		Existing Sections Subject to Amendment	Amendment Text
PLAN NAME		MUSKOKA RIVER WMP	None
DISTRICT		Parry Sound	None
Sections to be amended		Amendments - Section 17 SAC - Section 16.2 Compliance - Section 13.4.1, 13.4.2 Effectiveness Monitoring - Section 14.4 Implementation Reporting - Section 16.3, 16.4	
Expiry Date		Jan-21	Expiry date is removed based on approved Maintaining WMP Technical Bulletin 2016
Proponents, indicate lead if multiple		OPG (Jordan Hughes, Laci Farczadi, Joan Frain, Mike McNiven) Orillia Power Generation Corporation (Paul Young, Grant Hipgrave) Township of Muskoka Lakes (Kris Renewable Power Ltd.) Steve McDonald, Robert Levesque Bracebridge Generation Ltd. (Bryan Ingram)	None
Amendment Text		*The text below will be removed from the plan and text in the column to the right will be substituted as the new Section 17.* ~~17Plan Term, Amendments, Review and Renewal~~ ~~17.1 Term of the Plan~~ ~~The original term of this plan was for a ten year period from April 2006, to March 2016, with a plan review to be initiated in 2014, 2 years prior to the plans expiry. The plan is being extended in January 2016 for 5 years to ensure the plan provisions remain in effect, while providing time for draft policies under the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act to be finalized. The SC remains and retains overall responsibility for the implementation of decisions and the management of the water resources~~ ~~17.2 Plan Amendments~~ ~~Plan amendments may be made during the term of the WMP as a result of newly obtained information (from compliance monitoring, effectiveness monitoring or fulfilling science or data gap needs) or new issues and concerns. The SAC will monitor and review the need for a plan amendment(s), and will make recommendations to the SC as appropriate.~~ ~~17.2.1 Types of Amendments~~ ~~Amendments to the plan fall into one of three categories as follows:~~ ~~Administrative These amendments are administrative in nature and will not affect the implementation of the plan. An example would be a change in the manner in which information is presented in the plan.~~ ~~Minor Minor amendments are changes that are anticipated to affect a small geographic scale (i.e., in the vicinity of one dam) and without significant impact.~~ ~~Major Major amendments are changes that are anticipated to affect a wide geographic scale (i.e., multiple dams or area) and have a significant impact on the balancing of environmental, social and economic attributes.~~ ~~17.2.2 Amendment Request~~ ~~Any request for an amendment must be accompanied by sufficient information to allow the OMNR~~	**17 PROVISION FOR PLAN AMENDMENTS** **17.1 PLAN AMENDMENTS** In order for the Muskoka River WMP to remain current and to address future issues, the plan may be amended by following the amendment process set out in this section. Any change to the Muskoka River WMP requires an amendment to be submitted to the plan proponents and approved by MNRF. From time to time, new data, information, or issues may arise. MNRF retains the authority to amend a plan at any time, or issue an Order for the plan proponent(s) to amend the WMP. **17.2 The Amendment Process** Any party (Plan Proponent, MNRF, or 3rd Party) with an interest in the WMP may request an amendment to the WMP by bringing forward issues to the attention of the plan proponent(s). An amendment request must be accompanied by sufficient information to allow the proponent(s) to determine whether the proposed amendment should proceed, and whether the amendment should be treated as minor or major. Proponent(s) must apply due diligence when considering proposed amendments. The plan proponent(s) are responsible for: • Receiving amendment requests; • Assessing amendment requests based on criteria outlined in this section; • Proposing amendments to MNRF; and • Preparing amendment proposals for MNRF review The multiple proponents for this WMP will work together when assessing an amendment request and prepare an amendment proposal (where necessary). MNRF will review proposed amendments to ensure that plan proponents screen and process amendments consistent with the 2016 Maintaining Water Management Plans Technical Bulletin.

