued where there were cases of contraventions and/or non-compliance found with section 57 in this reporting period.						
		Current Year	Cumulative Count				
		0	0				
Provincial ⁻	otal	0	0				
Comment:							
Report Id	Completed	Question					
84	True	State the total number of notices issued where there were ca with section 58 in this reporting period.	ses of contraventions and/or non-compliance found				
		Current Year	Cumulative Count				
		1	1				
Provincial ⁻	Total	1	1				
Comment:							

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM



220

True

Source Water Protection Annual Report 2023 - Supplemental Form SPR - CTC

Report Id	Completed	Question			
85	True	State the total number of orders issued for contraventions an reporting period.	ate the total number of orders issued for contraventions and/or non-compliance found with section 57 in this porting period.		
		Current Year	Cumulative Count		
		0	0		
Provincial ⁻	Γotal	0	0		
Comment:					
Report Id	Completed	Question			
86	True	State the total number of orders issued for contraventions an reporting period.	d/or non-compliance found with section 58 in this		
		Current Year	Cumulative Count		
		0	0		
Provincial ⁷	Γotal	0	0		
Comment:					
Report Id	eport Id Completed Question				

List the municipality(ies) (including upper-, lower-, and single-tier) within the source protection region/area that are required to complete Official Plan and Zoning exercises to conform to the latest source protection plan, and indicate the status of those exercises for each applicable municipality. "Latest source protection plan" means the first approved plan or any subsequent approved plan update. *NOTE: Applies to every municipality affected by land use planning or Part IV type policies. Where the official plan and/or zoning by-law status for any particular municipality needs to be changed/updated, then please do so by deleting the entry for that particular municipality by clicking on the red "-" (minus) sign and then re-select the municipality name from the drop down list of municipalities followed by selecting the updated status of the conformity exercise for the official plan and zoning by-law from the drop down list for that particular municipality. After doing so, please be sure to add the municipality as your response by clicking on the green plus sign.

MunicipalityOfficial PlanZoning By LawTownship of KingCompletedCompleted

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM Page 9 of 29



Township of East Garafraxa

City of Pickering

City of Toronto

Peel, Regional Municipality of

York, Regional Municipality of

Township of Uxbridge

Dufferin, County of

Town of Markham

City of Vaughan

Town of Caledon

Town of Mono

Town of Oakville

Town of Richmond Hill

Township of Amaranth

Durham, Regional Municipality of

Halton, Regional Municipality of

Town of Aurora

Town of Halton Hills

Town of Milton

Town of Orangeville

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville

Township of Adjala-Tosorontio

Town of Erin

Simcoe, County of

Wellington, County of

City of Oshawa

Municipality of Clarington

Completed In Progress/Updates Underway

Completed Not Applicable
Completed Not Applicable

Completed Not Applicable

Completed Not Applicable
Completed, but Under appeal Completed

Completed, but Under appeal Not Applicable

In Progress/Updates Underway Completed

In Progress/Updates Underway

In Progress/Updates Underway

In Progress/Updates Underway

In Progress/Updates Underway

In Progress/Updates Underway

Not Applicable

In Progress/Updates Underway

Not Applicable
In Progress/Updates Underway

Not Started

In Progress/Updates Underway

Not Started

Not Started

In Progress/Updates Underway

Not Started

Not Started

Not Started

In Progress/Updates Underway

Not Started

Not Started

Not Started

Not Started

Not Started

In Progress/Updates Underway

Needs updating to reflect amended

SPP

Needs updating to reflect amended

SPF

Needs updating to reflect amended

SPP

Needs updating to reflect amended

SPF

Needs updating to reflect amended

SPP

In Progress/Updates Underway

Not Applicable

Not Applicable

Not Started

Not Started

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:18 PM Page 10 of 29



Town of Whitby Needs updating to reflect amended Not Started

SPP

Needs updating to reflect amended Not Started

SPP

City of Brampton Not Applicable Not Applicable
City of Mississauga Not Applicable Not Applicable

Town of Ajax Not Started In Progress/Updates Underway

Comment:

Township of Scugog

Report Id Completed Question

240 True State the number of source water protection signs installed on provincial highways in the source protection

region/area in this reporting period.

