

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 or they are not applicable implementing bodies in your source protection region/area in the Comments field text box.

Response	Answer
Risk Management Official	Yes
Municipality	Yes
Conservation Authority	Yes
Local Health Unit	No
MECP - Waste Disposal Sites - Landfilling and Storage	Yes
MECP - Wastewater/Sewage Works	Yes
MECP - Pesticides	Yes
MECP - Hauled Sewage/Biosolids	Yes
MECP - Permit to Take Water	No
MECP - Municipal Residential Drinking Water Systems	Yes
MECP - Other Policies	Yes
MECP - Waste Disposal Sites - Landfilling and Storage Inspections	No
MECP - Wastewater/Sewage Works Inspections	Yes
MECP - Conditions Sites	No
MECP - NMA - ASM and NASM Inspections	Yes
OMAFRA	Yes
MNRF	Yes
MTO	Yes
MMAH	No
MGCS-TSSA	No
MENDM	No

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 1 of 24



Provincial Boa	ard/Commission	No
Federal Depa	rtments/Agencies/Commissions/Crown Corporations	No
Private Entity/	Company	No
Association/O	Association/Organization N	
Comment:	All implementing bodies met the February 1st deadline to report on their implementation efforts in 2019. All "NO" responses are beca body is no named as an implementing body in the Thames-Sydenham & Region Source Protection Plan.	use that

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 2 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
20	True	Did the Source Protection Authority (i) indicate the status of all threat policies as contained in their source protection plan by using one of the two options outlined in the guidance document (ID 20a) AND (ii) complete the table to indicate which implementing body(ies) have not yet made any progress in policy implementation in reportable ID 20b?	Implementatio n status of source protection plan policies
Answer:	Yes		policios
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
30	True	Number of risk management plans agreed to or established within the source protection area/region (for existing and future threats) during the reporting period (i.e., annual total).	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	2		59)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
31	True	Number of properties (i.e., parcels) with risk management plans agreed to or established for this reporting period.	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section 59)
Answer:	2		39)
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 3 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
32	True	How many existing* significant drinking water threats have been managed through the established risk management plans for this reporting period (* meaning engaged in OR enumerated as existing significant threats)?	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section 59)
Answer:	2		39)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
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?	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	14		59)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
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?	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	1		59)
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 4 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
50	True	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 source protection plan (i.e., statement of conformity confirms the instrument holder is exempt from requiring a risk	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	5	management plan) did the risk management official receive?	59)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
60	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 for this reporting period.	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	39		59)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
61	True	How many properties (i.e., parcels) had inspections for the purposes of section 57 for this reporting period?	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	38		59)
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 5 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
62	True	Among the inspections conducted for section 57, 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 Clean Water Act for this reporting period?	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section 59)
Answer:	0		39)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
70	True	How many existing significant drinking water threats have been prohibited as a result of section 57 prohibitions in this reporting period?	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section 59)
Answer:	0		59)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
80	True	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 for this reporting period.	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	142		59)
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 6 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
81	True	How many properties (i.e., parcels) had inspections for the purposes of section 58 for this reporting period?	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section 59)
Answer:	108		00)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
82	True	Among the inspections conducted for section 58, how many were in contravention with section 58 of the Clean Water Act for 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)?	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	0		59)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
83	True	Among the inspections for section 58, how many were in non-compliance with the specific contents of the risk management plan for this reporting period? (NOTE: Please only include those inspections that showed non-compliance with measures/conditions to manage the actual threat activity.)	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	0		59)
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 7 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
84	True	State the total number of notices issued where there were cases of contraventions and/or non-compliance found with section 57 for this reporting period.	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section 59)
Answer:	0		
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
85	True	State the total number of notices issued where there were cases of contraventions and/or non-compliance found with section 58 for this reporting period.	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section 59)
Answer:	0		39)
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
86	True	State the total number of orders issued for contraventions and/or non-compliance found with section 57 for this reporting period.	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section
Answer:	0		59)
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
87	True	State the total number of orders issued for contraventions and/or non-compliance found with section 58 for this reporting period.	Part IV (Sections 57, 58 & Section 59)
Answer:	0		,
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 9 of 24