		~~Regional Director to determine whether the proposed amendment should proceed, and whether the amendment should be treated as administrative, minor or major. The amendment request must contain the following information:~~ ~~- a brief description of the proposed amendment~~ ~~- the rationale for the proposed amendment and a discussion of its significance~~ ~~- if new operations are proposed:~~ ~~(a) a brief description of the proposed operation and a description of the previously approved operations in the WMP that will be changed by the proposed amendment~~ ~~(b) an outline of the applicable planning requirements for the proposed operations including public consultation, based on the planning requirements for similar operations in the WMP.~~ ~~The SAC will be informed of all amendments and will be given an opportunity to provide comments.~~ ~~17.3 Plan Review and Renewal~~ ~~The PIT will produce regular reports (see Section 16) that summarize operational aspects of implementation of the plan and identify any outstanding issues or concerns. The SAC will review this information, and may request that actions are taken to address issues or concerns as appropriate. The SC will determine whether the issues/concerns merit an amendment to the plan, maintenance of the status quo, or an early review of the WMP.~~ ~~17.3.1 Plan Renewal~~ ~~A plan review process will be initiated 18 to 24 months prior to the date of plan renewal. New data and information will be considered as appropriate during the review as a basis for continuing with the status quo or recommending changes. All information collected during the term of the plan (compliance monitoring data, effectiveness monitoring data, gaps and science and information needs data) will be considered during the plan review process.~~	*17.2.1 Types of Amendments* Changes to the Muskoka River WMP may include simple text corrections to significant modifications to an operating regime. In order to provide flexibility for a range of potential amendment requests, two categories of amendments (minor and major) exist. The categories are mainly differentiated by the expected level of public interest in the proposed change to the WMP. Amendments may be subject to public and First Nations and Métis community engagement or consultation, dependent on the category of amendment (described below), as detailed in Section 3.5 of the Maintaining Water Management Plan Technical Bulletin, 2016. *17.2.1.1 Minor Amendments* Minor amendments are changes that do not affect the operating regime, plan objectives, are not expected to generate a high level of public interest, and are not expected to adversely affect Aboriginal and treaty rights. Minor amendments will not be subject to public and First Nations and Métis community engagement or consultation beyond discussions with a SAC (if applicable). Minor amendments may include: • Changes in the presentation of information, factual or text corrections; and/or • Changing a WMP to include a new dam and its associated Operating Plan (Section 2.1 of the Maintaining Water Management Plan Technical Bulletin, 2016) *17.2.1.2 Major Amendments* Major amendments are more significant in scale such as: changes to the operating regime or plan objectives, changes that could be expected to generate a high level of public interest or changes that might adversely affect Aboriginal and treaty rights. A major amendment will be subject to public, First Nations, and Métis community engagement or consultation. For major amendments where equivalent consultation and engagement has previously occurred through another process (e.g. previous notification that a change will be required, or amendments required after public consultation in other planning processes), the MNRF may exercise discretion to process the proposed change as a minor amendment on a case by case basis. *17.2.2 Amendment Request* Individuals submitting an amendment request shall clearly articulate concerns and potential solutions. Amendment requestors shall participate in good faith opportunities undertaken to obtain Indigenous Communities, public and stakeholder input on proposed major amendments and should consider their ability to contribute towards those engagement opportunities. An amendment request should provide sufficient information to allow plan proponent(s) to determine whether an amendment request should be investigated further. It is the responsibility of the individual(s) requesting the amendment to demonstrate that the request is credible, worthy of consideration and within the scope of the Muskoka River WMP and the LRIA.