Current Year Cumulative Count

	0	0
Provincial Total	0	0

Comment:

Report Id Completed Question

241 True State the number of source water protection signs installed on municipal roads in the source protection region/area

in this reporting period.

Current Year Cumulative Count

		U	8	
	Provincial Total	0	8	
i				
i	Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM



Report Id	Completed Q	Question	
242		state the number of source water protection signs installed at other locations (if applicable) in the source rotection region/area in this reporting period.	
		Current Year Cumulative Count	
		0 0	
Provincial ⁷	Total	0 0	
Comment:	Our best info	ormation suggests there are about 61 cumulative signs installed at other locations across CTC.	
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
260	True	Current total overall number of on-site sewage systems that are assessed as significant drinking water threat activities and that are required to be inspected every five years in accordance with the Ontario Building Code.	Sewage System Inspections
Answer:	279		Пареспопа
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
261	True	Of those requiring inspections, how many inspections of on-site sewage systems were due to be carried out in this reporting period? If not applicable or no inspections of on-site sewage systems were due to be carried out in this reporting period because they were already inspected earlier within the inspection cycle or will be inspected in a future year within the cycle, then please enter "0" and state either explanation in the comment field.	Sewage System Inspections
Answer:	153		
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM



Report Id	Completed	Question
262	True	How many on-site sewage system inspections were completed in this reporting period?
		Current Year Cumulative Count
		108 491
Provincial 7	Γotal	108 491
Comment:		
Report Id	Completed	Question
263	True	How many of the inspected on-site sewage systems required minor maintenance work in this reporting period?
		Current Year Cumulative Count
		37 80
Provincial 1	Γotal	37 80
Comment:		
Report Id	Completed	Question
264	True	How many of the inspected on-site sewage systems required major maintenance work (e.g., tank replacement, etc.) in this reporting period?
		Current Year Cumulative Count
		19 27
Provincial 7	Γotal	19 27
Comment:		

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 13 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
265 Answer:	True 52	How many of the inspected on-site sewage systems required no maintenance work?	Sewage System Inspections
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 14 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	
266	True	For those on-site sewage systems that were not inspected in this reporting period but should have been inspected, and are now out of compliance, please indicate why they were not all inspected from among the reasons below. [Note: For municipalities that have not yet initiated the mandatory on-site sewage system inspection program, please see the next reportable to provide your response if this is the case].	
Response			Answer
landowner r	efused entry,	compliance order being sought	Yes
inspections	delayed/postp	oned due to COVID-19 restrictions	No
vulnerable a	area changed	and on-site sewage system(s) no longer a threat activity	No
other. Pleas	e specify in th	e comment box below.	Yes
Comment:	Erin: for 15 Halton Hills York Regio	icipalities reported systems that were not inspected in 2023, but were due for inspection. systems, compliance orders are being sought as landowners refused entry. stror 1 system, staff are seeking confirmation the system has been decommissioned and would no longer require an instruction in the system in Vaughan, ongoing inspection delays resulted from challenger fresources for area municipalities, residential financial constraints, seasonal weather obstacles, and difficulties enforcing	ges relating to:

with property owners who have leased their homes to tenants. Next steps include issuing of final notices and possible compliance orders.

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 15 of 29



Report Id Completed Question

270 True

Complete the information below regarding environmental monitoring of drinking water issues identified in accordance with the Technical Rules within your source protection region/area. Begin by selecting the drinking water system, the specific well or intake, the drinking water issue, the delineation status, and the observation of the concentration. [OPTIONAL]: In the comments field, describe any actions or behavioural changes that might be contributing to reported changes in the concentration of the issue or parameter. Where the drinking water issue, well or intake, delineation status, or observation of any previously listed drinking water system needs to be changed/updated, then please do so by deleting the entry for that particular drinking water system by clicking on the red minus sign on the right side of the entry and then re-select the drinking water system from the dropdown list of drinking water systems followed by selecting the associated well or intake, the drinking water issue, its delineation status, and the observation from the dropdown list for that particular drinking water system. After doing so, please be sure to add the drinking water system as your response by clicking on the green plus sign on the right side of the entry. If this reportable is not applicable to your source protection region/area, please indicate as such by choosing "No system with issues," "Not Known/Available," "No issue," "Not applicable," and "No observation," respectively, under the drop down menu options under each of the categories of this reportable. Do not leave blank.

