



Regional Municipality of Durham COUNCIL INFORMATION PACKAGE

September 1, 2023

If this information is required in an accessible format, please contact 1-800-372-1102 ext. 2097.

	Pages
1. Information Reports	
1.1 2023-INFO-74 Commissioner and Medical Officer of Health	3
• Public Health Services to Support School Health, including Mental Health Promotion and Substance Use Prevention	
1.2 2023-INFO-75 Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development	9
• Durham Environment and Climate Advisory Committee Pollinator Distribution Project	
2. Early Release Reports	
There are no Early Release Reports	
3. Confidential Reports Authorized for Release	
The following confidential reports have been previously authorized for release at the appropriate time:	
There are no Confidential Reports	
4. Staff Correspondence	
There is no Staff Correspondence	
5. Durham Municipalities Correspondence	
There are no Durham Municipalities Correspondence	
6. Other Municipalities Correspondence/Resolutions	

6.1	The Township of Greater Madawaska	12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Resolution passed at their Council meeting held on August 17, 2023, regarding Legislative Amendments to Improve Municipal Codes of Conduct and Enforcement	

7. Miscellaneous Correspondence

7.1	Elizabeth Bridge on Behalf of The Women of Ontario Say NO	13
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Legislative Amendments to Improve Municipal Codes of Conduct and Enforcement	
7.2	Keith Taylor, Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Region	17
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Plan Amendments – Public Consultation	

8. Advisory / Other Committee Minutes

There are no Advisory/Other Committee Minutes

Members of Council – Please advise the Regional Clerk at clerks@durham.ca, if you wish to pull an item from this CIP and include on the next regular agenda of the appropriate Standing Committee. Items will be added to the agenda if the Regional Clerk is advised not later than noon the day prior to the meeting, otherwise the item will be included on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled meeting of the applicable Committee.

Notice regarding collection, use and disclosure of personal information: Written information (either paper or electronic) that you send to Durham Regional Council or Committees, including home address, phone numbers and email addresses, will become part of the public record. If you have any questions about the collection of information, please contact the Regional Clerk/Director of Legislative Services.



The Regional Municipality of Durham Report

From: Commissioner & Medical Officer of Health
Report: #2023-INFO-74
Date: September 1, 2023

Subject:

Public Health Services to Support School Health, including Mental Health Promotion and Substance Use Prevention

Recommendation:

Receive for information

Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 To provide information on Durham Region Health Department's (DRHD's) school-based health promotion services, including mental health promotion and substance use prevention.

2. Background

2.1 The [Ontario Public Health Standards](#): Requirements for Programs, Services, and Accountability (OPHS) are published by the Minister of Health under the authority of section 7 of the *Health Protection and Promotion Act* to specify the mandatory health programs and services provided by boards of health.

2.2 Boards of health are accountable for implementing the OPHS including the protocols and guidelines that are referenced in the standards.

2.3 As per the OPHS, DRHD is required to examine the complex interplay between individual, family, school, and community/societal factors to develop programs and services to reduce burdens associated with substance use and mental health.

2.4 The OPHS and its [Substance Use Prevention and Harm Reduction Guideline](#), [Tobacco, Vapour and Smoke Guideline](#), and [Mental Health Promotion Guideline](#), provide direction to boards of health on:

- a. Required approaches to developing and implementing programs and services that contribute to achieving optimal health of school-aged children and youth through partnerships and collaboration with school boards and schools.
- b. Required approaches and interventions in developing and implementing a program of public health interventions for substance use prevention and harm reduction.
- c. Required approaches and interventions in developing and implementing a program of public health interventions for comprehensive tobacco control.
- d. Considering mental health promotion within their processes for planning, implementing, and evaluating programs of public health interventions.
 - Mental health promotion is the process of enhancing the capacity of individuals and communities to increase control over their lives and improve their mental health. Beyond a focus on risk factors, it is an approach that aims to improve the health of individuals, families, communities, and society by influencing the complex interactions between social and economic factors, the physical environment, and individual behaviours and conditions across the lifespan (i.e., the social determinants of health).