			The amendment request must contain the following information: • A description of the changes being requested; • The rationale for the changes being requested; • Results of any pre-consultation completed with potentially affected parties; and • Where changes in operations are proposed, a description of how the proposed operation changes may impact other dams subject to the WMP. Upon receipt of an amendment request from a third party, the plan proponent(s) will acknowledge receipt of the request in writing to the third party and notify the MNRF that a request has been received. Where the MNRF receives an amendment request from a third party, the request will be forwarded to the plan proponent(s). Where plan proponent(s) are considering submitting an amendment request to the MNRF, prior consultation with the MNRF, the SAC (if applicable) and other plan proponents may occur. Plan proponents will maintain records for all amendment requests. *17.2.3 Review of Amendment Request and Categorization of Amendment* The proponent(s) is responsible for screening amendment requests to determine if the request should proceed through the amendment process, and for categorizing the amendment as minor or major. This determination will ensure the appropriate degree of public consultation for the plan amendment. The assessment will consider the following criteria: a) Is the amendment consistent with this Technical Bulletin? b) Is the amendment consistent with the Muskoka River WMP objectives, or does the amendment propose a change to the WMP objectives? c) Is there an alternative method to deal with the request rather than amending the WMP? d) Is the request within the scope of the Muskoka River WMP? e) Is the request related to any ongoing data or effectiveness monitoring commitments? f) Is the request supported by other potentially affected parties? g) Is the amendment required to comply with other regulatory requirements? h) Has the amendment request been considered previously? i) Does the amendment have the potential to negatively affect dam safety/public safety? j) Does the amendment have potential impacts on socio-economic or environmental considerations? Where an amendment request does not contain sufficient information to complete an assessment or make a recommendation to MNRF, the plan proponent will return the proposed amendment to the third party with a request for additional information. When a plan proponent(s) has completed the screening of the amendment request, written notification will be provided to MNRF. The notification will include: a summary of the amendment request and supporting rationale, results of the assessment, a recommendation of whether the request should be further considered, and if so, the appropriate category for the amendment.

			17.2.4 Review of Assessment Results The MNRF will review the plan proponent's screening results and will: • Agree with the recommendation; • Request additional information; or • Disagree with the recommendation. Where the plan proponent(s) recommends against proceeding with the amendment request, and the MNRF is in agreement, the plan proponent(s) will notify the requestor of the decision with supporting rationale. Where the MNRF agrees that the amendment request should proceed, the plan proponent(s) will develop and submit the final amendment proposal for MNRF consideration. The plan proponent(s) will undertake any necessary planning, consultation, information gathering or other investigative activities associated with the amendment. Where the amendment is requested by a third party, the third party may be expected to support engagement activities. Where the MNRF disagrees with the recommendation, the MNRF will discuss the proposed amendment with the plan proponent(s). The MNRF may subsequently direct the plan proponent(s) to proceed with consideration of the plan amendment. **17.3 Ordering an Amendment** When a decision is made to proceed through the plan amendment process, the MNRF may formalize the decision through the issuance of an Order to prepare an amendment or approve the amendment under the authority of LRIA Section 23.1(6). Plan proponent(s) may also request that the MNRF issue an Order to amend the plan. The MNRF retains the authority to require a plan proponent to undertake a WMP amendment where the plan proponent is unwilling to consider reasonable requests or where there are significant concerns regarding a facility's operation. When MNRF intends to order a plan proponent to amend a plan, the proponent(s) will be provided a notice of intent to issue an Order to amend the plan prior to the issuance of the Order. Upon receipt of a notice of intent to issue an Order to amend a plan, the proponent(s) has 15 days to submit a request for an inquiry to the MNRF. Requests for an inquiry under the LRIA are referred by the MNRF to the Office of the Mining and Lands Commissioner (OMLC). Additional detail regarding appeals to the OMLC are referenced in MNRF's LRIA Administrative Guide and Section 11 of the LRIA. **17.4 Amendment Preparation** Where the MNRF has determined that a proposed amendment request should proceed, the plan proponent(s) shall prepare the final amendment proposal, including completing consultation activities or information gathering in support of the proposed amendment. Where the amendment

			is requested by a third party, the third party requester should discuss opportunities for collaboration in preparing the amendment. For minor amendments, the plan proponent(s) must engage the MNRF, other plan proponent(s) and the SAC (if applicable). Public and First Nations and Métis community engagement and consultation requirements for major amendments are described in the subsections 17.4.1 and 17.4.2. *17.4.1 Consultation and Engagement Requirements for Major Amendments* Plan proponent(s) and in certain circumstances third party amendment requestors, shall undertake public and First Nations and Métis community engagement and consultation when developing a major amendment. Specific requirements shall be discussed with the MNRF in advance. The scope of consultation and engagement may vary depending on: • Scope and scale of the proposed major amendment; • Level of public, stakeholder and First Nation and Métis community interest in dam operations; • Level of potential impact on Aboriginal and treaty rights; • Potential impacts on other regulatory approvals; and • Potential impacts within the scope of the LRIA and the WMP. Consultation and engagement approaches may include: • Direct written notice; • Open houses; • Information sessions; • Public notice; and/or • Community meetings or workshops/focus groups. Sufficient opportunity for reasonable engagement shall be provided and information regarding the amendment shall be communicated in concise plain language. *17.4.2 Consultation and Engagement Requirements Where EA Applies* In some instances, proposed changes to existing operations of the WMP will be subject to the Environmental Assessment (EA) Act, such as MNRF's Resource Stewardship and Facility Development Class EA, or the OWA Class EA. In such cases, the EA Act requirements shall be completed in advance of submitting an amendment request. The plan proponent(s) is not required, but may elect, to incorporate WMP amendment considerations during the EA Act process. Where proposed changes are subject to an EA, the proponent may not be required to complete any additional public and First Nations and Métis community engagement and consultation in support of the proposed WMP amendment where sufficient engagement activities have been completed as part of the EA process.