True	Indicate the methods by which education and outreach policies have been/are being implemented in the source protection region/area for the reporting period by all the relevant implementing bodies from the checklist below. Choose all that apply.	
		Answer
itional materia	ls for general public (e.g., "Source Water Protection - 2018 resources" on Conservation Ontario's website)	Yes
		Yes
		Yes
		Yes
ction content f	or websites	Yes
/ideos (e.g., D	rinking Water Source Protection video available Conservation Ontario)	Yes
		No
with other bo	dies (e.g., ministries, local organizations, etc.)	Yes
promotion (e.	g., use of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.)	Yes
tising (e.g., pri	nt media, radio, television) in news media and/or industry/stakeholder specific publications	Yes
ith other outre	ach programs or campaigns (e.g., Community Environment Days, etc.)	Yes
blications		No
iosks at event	s/festivals	Yes
implementing	Education and Outreach not yet determined	Yes
ti ti	tional materia tional materia n Conservatio ction content f rideos (e.g., D with other boo promotion (e. tising (e.g., pri ith other outre blications iosks at event	protection region/area for the reporting period by all the relevant implementing bodies from the checklist below. Choose all that apply.  tional materials for general public (e.g., "Source Water Protection - 2018 resources" on Conservation Ontario's website)  tional materials for target audiences including developers, builders, landowners, farmers, etc. (e.g., "Source Water Protection - 2018 in Conservation Ontario's website)  ction content for websites  videos (e.g., Drinking Water Source Protection video available Conservation Ontario)  with other bodies (e.g., ministries, local organizations, etc.)  promotion (e.g., use of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.)  tising (e.g., print media, radio, television) in news media and/or industry/stakeholder specific publications  ith other outreach programs or campaigns (e.g., Community Environment Days, etc.)  blications  iosks at events/festivals

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 10 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	
240	True	State the number of source water protection signs installed on provincial highways in the source protection region/area for this reporting period.	
Agency		Current Year Cumulative Count	
MECP		0 6	
Provincial	Total	0 6	
Comment:			
Report Id	Complete	d Question	Category
241	True	State the number of source water protection signs installed on municipal roads in the source protection region/area for this reporting period.	Signage
Answer:	14	region/area for this reporting period.	
Comment:			
Report Id	Complete	d Question	Category
242	True	State the number of source water protection signs installed at other locations (if applicable) in the source	Signage
Answer:	0	protection region/area for this reporting period.	
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 11 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
260	True	How many on-site sewage systems in the source protection area require inspections in accordance with the Ontario Building Code (i.e., once every five years)?	Sewage System Inspections
Answer:	249		Inspections
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
261	True	Of those requiring inspections, how many on-site sewage systems (identified as significant drinking water threats) were inspected for this reporting period?	Sewage System Inspections
Answer:	2		Inspections
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 12 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	
262	True	If not all required on-site sewage systems were inspected, please indicate why they were not all inspected from among the options below:	
Response			Answer
on-site sew	age system(s)	is newly constructed and therefore not captured in the first round of inspections	Yes
landowner i	efused entry, c	compliance order being sought	Yes
municipality	has not yet ini	tiated inspection program	Yes
other. Pleas	se specify in the	e comment box below.	Yes
Comment:	Inspections	in some municipalities were all completed in previous years, and the next round of inspections has not yet begun.	

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 13 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category	
263	True	How many of the on-site sewage systems inspected required minor maintenance work (e.g., pump out, etc.)?	Sewage System Inspections	
Answer:	0		Парсопопа	
Comment:				
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category	i
264	True	How many of the on-site sewage systems inspected required major maintenance work (e.g., tank replacement, etc.)?	Sewage System Inspections	
Answer:	1		пвреснопв	
:				

Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
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))?	Transport pathways
Answer:	1		
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM



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	formation to m	unicipalities about changes in vulnerability	No
Provided no	otice to Source	Protection Committee for information	Yes
Situation co	ntinues to be r	monitored	No
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 15 of 24



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 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.)	and Outreach (	in description include details, if available, on type and percentage of target population reached, outcome(s) achieved,	Yes
	(in description i	include details, if available, on outcome(s) achieved, how widely available was the incentive, etc.)	No
Stewardshi	p Programs		No
Best Mana	gement Practic	es	Yes
Pilot Progra	ams		No
Research			Yes
		salt management, municipal by-laws, legislative or regulatory amendments, mapping, review of fuel codes, new airport o manage runoff of chemicals from de-icing of aircraft, instrumentation, etc.)	No
Climate Ch	ange (e.g., dat	a collection)	Yes
Spill prever	ntion/spill contir	ngency/emergency response plan updates	Yes
Transport p	athways		Yes
Water quar	ntity		No
Great Lake	S		Yes
Other polici	ies (i.e., stratec	gic action, etc.)	No

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 16 of 24



#### Comment:

Best Management Practices (Oxford County): When Risk Management staff are conducting inspections for DNAPL threats, very few DNAPLs are actually being found. However, most property/business owners are very interested in learning about basic BMPs around chemical storage and handling and spill response plans even without requiring a formal RMP.