3. Local Trends

- 3.1 The [Ontario Student Drug Use and Health Survey](#) (OSDUHS) is a population survey of Ontario students in Grades 7 through 12. OSDUHS began in 1977 and is the longest ongoing school survey in Canada – and one of the longest in the world.
- 3.2 According to OSDUHS, from 2009 to 2017:
 - a. There was a significant decrease in the [rate of early alcohol use](#) among Durham Region secondary school students.
 - b. There was no statistical difference in the [trend of early alcohol use](#) between Durham Region and the rest of Ontario.
 - c. There was a significant decrease in the [rate of past year alcohol use](#) among Durham Region students.
 - d. In 2017, Durham Region students reported similar [rates of trying alcohol, cannabis, and cigarettes](#), when compared to Ontario.
 - e. In 2017 students' daily [use of e-cigarettes was lower than](#) provincial rates.

- f. Between 2009 and 2017 there was a significant decline in youth use of alcohol use (past year), binge drinking (past month), and hazardous harmful drinking (past year).
- 3.3 The [Findings from the 2021 Ontario Student Drug Use and Health Survey](#) indicate an increase in youth prescription opioid use provincially, in Durham Region the increase in opioid poisoning emergency department visits for those ages zero to 19 is not statistically significant.
- 3.4 Between 2017 and 2019, [past year e-cigarette use doubled](#) among Ontario students in Grades 7 to 12.
- 3.5 Among high school students, [consuming cannabis edibles increased significantly](#) from 2017 to 2019.
- 3.6 Since 2009, there was a significant increase in the [rate of fair to poor self-reported mental health](#) among Durham Region students. There was no statistical difference in the trend of fair to poor self-reported mental health between Durham Region and the rest of Ontario.
- 3.7 From 2015 to 2017, there was a significant increase in the [rate of fair to poor self-reported mental health](#) in Durham Region students.

4. DRHD Programs and Services

- 4.1 [Comprehensive school health](#) is an internationally recognized approach to supporting improvements in students' educational outcomes while addressing school health in a planned, integrated, and holistic way.
- 4.2 This whole-school model builds capacity to incorporate well-being as an essential aspect of student achievement. Actions address four distinct but inter-related components that comprise a comprehensive school health approach: 1) social and physical environment; 2) teaching and learning; 3) healthy school policy; and 4) partnerships and services.
- 4.3 When actions in all four components are harmonized, students are supported to realize their full potential as learners, and as healthy, productive members of society.
- 4.4 Health and education are interdependent: healthy students are better learners, and better-educated individuals are healthier. Research has shown that comprehensive school health is an effective way to enhance that linkage, improving both health and educational outcomes and encouraging healthy behaviours that last throughout life.
- 4.5 In the classroom, comprehensive school health facilitates improved academic achievement and can lead to fewer behavioural problems. In the broader school environment, it helps students develop the skills they need to be physically and

emotionally healthy for life.

4.6 Comprehensive School Health:

- a. Recognizes that healthy students learn better and achieve more.
- b. Understands that schools can directly influence students' health and behaviours.
- c. Encourages healthy lifestyle choices, and promotes students' health and wellbeing.
- d. Incorporates health into all aspects of school and learning.
- e. Links health and education issues and systems.
- f. Needs the participation and support of families and the community at large.

4.7 In Durham Region, all elementary and secondary schools have an assigned public health nurse (PHN) to deliver health promotion services and support comprehensive school health.

4.8 PHNs assess local school needs, plan and implement strategies in collaboration with the school community and evaluate. PHNs are involved in school health action teams, youth engagement strategies, provide curriculum support, attend parent council meetings and other school related wellness committees.