			MNRF determination of whether consultation and engagement completed during the EA is sufficient for purposes of a WMP amendment shall be made as part of the Ministry's assessment of the WMP amendment screening results. Additional consultation and engagement shall not be required, unless the MNRF concludes that the EA consultation was insufficient. In this case, the MNRF will determine the scope and scale of additional consultation and engagement necessary for the purposes of the WMP amendment. **17.5 Amendment Submission** Following completion of any applicable consultation requirements, the plan proponent(s) will provide the MNRF, other plan proponent(s) where appropriate, and any third party requesters, a copy of the final amendment proposal including: a) Amendment request and supporting rationale; b) Proposed changes (replacement text) as they would appear within the approved plan; c) Map of the area affected by the amendment (if applicable); d) Record of consultation identifying the type of form of feedback sought, issues identified and steps taken by the proponent to modify the proposed amendment in response to comments (if applicable); and e) Any other supporting information deemed applicable to the proposed amendment. **17.6 Amendment Review** All amendments to the Muskoka River WMP must be approved by the MNRF. The MNRF will complete a review of the amendment submission. For proposed minor amendments, the MNRF will complete a review within 30 days of receipt of a complete submission. For proposed major amendments, MNRF will complete a review within 60 days of receipt of a complete submission. During and/or following the review of the proponent's amendment submission, the MNRF may, with supporting rationale, request additional information required to complete the MNRF's review. *17.6.1 Requests for Additional Information* Where additional information is required, the MNRF will identify in writing the additional information requested and the rationale for the request. In such circumstances, the MNRF review timeline will be put on hold until the MNRF receives the requested information. Upon receiving a request for additional information from the MNRF, the proponent may: • Agree to provide the additional information by the specified time; • Request a change to the specified time for submitting the information; • Request a review by the Regional Director of the required information; or • Refuse to provide the additional information. Further details regarding the above scenarios can be found in Section 3.7.1 of the Technical Bulletin

			(2016). **17.7 Issuance of Decision** In issuing a decision on the proposed amendment, the MNRF shall either: • Approve the amendment; • Approve the amendment subject to changes considered advisable to further the purposes of the Act; or • Refuse the amendment. MNRF will provide the plan proponent(s) and any third party requester, as appropriate, written confirmation of its decision and supporting rationale. If the amendment is approved, the WMP will be revised and a record of the amendment will be appended to the approved WMP. Where the MNRF intends to refuse an amendment, a Letter of Intent to Refuse approval of the amendment will be issued to the proponent identifying the supporting rationale and any additional measures the proponent(s) can take to address any outstanding concerns. The Letter of Intent to Refuse approval of amendment will notify the proponent that unless the MNRF receives a request within 15 days from the proponent for an inquiry, the amendment will be refused. Requests for an inquiry under the LRIA are referred by the Ministry of the Office of Mining and Lands Commissioner (OMLC). Additional information on appeals to the OMLC is detailed in MNRF's LRIA Administrative Guide.