Climate Change, Research and Great Lakes (Chatham-Kent): The Adapting to the Future Storm and Ice Regime in the Great Lakes, Chatham-Kent Lake Erie Shoreline Study proposal was accepted for funding by Natural Resources Canada in 2018. Specifically, the study is being produced through Canada's Climate Change Adaptation Platform, with support from Natural Resources Canada. It is supported by a very large collaboration with matching funds and in-kind support from: • Municipality of Chatham-Kent • Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority • Province of Ontario • Federal Government • International Joint Commission This type of work has never been completed before in the Great Lakes. As one of four Case Studies of the overall study, experts in shoreline hazards, meteorology, climate change, coastal engineering design, and adaptation planning are undertaking a detailed study for the Lake Erie shoreline from Wheatley to Clear Creek (the Lake Erie municipal boundary of Chatham-Kent). The technical work is being undertaken by Zuzek Inc. and other partners. Phase I is investigating the magnitude and intensity of historical storms on Lake Erie, such as the recent April 14 to 16, 2018 ice storm that extensively damaged infrastructure along the shoreline. The study will also assess the effects of climate change on future ice conditions, as less ice cover increases the exposure of the shoreline to damaging storms in the winter. Estimated changes in the duration, intensity, and magnitude of future storms that cause flooding and erosion along the Lake Erie shoreline will also be provided. This work will be completed by March 2019. Using existing knowledge of natural hazards and projected effects of climate change, the study will develop information to reduce coastal risks, increase the resilience of the shoreline, and protect natural assets such as beaches and coastal wetlands. Both short- and long-term solutions will be co-developed with stakeholders during the study. The final report to be presented to Council inn March 2020. Climate Change Action Plan (mitigation/adaptation) initiated in 2020. To be completed in June 2021.

Education and Outreach (Leamington): Discussions with greenhouse developers regarding source protection planning is taking place during the preliminary site plan review/approval process.

Education and Outreach (St. Marys): Completed a E/O program along with the Doors-Open Event at a water facility. Approximately 300 people attended throughout the day that was coordinated with water operators, conservation authority staff and municipal staff.

Spill Prevention/Spill Contingency/Emergency Response Plan Updates (Sarnia): The City of Sarnia developed a Sarnia Emergency Management "Guideline for communication & response for spills that could impact municipal drinking water sources" in 2017 and a special training exercise was held for the City's emergency response Primary Control Group in December 2017.

Transport Pathways (Sarnia): In 2018, a workshop was held and the Source Protection Authority provided guidance materials for Transport Pathways.

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 17 of 24



Report Id	Completed	I Question				
305	True	Complete the table below with the count data for each significant drinking water threat activity/local three being engaged in (i.e., enumerated as 'existing' significant threats) at the time of source protection pla of amendments that include new / changing protection zones. *NOTE: SPAs are strongly encouraged Guidance document for additional details and instructions on completing this table.	n approvál d	or approva	ıl	
ThreatId	Threat		Α	В	С	D
1		ablishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the mental Protection Act.	35	1	19	9
2	The esta sewage.	ablishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of	269	0	42	108
3	The app	lication of agricultural source material to land.	87	0	11	39
4	The stor	age of agricultural source material.	12	4	3	10
5	The mar	nagement of agricultural source material.	0	0	0	0
6	The app	lication of non-agricultural source material to land.	34	0	10	5
7	The han	dling and storage of non-agricultural source material.	0	0	0	0
8	The app	lication of commercial fertilizer to land.	57	5	4	18
9	The han	dling and storage of commercial fertilizer.	22	3	12	7
10	The app	lication of pesticide to land.	60	0	17	11
11	The han	dling and storage of pesticide.	19	0	11	1
12	The app	lication of road salt.	0	0	0	0
13	The han	dling and storage of road salt.	0	0	0	0
14	The stor	age of snow.	0	0	0	0

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM



15	The handling and storage of fuel.	93	6	77	16
16	The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid.	257	51	169	88
17	The handling and storage of an organic solvent.	35	4	20	14
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	0	0	0	0
20	Reducing recharge of an aquifer	0	0	0	0
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.	29	0	14	4
22	The establishment and operation of a liquid hydrocarbon pipeline	0	0	0	0
1000	Water conditioning salts from water softeners	0	0	0	0
1001	Transportation of specified substances along corridors	0	0	0	0
1002	Spill of Tritium from Nuclear Generating Station	0	0	0	0
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	46	5	27	4
1009	Waterfowl	0	0	0	0
1010	Local condition	0	0	0	0