4.9 Following are some examples of strategies PHNs use in schools related to substance use and mental health:

- a. Work to address substance use risk and protective factors to prevent substance use or delay the age of initiation of substances.
- b. Work with student leaders to deliver health teaching on vaping using the "[Not an Experiment!](#)" escape room activity to Grade 7 and Grade 8 peers.
- c. Provide training on Brief Contact Interventions (BCI) to educators for discussions with youth; BCI includes providing opportunistic advice, discussion, negotiation or encouragement on vaping or smoking cessation that takes between 5 to 10 minutes.
- d. [Presentations](#) to parents at school community council meetings in collaboration with Health Protection Division to provide teaching on both health risks and legal risks related to vaping at school.
- e. Host an annual Durham Youth Drug Awareness Conference with community partners and high schools to foster opportunity between school-assigned PHNs and student leaders to deliver comprehensive strategies in school on

- mental health, substance use, and vaping.
- f. Collaborate with school board mental health leadership teams to ensure a streamlined consistent approach to mental health promotion in schools and development of evidence-based mental health promotion resources.
 - g. Participate on school board mental health and wellbeing committees.
 - h. Promote and support educators with implementing [School Mental Health Ontario](#) materials and resources. School Mental Health Ontario supports schools to enhance student mental health through the use of evidence-informed strategies and services.
 - i. Collaborate with schools to develop comprehensive plans to address and promote Mental Health within school communities utilizing School Mental Health Ontario resources and tools.
 - j. Support the implementation of TAMI (Talking About Mental Illness) anti-stigma initiative in Durham schools. TAMI is a program for youth in schools which aims to raise awareness and increase understanding of mental illness. A primary goal of TAMI is to reduce the stigma surrounding mental illness so that youth are more likely to seek help and/or help others, thereby improving their chances for managing mental health and improving long term outcomes.
- 4.10 During the 2022/2023 school year, schools consulted their PHN on mental health and vaping in schools as two priority issues.
- 4.11 Regarding student mental health, and preventing or delaying student substance use, the presence of risk factors and protective factors in a person's life, and their ability to mitigate or strengthen these factors, impacts outcomes. Risk factors make individuals more likely to experience harms related to substance use, whereas protective factors decrease the likelihood of these harms. Both risk and protective factors are present at the individual, family, school, and community/societal level.
- 4.12 PHNs assess risk and protective factors to inform the development of programs and services across varying substance use patterns in accordance with the OPHS.
- 4.13 School-based prevention efforts include the development of curriculum support materials, awareness and education strategies, as well as youth engagement activities.
- 4.14 To ensure environments are conducive to fostering health, DRHD staff informs, develops, and implements healthy public policies that address prevention, harm reduction and risk and protective factors for substance use and mental health, to foster healthy environments where students live, learn, work and play. One example of this work would be the implementation of the School Board Smoking and Vaping policy.

5. Relationship to Strategic Plan

5.1 This report aligns with/addresses the following strategic goals and priorities in the Durham Region Strategic Plan:

a. Goal 2: Community Vitality

- 2.2 Enhance community safety and well-being.
- 2.3 Influence the social determinants of health to improve outcomes for vulnerable populations.
- 2.4 Support a high quality of life for all through human services delivery.

b. Goal 5: Service Excellence

- 5.1 Optimize resources and partnerships to deliver exceptional quality services and value.
- 5.2 Collaborate for a seamless service experience.

6. Conclusion

6.1 DRHD staff continues to work with school communities to monitor and respond to local trends related to youth mental health and substance use.

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by

R.J. Kyle, BSc, MD, MHSc, CCFP, FRCPC, FACPM
Commissioner & Medical Officer of Health

If this information is required in an accessible format, please contact 1-800-372-1102 ext. 2564



The Regional Municipality of Durham Information Report

From: Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development
Report: #2023-INFO-75
Date: September 1, 2023

Subject:

Durham Environment and Climate Advisory Committee Pollinator Distribution Project,
File: A01-37

Recommendation:

Receive for information

Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the Durham Environment and Climate Advisory Committee's (DECAC) Pollinator Distribution Project that took place in Spring 2023.