SAC Text		*Section 16.2 will remain, though some text within the Section will be removed, as displayed below, and additional text in the column to the right will be added above the existing text.* 16.2 Standing Advisory Committee ~~Upon completion of the WMP, the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) will have fulfilled its mandate (i.e., to advise on the development of the plan and effective means of consulting with the public during that process) and will be disbanded. A new committee, the Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) will be established to provide public input into the implementation of the WMP.~~ The SAC will be composed of a number of citizens (up to 5) that represent a diversity of interests and knowledge bases along the course of the river. The SAC will report to the Steering Committee (SC), will provide a conduit for the transfer of public comments related to plan implementation to the operating partners (~~MNR and~~ waterpower companies), and will provide advice on the implementation of the plan. The organizational relationship between the SC, the PIT, the SAC, and the general public is provided in the following organizational flowchart. *(Flowchart will remain)*	**16.2 Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)** A SAC is not a mandatory requirement. SACs are recommended as a best management practice to provide plan proponent(s) with a mechanism for engaging First Nation and Métis communities and the public. Any proposal to discontinue an established SAC should be informed by advice from the MNRF, advice from the SAC and consideration of the level of public, stakeholder and First Nation and Métis community interest in dam operations. Where a plan proponent(s) makes this recommendation, an amendment to the WMP with appropriate rationale will be required to remove the provision for a SAC from this WMP. Plan proponent(s) are responsible for administering the SAC (if applicable), and SACs will work directly with the plan proponent(s). Proponents are required to report on the status of the SAC (if applicable) every five years as a component of ongoing Implementation Reports as outlined in Section 16.3. The role of the SAC (if applicable) is to serve as an advisory group, as defined through a terms of reference. The terms of reference will outline the membership, scope, duration and roles and responsibilities of the SAC and its relationship with the plan proponents. MNRF will define what role it will have, if any, in the SAC.

			A SAC (if applicable) should include representatives with a broad range of interests on the river such as First Nation and Métis communities, riparian land owners, municipalities and interested groups.
Compliance Text		*Section 13 of the WMP outlines Compliance monitoring requirements. Specific requirements, other than those outlined in Sections 13.4.1 and 13.4.2, will continue to apply. Revised and additional text will be amended into the plan as outlined in the column to the right.* *Section 13.4.1 will be removed (outlined below) and new text (see column to the right) will be substituted.* *Section 13.4.2 will be removed (outlined below). Text will be inserted in the new Section 13.4.1 (column to the right) which outlines that proponents shall make water flow and level data available to the Ministry upon request. A new Section 13.4.2 will be added that outlines updated Annual Compliance reporting requirements.* ~~**13.4.1 Event Reporting Format**~~ ~~Events outside the NOZ shall be reported by telephone to the Bracebridge Area office or other location as per MNR direction within 24 hours of the time that industry is aware of the event. The telephone message will, to the extent that the information is available, explain Items 1 to 5 below and an event report will be faxed to the Bracebridge Area Office within 30 days of the occurrence. Each report will be dated and signed by the waterpower operator (see Event Report form located at end of section). 1. Nature of Non-Compliance: (e.g., water level out of range and amount) 2. Why it happened: (e.g., power outage, generator not able to operate, power dam not functioning, etc) 3. What is being done to correct it: (e.g., dam operated manually) 4. How long before return to compliance: (e.g., 24 hours, already back in compliance). 5. Corrective actions that are required (if any).~~ ~~**13.4.2 Data Recording and Reporting**~~ ~~Specific waterpower facilities shall record and report the following data to MNRF. The actual readings (raw data) used to determine the average water levels will be recorded and retained by all waterpower facilities, and will include measurements taken every hour, on the hour (i.e., 0600 hours., 0700 hours, etc).~~ *Table removed.*	**13.4.1 Self-Monitoring, Data Reporting and Incident Notification** All facilities are required to self-monitor mandatory water flow and level limits, and report on any incidents where a deviation from the operating requirements of the WMP (mandatory water flow and level), or other mandatory conditions of the Muskoka River WMP. All incidents must be reported to the MNRF. An initial notification to the MNRF (via telephone to the Bracebridge Area office or other office as per MNRF direction) is required within 24 hours of the occurrence of the incident or when the proponent(s) first becomes aware of the incident. The report should include: • The date, time and nature of the deviation; • The extent of the deviation; • Possible causes of the deviation; • Known or anticipated impacts associated with the deviation; and • Steps taken or to be taken, including the timeframe, to correct the deviation. The facility owner/operator is then required to provide a written report via fax to the MNRF Bracebridge Area office within 30 days, outlining the details of the incident, any additional information not provided in the incident notification and subsequent remediation. The report must be signed and dated. (See event report form located at the end of Section 13). Proponents shall make water flow and level data available to the Ministry upon Request. **13.4.2 Annual Compliance Reports** Each individual plan proponent will prepare and submit an Annual Compliance Report. The report will contain a summary and description of all incidents and any remedial action(s) proposed or undertaken. In the event there were no recorded incidents of noncompliance, the report will state as such.