DWIS Number	DWIS Name	Issue	ICA Delinated	Observation
220003252	Orangeville Well Supply	Sodium	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220003252	Orangeville Well Supply	Sodium	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220003252	Orangeville Well Supply	Sodium	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220003252	Orangeville Well Supply	Chloride	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220003252	Orangeville Well Supply	Chloride	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220003252	Orangeville Well Supply	Chloride	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220003252	Orangeville Well Supply	Chloride	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220003252	Orangeville Well Supply	Chloride	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220001655	Georgetown Well Supply	Chloride	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220001655	Georgetown Well Supply	Chloride	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220001655	Georgetown Well Supply	Chloride	Yes	Increasing Concentration / Trend
220001673	Acton Well Supply	Nitrate	Yes	Decreasing Concentration / Trend
220001673	Acton Well Supply	Nitrate	Yes	Decreasing Concentration / Trend
220004037	Inglewood Well Supply	Decommissioned	Not Applicable	No Observation

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 16 of 29



Comment:

CTC has proposed switching to an updated statistical analysis method using General Additive Models (GAMs), as opposed to relying on linear projections for trend analysis of identified issues. The observations for 2023, are based on the results of that approach as presented in the CTC SPR Water Quality Assessment Technical Report at CTC SPC Meeting #3/23.

In the Orangeville Drinking Water System (DWS), five wells have been identified with chloride issues and three wells with sodium issues. Chloride concentrations continue to increase in all five wells (6, 9A, 9B, 10, and 11). Sodium concentrations in the affected wells continue to increase (6, 9A, and 9B).

In the Acton DWS, Davidson 1 and 2 wells have been identified with nitrate issues, analysis suggests concentrations appear to be decreasing.

In the Georgetown DWS, Cedarvale 1A, 4 and 4A wells have been identified with chloride issues and concentrations continue to increase.

In York Region, staff are continuing their investigation into a possible future identification of an issue for sodium and chloride at Stouffville PW3.

Regarding the Inglewood Well supply: Inglewood Well No. 2 previously had an identified issue for pathogens. This well was disconnected in 2020, decommissioned in 2021, and therefore removed from the CVSPA Assessment Report and CTC Source Protection Plan in May 2022. Accordingly, the municipality has discontinued monitoring this former issue there.

Across CTC, staff will be continuing the broader water quality/issues assessment of municipal drinking water supplies in 2024.

Report Id Completed Question

280 True

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 source protection authority receive from municipalities in this reporting period (as per O. Reg. 287/07, ss. 27(3))?

Current Year Cumulative Count

	0	1
Provincial Total	0	1

Comment: The development of a formal transport pathway notification process is expected to be finalized in 2024.

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 17 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	
281	True	Where transport pathway notices were received, indicate the action(s) taken by the source protection region/area in response to receiving these notices:	
Response			Answer
Provided in	Provided information to municipalities about changes in vulnerability		
Provided no	tice to Source	Protection Committee for information	No
Situation co	ntinues to be r	monitored	No
Comment:		ble, as no Transport Pathway notifications were received in 2023. The development of a formal transport pathway notific expected to be finalized in 2024.	cation

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 18 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	
300	True	[OPTIONAL]: If and where there are successful examples for each of the following initiatives in the source protection region/area (including from local municipalities, residents and businesses) that occurred in this reporting period that the authority wishes to highlight, then please indicate in the Comments field below. In your comments, please include details for each of the selected topics. Please limit the descriptions provided (e.g., one example for each topic or more could be included when the source protection authority feels they are exceptional/quite successful).	
Response			Answer
Education a etc.)	ınd Outreach (i	n description include details, if available, on type and percentage of target population reached, outcome(s) achieved,	Yes
Incentives (in description i	nclude details, if available, on outcome(s) achieved, how widely available was the incentive, etc.)	Yes
Stewardship	o Programs		No
Best Manag	gement Practic	es	Yes
Pilot Progra	ms		Yes
Research			Yes
		salt management, municipal by-laws, legislative or regulatory amendments, mapping, review of fuel codes, new airport or manage runoff of chemicals from de-icing of aircraft, instrumentation, etc.)	No
Climate Cha	ange (e.g., data	a collection)	No
Spill preven	tion/spill contir	gency/emergency response plan updates	Yes
Transport p	athways		No
Water quan	tity		No
Great Lakes	6		No
Other polici	es (i.e., strateg	ic action, etc.)	Yes