2. Background

2.1 The role of DECAC is to provide advice to the Region on environmental and climate-related matters. The Committee also has a role in implementing and participating in community outreach programs and stewardship that support environmental awareness and appreciation, as outlined in the 2023 DECAC Workplan.

3. Previous Reports and Decisions

3.1 In June 2023, Council considered DECAC's 2023 Annual Report and Terms of Reference through Report #[2023-P-17](#).

3.2 In January 2023, Council considered DECAC's 2022 Annual Report through Report [#2023-P-3](#).

4. Pollinator Distribution Project

4.1 The Pollinator Distribution Project is intended to raise awareness and protect pollinator health and the important role they play in supporting ecosystems, global food production and sustainability. This is the second year of DECAC's Pollinator Distribution Project.

4.2 Pollinator seeds were distributed to residents attending the Durham Region Compost Giveaway events organized by the Regional Works Department. These events took place during April and May in all eight municipalities across Durham.

4.3 DECAC members and staff from the Planning Division distributed seed packets to residents of approximately 2,400 households who attended the following events:

- a. Town of Ajax (April 29th, 2023);
- b. Municipality of Clarington (April 29th, 2023);
- c. Township of Brock (May 6th, 2023);
- d. City of Oshawa (May 6th, 2023);
- e. Township of Scugog (May 13th, 2023);
- f. Town of Whitby (May 13th, 2023);
- g. City of Pickering (May 27th, 2023); and
- h. Township of Uxbridge (May 27th, 2023).

4.4 The seed packets included a wildflower mix of annual and perennial native, pollen-producing plant species that are attractive to bees. Bulk seeds were obtained from a local Ontario seed supplier and assembled into individual packets by DECAC members and volunteers.

5. Relationship to Strategic Plan

5.1 This report aligns with/addresses the following strategic goals and priorities in the Durham Region Strategic Plan:

- a. Goal 1: Environmental Sustainability's objective: To protect the environment for the future by demonstrating leadership in sustainability and addressing climate change.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 Following a positive response from residents attending the events in 2022, DECAC was pleased to proceed once again in 2023, doubling the number of seed packets distributed. Many residents expressed excitement in receiving seeds and learning about the importance of pollinators. Some who received seeds in 2022 provided positive feedback on their quality and effectiveness in attracting pollinator populations.
- 6.2 Nearly 2,200 of the 4,215 households attending the Regional Compost Day events across the Region in 2023 received pollinator seeds. Given the success of this project, DECAC looks forward to undertaking the initiative again in 2024.
- 6.3 DECAC members Jay Cuthbertson, Richard Dickinson, Gwen Layton, Keiko Lui, Kim Murray, Muaz Nasir, Shlok Panchal and Councillor Wilma Wotten are to be commended for the time and commitment they invested in organizing the project, assembling seed packets, and attending events to distribute seeds to residents.

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by

Brian Bridgeman, MCIP, RPP, PLE
Commissioner of Planning and
Economic Development

Corporate Services Department Legislative Services Division	
Date & Time Received:	August 25, 2023 10:39 am
Original To:	CIP
Copies To:	
Take Appropriate Action	<input type="checkbox"/> File <input type="checkbox"/>
Notes/Comments:	

Council Resolution Form

Date: 17 Aug 2023 No: Resolution No.199-23

Moved By: Councillor Popkie Disposition: CARRIED.
Seconded by Councillor Thomson

Item No: 12.08.2 Description: Request for Support - The Women of Ontario Say No

RESOLUTION:

Whereas, all Ontarians deserve and expect a safe and respectful workplace; and

Whereas, municipal governments, as the democratic institutions most directly engaged with Ontarians need respectful discourse; and

Whereas, several incidents in recent years of disrespectful behaviour and workplace harassment have occurred amongst members of municipal councils; and

Whereas, these incidents seriously and negatively affect the people involved and lower public perceptions of local governments; and