Effectiveness Monitoring Text		*Section 14 outlines the Effectiveness Monitoring Program. All current requirements continue to apply; however, the reporting on the results of this program will occur through submission of the Implementation Report. Text to outline this (in the column to the right) will be included at the beginning of Section 14.4: Data Sharing and Communication.*	*Text to be added:* Reporting on the results of the effectiveness monitoring program will occur through submission of the Implementation Report as outlined in Section 16.3.

Implementation Reporting Text		*Section 16.3 has been revised to be consistent across Ontario as per the Technical Bulletin. The annual reporting requirements are now included in Section 13.4.2 Annual Compliance Reports. The below paragraph is removed, with the exception of the last sentence which is incorporated into the new Section 16.3, as shown to the right..* ~~16.3 Annual Report~~ ~~The PIT will produce an annual report that provides a summary of system operations, identifies any new issues/concerns and associated actions/resolutions, and outlines ongoing implementation, coordination/cooperation, monitoring and data gathering activities.~~ The ~~annual~~ report will be provided to the SAC, key stakeholders, the Wahta Mohawks, and made available to the public on request. *Section 16.4 has been revised to be consistent across all WMPs within Ontario as per the Technical Bulletin. The Mid-Term Report requirement is replaced by the Implementation Reporting requirements in Section 16.3 Implementation Reporting (as per text in the right column).* ~~16.4 Mid-Term Report~~ ~~After the fifth year of plan implementation, a status report will be prepared by the PIT which summarizes progress on implementation of the plan, issues raised and associated resolution/actions, and provides recommendations (as required) for the second half of the plan term. The SAC, key stakeholders, the Wahta Mohawks and the public will be invited to comment on the report and the implementation of the plan to date.~~ ~~The SAC will review the comments received, and may provide recommendations to the SC for specific actions/resolutions (i.e., additional monitoring, filling of data gaps, or revisions to facility operating plans). The SC will determine whether the issues/concerns merit an amendment to the plan, maintenance of the status quo or an early review of the WMP.~~	**16.3 Implementation Reporting** Plan proponents for the Muskoka River WMP shall submit an Implementation Report to the MNRF every five years. This report shall be a collective submission from all plan proponents. The Implementation Report will provide status updates, transparency of dam operations and inform adaptive management considerations. The Implementation Report is not intended to initiate a fundamental review of the WMP. The Implementation Report will include: • Summary of all amendment requests received, including the rationale for completed amendments and how proposed amendments that did not proceed were addressed; • Status of the Standing Advisory Committee, where applicable; • Report on the results of the effectiveness monitoring program (EMP), if applicable, including a summary of monitoring conducted and findings, a determination of whether operations are having a negative or unintended impact, and an assessment of whether revisions to the facility operations, or the EMP, are required; and • Status and results of any data or information collection outlined in the WMP's data collection program, if applicable, and a determination of whether revisions to the program are required. The MNRF will review the report for completeness but will not formally approve the report. If the report is not complete, the MNRF will request that additional information be provided. The MNRF may also audit records used by the proponent(s) to prepare the Implementation Report and may request any additional information to verify the information presented. Upon confirmation from the MNRF that the Implementation Report is complete, plan proponents will make the report publicly available. The report will be provided to the SAC (if applicable), key stakeholders, and Wahta Mohawks, and made available to the public on request. The SAC will review this information, and may request that actions are taken to address issues or concerns as appropriate. The SC will determine whether the issues/concerns merit an amendment to the plan, maintenance of the status quo, or an early review of the WMP. In accordance with the Technical Bulletin, the first Implementation Report to cover the initial term of the Muskoka River WMP should be submitted to MNRF no later than December 31, 2021, as outlined in the OWA schedule. Also, in accordance with the Technical Bulletin, Implementation Reports must be submitted every five year thereafter.