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 19 of 29



Comment: E&O:

- Wellington County municipalities hosted forty education and outreach events targeted to: several municipal departments, maintenance contractors, septic system owners, communities and schools. Stickers and metals tags listing the Spills Action Centre number and location were handed out to property owners in vulnerable areas. Staff participated in the Waterloo-Wellington Children's Groundwater Festival, which occurred in both virtual and in-person formats in 2023, to deliver water protection messages including source protection
- RMO's distributed salt bin stickers, promoting best practices for salt storage
- Credit Valley Conservation continued education and outreach to owners of non-municipal drinking water sources to promote source water protection best practices

Incentives

• Orangeville marked its first full year of their water softener rebate program, to promote water conservation and reduce salt loading to municipal sewers

BMP's

• In Wellington County municipalities, staff managed and assisted in the delivery of six Septic Social Events to educate and answer questions from residents about the mandatory septic inspection program,

Research/Pilot programs

- York Region is continuing a sodium and chloride research and mitigation pilot project in Stouffville
- CTC staff have been working to improve issues identification methods and issues delisting criterion.

Spill contingency/Strategic Action

• The Lake Ontario Collaborative Group's (Peel, Toronto, Durham) Lake Ontario Water Quality Forecasting System (LOWQFS) continued to undergo development and improvements to how it monitors and analyses spill events and possible impacts, as part of Decision Support System updates in 2023. The LOWQFS was also presented at several 2023 conferences.

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 20 of 29



Report Id Completed Question

305 True

Complete the table below with the count data for each significant drinking water threat activity/local threat activity/condition being engaged in (i.e., enumerated as 'existing' significant threats) at the time of source protection plan approval or approval of amendments that include new / changing protection zones. Please use the best available information/desktop exercises, reports from Risk Management Officials, and other implementing bodies to provide the counts below. For convenience, the count data from the previous reporting year have been copied over, but please be sure to review, edit, and confirm the counts for accuracy in the table below. [CWA Section 46(1)(a)]

The running tally consists of the formula: A+B-C-D where:

A = Number of significant drinking water threats estimated when the source protection plan was first approved

B = Number of additional significant drinking water threats counted after the first source protection plan approval (not part of the original estimate)

C = Number of significant drinking water threats included in A that were determined through field verification to no longer exist because: (i) the threat 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 is no longer applying pesticides for their own reasons)

D = Number of significant drinking water threats addressed because a policy is implemented. (It is understood that multiple policies/policy tools may address a single threat on the landscape. If any one policy is implemented and directed at that single threat it is considered addressed.)

In the comments box below summarize any remaining significant threats needing to be addressed for each source protection authority and what actions will be taken to eliminate those threats. If all threats have been addressed for each source protection authority(ies) write "All known significant threats have been addressed" in the comments box. Note that this summary response will be posted under the objective summary section 2 of the report.

ThreatId	Threat	Α	В	С	D
1	The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act.	11	6	10	7
2	The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.	172 0	78	153 7	222
3	The application of agricultural source material to land.	65	6	47	12
4	The storage of agricultural source material.	39	12	42	2