Whereas, municipal Codes of Conduct are helpful tools to set expectations of council member behaviour; and

Whereas, municipal governments do not have the necessary tools to adequately enforce compliance with municipal Codes of Conduct; and

Now, therefore be it resolved that the Township of Greater Madawaska supports the call of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario for the Government of Ontario to introduce legislation to strengthen municipal Codes of Conduct and compliance with them in consultation with municipal governments; and

Also be it resolved that the legislation encompass the Association of Municipalities of Ontario's recommendations for:

- Updating municipal Codes of Conduct to account for workplace safety and harassment
- Creating a flexible administrative penalty regime, adapted to the local economic and financial circumstances of municipalities across Ontario
- Increasing training of municipal Integrity Commissioners to enhance consistency of investigations and recommendations across the province
- Allowing municipalities to apply to a member of the judiciary to remove a sitting member if recommended through the report of a municipal Integrity Commissioner
- Prohibit a member so removed from sitting for election in the term of removal and the subsequent term of office

Rob Weir, Mayor

Robin Emon, Clerk

August 28, 2023

Durham Regional Council

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

Legislative Amendments to Improve Municipal Codes of Conduct and Enforcement:

This request is from The Women of Ontario Say NO, a grassroots advocacy effort comprised of individuals, organizations, and community groups. We are committed to ensuring that locally elected officials are held accountable for violence and harassment in municipal workplaces. This advocacy stems from a number of egregious cases throughout the province including Ottawa, Barrie, and Mississauga. You can learn more on our website: <https://www.thewomenofontariosayno.com/>

Many councillors will know that on May 31st, 2023, the government voted down Bill 5 – The Stopping Harassment and Abuse by Local Leaders Act. At that time 160 municipalities had endorsed their support for Bill 5. In 2021, the Association of Municipalities Ontario recommended changes to strengthen municipal codes of conduct for elected officials. Again in 2023, after meetings with our group, the AMO issued a statement again calling on government to implement legislation change on this matter. AMO also provided sample resolution text for councils that wish to lend their support to this call: [Codes of Conduct, Changes to Visible Fees, and Fees Charged to Beverage Producers | AMO](#) These recommendations have still not been implemented.

We are calling on your municipality to be an active and engaged voice in your own workplace safety and that of the municipal staff in holding municipally elected representatives accountable for violence and harassment.

- **We are therefore asking Council to pass the attached motion of March 27, 2023, issued by AMO, calling for government legislation on this issue.**
- **We are requesting the motion include the communication that this legislation be prioritized for the fall of 2023 given the urgency of this issue.**
- **We are asking that a letter expressing support for the motion be sent to: The Premier, Local MPPs, Minister of Municipal Affairs, Associate Minister of Women’s Social and Economic Opportunity, AMO and local municipalities.**

We are counting on you as leaders to ensure your municipal workplace is safe and that there is basic human rights protection for all persons. This cannot wait any longer. This legislation needs to move ahead without any further delay.

Thank you in advance for being open to advocating for legislative change that will help ensure workplaces and community spaces are safe for everyone!

If you have any questions, please contact us at thewomenofontariosayno.team@gmail.com.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Bridge
On Behalf of
The Women of Ontario Say NO

AMO Sample Resolution Text

Legislative Amendments to Improve Municipal Codes of Conduct and Enforcement

Whereas, all Ontarians deserve and expect a safe and respectful workplace;

Whereas, municipal governments, as the democratic institutions most directly engaged with Ontarians need respectful discourse;

Whereas, several incidents in recent years of disrespectful behaviour and workplace harassment have occurred amongst members of municipal councils;

Whereas, these incidents seriously and negatively affect the people involved and lower public perceptions of local governments;

Whereas, municipal Codes of Conduct are helpful tools to set expectations of council member behaviour;

Whereas, municipal governments do not have the necessary tools to adequately enforce compliance with municipal Codes of Conduct;