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM



Comment:

#### Source Water Protection Annual Report 2019 - Supplemental Form SPR - Thames, Sydenham and Region

334

Totals: 105 Comment: MECP Calc D/(A+B-C): Category Report Id Completed Question 310 True Please provide comments below to explain the overall progress made in addressing these significant threats. Addressing Include the percentage of overall progress made in the comments provided. The percentage of overall progress existina made in addressing local threats and conditions that are taking place on the landscape is determined by taking enumerated the total number in column D (i.e., significant drinking water threat addressed because policy is implemented) threats 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 plus B minus C). Answer: Overall progress made is 48% There were 1,055 threats included in the original enumeration and subsequently 79 new threats have been identified after the Source Protection Plan was approved. Of those threats 436 were determined to not be present/or no longer a occurring on the landscape. There are 334 threats that are being managed. Comment: Category Report Id Completed Question 320 True If applicable to the assessment report in your source protection region/area, provide a summary of steps taken Assessment to further assess or implement the plans of work described in technical rule 30.1: Water Budget Tier 3 not report included in your original assessment report(s). information gaps Answer: N/A

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 20 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
321	True	If applicable to the assessment report in your source protection region/area, 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
Answer:	N/A		gaps
Comment:			
Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
322	True	If applicable to the assessment report in your source protection region/area, 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 gaps
Answer:	N/A		<b>g</b> αρ3
Comment:			
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:	No oth	er items to report on.	IGHIS
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 21 of 24



Report Id	Completed	Question	Category
340	True	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 source protection plan policies? Please describe the outcomes below.	Source protection outcomes
Answer:	- Incre	are some comments from our municipalities: ase in general public awareness and public sector awareness. poration of source water protection into public works procedures and protocols	
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 22 of 24



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	g Well/On Targ	et - The majority of the source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well	Yes
Satisfactory	- Some of the	source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well	No
Limited Pro	gress made - A	A few of source protection plan policies have been implemented and/or are progressing well	No
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 23 of 24



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:	During been i implen and pr specia Manag the ne took e	II, significant progress in the Thames-Sydenham and Region has been made since the Source Protection Plan car the last four years of plan implementation, 100% of the policies in the plan that address significant drinking water implemented or are in progress. In 2019, many of our member municipalities reported success stories stemming from mentation of source protection plan policies. These included voluntary best management practices being undertaked toperty owners; a doors open event at a drinking water system that attracted over 300 attendees; and the development training exercise for municipal emergency response staff which incorporated source protection information. Local gement Officials in the Thames-Sydenham and Region have successfully managed 116 significant drinking water to gotiation and establishment of 57 risk management plans in municipalities across the Source Protection Region si ffect. For the reasons outlined above, the Source Protection Committee feels confident in their assessment that impurce Protection Plans is progressing well/on target.	threats have om the en by business ment of a I Risk threats through nce the Plan
Comment:			

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 11:36:39 AM Page 24 of 24



#### Implementation Status - Significant Legally Binding Policies

Implementation Status Category	Count of Plan Policies	Percent of Plan Policies
Implemented	321	78 %
In progress/some progress made	72	18 %
No response required/not applicable	16	4 %
TOTAL	409	100 %

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 10:22:53 AM Page 1 of 5



#### Implementation Status - Significant Non Legally Binding Policies

	Count of Plan Policies	Percent of Plan Policies
Implementation Status Category	Policies	Policies
Implemented	55	80 %
In progress/some progress made	3	4 %
No response required/not applicable	11	16 %
TOTAL	<del></del>	100 %

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 10:22:53 AM Page 2 of 5



#### Implementation Status - Moderate/Low Policies

Implementation Status Category	Count of Plan Policies	Percent of Plan Policies
Implemented	110	81 %
In progress/some progress made	26	19 %
TOTAL	136	100 %

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 10:22:53 AM Page 3 of 5



Count of Plan

Percent of Plan

#### Implementation Status - Non-threat specific policies

Implementation Status Category	Policies	Policies
Implemented	40	67 %
In progress/some progress made	18	30 %
No response required/not applicable	2	3 %
TOTAL	60	100 %

Date Printed: 3/6/2020 10:22:53 AM Page 4 of 5