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 21 of 29



5	The management of agricultural source material.	0	0	0	0
6	The application of non-agricultural source material to land.	9	2	8	0
7	The handling and storage of non-agricultural source material.	0	0	0	0
8	The application of commercial fertilizer to land.	57	25	51	24
9	The handling and storage of commercial fertilizer.	89	13	99	2
10	The application of pesticide to land.	126	48	143	23
11	The handling and storage of pesticide.	110	17	127	0
12	The application of road salt.	546 9	8	619	478 6
13	The handling and storage of road salt.	117	81	935	291
14	The storage of snow.	60	111	0	131
15	The handling and storage of fuel.	366	12	350	27
16	The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid.	287	63	245	89
17	The handling and storage of an organic solvent.	68	2	64	6
18	The management of runoff that contains chemicals used in the de-icing of aircraft.	0	0	0	0
19	Water taking from an aquifer without returning the water to the same aquifer or surface water body	233	0	0	233
20	Reducing recharge of an aquifer	3	0	0	3
21	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.	176	4	167	4
22	The establishment and operation of a liquid hydrocarbon pipeline	12	0	0	12
1000	Water conditioning salts from water softeners	0	0	0	0

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM



MECP Calc (C+D)/(A+B):

98 %

1001	Transportation of specified substances along corridors		0	0	0	0
1002	Spill of Tritium from Nuclear Generating Station		2	0	0	2
1003	Handling storage of fuel		0	0	0	0
1004	Transportation, storage and handling of diesel/gasoline		0	0	0	0
1005	Transportation of Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Source Materials		0	0	0	0
1006	International Shipping Channel within IPZ2		0	0	0	0
1007	Transportation of hazardous substances along transportation corridors		0	0	0	0
1008	Transportation or Storage and Handling of Fuel in an Event Based Area		0	0	0	0
1009	Waterfowl		0	0	0	0
1010	Local condition		0	0	0	0
	587 611 6 7	Totals: 1	0073	488	4444	5876

Comment:

There are 16 other identified significant threats to CTC Lake Ontario intakes (4 WWTP disinfection failures, 6 WWTP bypasses, 4 STS breaks, and 2 petroleum storage spills) from within the CTC area, not identified in this table. There are another 9 significant threats (4 pipeline breaks, 1 bulk storage spill, 3 WWTP disinfection failures, and 1 mini tank spill) to CTC Lake Ontario intakes from locations outside the CTC, also not included in this table.

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 23 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
310 Answer:	True Percer	Please provide comments below to explain the overall progress made in addressing existing significant threat activities and include the percentage of overall progress made within 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., significant drinking water threat addressed because policy is implemented) from the table above (reportable 305) adding it to C (i.e., significant threats determined through field verification to no longer be threats) and dividing it by the number that is derived by adding the total numbers in columns A and B. In other words, overall progress made = (C+D)/(A + B).	Addressing existing enumerated threats
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
320	True	If applicable, where the 2013/2017 technical rules were used for the assessment report update/amendment, provide a summary of steps taken to further assess or implement the plans of work described in technical rule 30.1: Water Budget Tier 3 not included in your original assessment report(s).	Assessment report information gaps
Answer:	Not ap	plicable	gapo
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
321	True	If applicable, where the 2013/2017 technical rules were used for the assessment report update/amendment, provide a summary of steps taken to further assess or implement the plans of work described in technical rule 50.1: GUDI for WHPA-E or F not included in your original assessment report(s).	Assessment report information
		plicable	gaps

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
322	True	If applicable, where the 2013/2017 technical rules were used for the assessment report update/amendment, provide a summary of steps taken to further assess or implement the plans of work described in technical rule 116: Issue Contributing Area not included in your original assessment report(s).	Assessment report information
Answer:	Not ap	plicable	gaps
Comment:	Note: F	Rule 116 has been removed from the most recent approved Technical Rules (2021).	
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
323	True	[OPTIONAL] If applicable where the 2021 technical rules were used for the assessment report update/amendment, provide a summary of steps taken to further assess or implement the plans of work described in technical rule 30.1: Water Budget Tier 3 not included in your original assessment report(s).	Assessment report information
Answer:	Not ap	plicable	gaps
Comment:	No wo	rk plans were required to be implemented for our assessment report(s).	
	Tier 3	Water Budget updates are planned for Town of Orangeville and Halton Region.	
	update	v of the 2021 Technical rules is ongoing and the Source Protection Committee is guiding a multi-year comprehens of the CTC Source Protection Plan and Assessment Reports under s.36 of the Clean Water Act, 2006. In 2023, t ued work on updated water quality trend analysis and issues identification methods.	