Now, therefore be it resolved that (MUNICIPALITY NAME) supports the call of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario for the Government of Ontario to introduce legislation to strengthen municipal Codes of Conduct and compliance with them in consultation with municipal governments;

Also be it resolved that the legislation encompass the Association of Municipalities of Ontario's recommendations for:

- Updating municipal Codes of Conduct to account for workplace safety and harassment
- Creating a flexible administrative penalty regime, adapted to the local economic and financial circumstances of municipalities across Ontario
- Increasing training of municipal Integrity Commissioners to enhance consistency of investigations and recommendations across the province
- Allowing municipalities to apply to a member of the judiciary to remove a sitting member if recommended through the report of a municipal Integrity Commissioner
- Prohibit a member so removed from sitting for election in the term of removal and the subsequent term of office

#THEWOMENOFONTARIOSAYNO

A call for legislation to hold municipally elected leaders accountable for violence and harassment

Overview

Who We Are

The Women of Ontario Say No is a non-partisan group of individuals, municipalities and community groups committed to holding municipally elected politicians accountable for violence and harassment. Our mission: drive essential legislative changes to the Ontario Municipal Act that ensures sitting elected officials are not immune to accountability when it comes to the mistreatment of others.

The Issue at Hand

Municipally elected leaders do not have an appropriate accountability structure when it comes to perpetrating violence and harassment in the workplace. In fact, if a claim of egregious (the most severe) harassment is substantiated; the maximum penalty that can be imposed is three months without pay. But the elected official can **retain their position, return to the workplace and seek re-election.**

This differs from any other workplace in the province, where, not only are workplaces mandated to have violence and harassment in the workplace policies (Bill 168), these policies outline consequences for egregious violation which includes termination.

Why this is so important?

Having a route to address violence and harassment outside of the court system is critical. The burden of proof in the court system is "beyond a reasonable doubt". This is significantly more onerous than with HR departments (or in this case for the Integrity Commissioner in the municipal setting), wherein the burden of proof required for a determination of Code of Conduct violation is based on "a balance of probabilities". As such, a fair outcome can be pursued that ensures misconduct can be addressed much more effectively than the current reality.

The Consequence of Inaction

When local leaders are able to perpetrate harassment and are not held to account, the message this sends to community is toxic. It means that:

- 1) **as an elected official you are somehow immune** to the communal standards of treatment we have come to expect from the population at large, and;
- 2) **That you can abuse your power**, unchecked, and continue to have the privilege of serving the population that elected you.

A fundamental, underlying principle of broadening diversity, equity and inclusion in politics rests on the assumption that the workplace is SAFE. This is currently not the case. As such, despite the most recent municipal elections in October, 2022, councilors currently can perpetrate the most egregious acts of harassment and keep their jobs.

This has immeasurable negative impact in communities, wherein:

- 1) **community members** and/or municipal staff may not feel safe meeting with their local ward councillor or mayor;
- 2) **if a person is harassed**, they may not see the point of filing a complaint with the Integrity Commissioner;
- 3) **there is no deterrent to council members** when it comes to perpetrating harassment, because they know they can still keep their job;
- 4) **it stifles diversity of voice** at the local decision making tables, because when safety is a risk, it deters quality people from traditionally marginalized backgrounds from seeking election;
- 5) **in instances where council members** who have perpetrated harassment to staff or their colleagues can retain their position, no matter how serious, it creates toxic workplaces which has an adverse effect on mental health in the workplace and throughout community;
- 6) **it supports current systems** of privilege and immunity of a certain segment of the population, which is not optimal for healthy communities;
- 7) **it sends the message** that if you have power, you are different (and superior to) the average citizen.

To learn more check out:
thewomenofontariosayno.com



* Government Legislation, once passed, will be applicable to ALL municipalities in Ontario at the same time.

What are we asking for?