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:19 PM Page 25 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
324	True	[OPTIONAL] Where the 2021 technical rules were used for the assessment report update/amendment, provide a summary of steps taken to further assess or implement the plans of work described in technical rule 50.1: GUDI for WHPA-E or F not included in your original assessment report(s).	Assessment report information gaps
Answer:	Not applicable		9440
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:20 PM Page 26 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
330	True	Does the source protection authority have any other item(s) on which it wishes to report? If so, please explain.	Other reporting items
Answer:	Regarding SPP policy T-6 (extension to s.58 RMP completion deadline): In 2020, the CTC Source Protection Committee authorized a 3-year extension (to December 31, 2023) for the completion of outstandirisk management plans (RMPs) that were originally required to be finalized by December 31, 2020. The 3-year extension, was further approved by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks. The CTC Source Protection Region provided a work plan on establishing the remaining outstanding RMPs, to the Ministry, on April 29, 2021. In March 2023, the CTC Source Protection Committee authorized a further 2-year extension (to December 31, 2025) to this deadline, which was approved by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks in November 2023. Staff from the three impacted municipalities sought and received support for their ongoing RMP implementation from their respective councils in late 2023. On Mar. 20, 2024, the CTC Source Protection Committee received an annual update on municipal progress in completing RMPs to address existing significant drinking water threats, as per the revised deadline. Thirty-three RMPs to address outstanding existing significant threats were completed in 2023, relative to the target of forty-four in the revised workplan to complete RMPs by December 2025. The shortfall was attributed to a number of factors, including: agricultural RMP negotiation window limitations and limited availability; ongoing need for reengagement with property owners; desire to maintain positive relations with property owners; property ownership changes; slow progress for upper level government properties; low response to outreach attempts; resistance to final signoff; and limited staff resources/turnover.		
	Regarding SPP policy DEM-6 (development of Joint Municipal Water Supply Management Model for 4 Dufferin municipalities): The Joint Municipal Water Supply Management Model agreement was executed in early 2023 by the four partner municipalities: Township of Amaranth, Township of East Garafraxa, Town of Mono, and Town of Orangeville. This completes a requirement of CTC Source Protection Plan policy DEM-6. The intent of the Agreement is to facilitate the planning, management and protection of water sources to ensure sustainability of a long-term water supply in each of these municipalities, in particular the WHPA-Q1 area. A WHPA-Q1 is the area where activities that take water without returning it to the same source may be a water quantity threat. The agreement commits the four municipalities to: meet and share information, undertake model updates based on threshold triggers and conditions, complete risk assessment and peer review. The terms also lay out apportionment of costs, and a dispute resolution mechanism.		
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:20 PM Page 27 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	
350	True	In the opinion of the Source Protection Committee, to what extent have the objectives of the source protection plan been achieved in this reporting period?	
Response			Answer
Progressing progressing	•	ajority of the policies from the approved original or an amended source protection plan have been implemented and/or are	Yes
	- Some of the	policies from the approved original or an amended source protection plan have been implemented and/or are	No
	gress made - A	A few of the policies from the approved original or an amended source protection plan have been implemented and/or are	No
Comment:	achieving th	ew of the 2023 Annual Progress Report, the CTC Source Protection Committee again chose a modified assessment of prone source protection's objectives. Specifically, the SPC indicated that in their opinion: implementation of the Source Protectsed well but is short of target in achieving the plan's objectives.	

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:20 PM Page 28 of 29



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
351	True	Please provide comments to explain how the Source Protection Committee arrived at its opinion. Include a summary of any discussions that might have been had amongst the Source Protection Committee members, especially where no consensus was reached.	Achievement of source protection plan objectives
Answer:	Staff of the CTC Source Protection Region conducted a detailed analysis of the data received from policy implementing bodies and developed the draft 2023 Annual Progress Report and Supplementary Report. The CTC Source Protection Committee (SPC) was provided the draft 2023 Annual Progress Report and Supplementary Report on March 14, 2024, including a recommendation from staff regarding implementation progress. At its March 20, 2024 meeting, the SPC concurred with staff that implementation of the Source Protection Plan has progressed well but is short of target in achieving the plan's objectives.		
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/22/2024 1:53:20 PM Page 29 of 29