We are advocating for 3 key components to the Ontario Municipal Act to strengthen our democratic processes by upholding fundamental human rights—the right to go to work and not be harassed:

* **Note: These changes have been endorsed by the Rural Ontario Municipal Association, Association of Municipalities Ontario, Ontario Big City Mayors and 185 municipalities in Ontario (and growing weekly).**

- 1. Strengthened Codes of Conduct:** An amendment to the Ontario Municipal Act that ensures Code of Conduct explicitly includes accountability to violence and harassment policies. This step ensures that our political representatives are held to the same standard as any other employee in Ontario when it comes to respecting the rights and dignity of every individual, thus fostering a safer and more inclusive environment for all.
- 2. Mechanism for Removal:** To address the investigated and substantiated egregious violations of municipal codes of conduct, a robust removal mechanism in the Ontario Municipal Act is essential. This process, reserved for only the most egregious of cases, aims to maintain the integrity of our governance while addressing actions that breach the core values we uphold. It ensures that municipally elected representatives are not immune from the basic standards of treatment we have come to expect in every other workplace.
- 3. Restriction on Re-election:** To ensure the message that violence and harassment will not be tolerated, and to support greater accountability over time, a restriction on subsequent re-election for individuals found guilty of serious misconduct is required. This measure ensures that those who fail to uphold the most basic ethical standards of workplace safety face consequences that extend beyond a single term. This is consistent with any other workplace, where an employee who is terminated for perpetrating violence and harassment is not rehired a year later, for example.

These changes are not meant to undermine the democratic process but rather to bring elected representatives up to the same standard as every other employee in Ontario. This advocating effort is not meant to undermine the democratic process but rather to bring elected representatives up to par— a very basic benchmark for how we treat each other in the political sphere. Workplace safety is foundational to overall workplace and greater community health.

This effort is firmly rooted in advocating for legislative changes that are supported by due process, ensuring fairness for all parties involved.

History

The Ontario government introduced legislation to mandate that employers have a Workplace Violence and Harassment policy. This legislation underscored the rights of all persons to be safe at work. Yet, municipally elected representatives have essentially experienced immunity, by virtue of public election.

In 2021, the Conservative government completed consultation on “Strengthening accountability for municipal council members.” Not only did the current government not pass its own legislation to address this human rights protection gap, they also *did not* prioritize The Stopping Harassment and Abuse by Local Leaders Act (most recently known as Bill 5) and *voted it down* on May 31, 2023.

The same private members bill had all party support in 2021. We know that the examples of councillor misconduct have only grown since this time. This issue is not going away.

Here are our calls of action to help us change the future:

- 1) SHARE, LIKE and Follow:** @womenofontariosayno (facebook and Instagram)
- 2) deliver a presentation to a municipal council in Ontario** requesting support (materials provided). This is a unique approach to advocacy, but is appropriate to approach local councils, as it is their workplace.
- 3) showcase your organization/community** groups’ logo to the website to add credibility and legitimacy to the advocacy effort.
- 4) meet/write/call your local MPP** and express that this legislation matters to you/your organization/their constituents and the overall community.
- 5) share and disseminate** information with your networks.
- 6) write the Ontario Human Rights Commission** and request a public inquiry into the issue: legal@ohrc.on.ca (a letter provided on our website)
- 7) feel empowered** to have the hard conversations. So much of grassroots change occurs at our dinner table, speaking with a neighbor, or your local councillor. Start talking about the issue. Express the change you want to see and never feel ashamed to advocate for basic human rights. We often feel we have to be experts in legislation to advocate for it. We are all experts in how we want to be treated. Let this be your guide.

To learn more check out:
thewomenofontariosayno.com



* Government Legislation, once passed, will be applicable to ALL municipalities in Ontario at the same time.

Summary of the Trent and Ganaraska Source Protection Plan Amendments - Public Consultation

Introduction:

Since January 1, 2015 the Trent and Ganaraska Source Protection Plans have been in effect to protect sources of municipal drinking water in the Trent Conservation Coalition Source Protection Region.



These plans contain policies for activities that have been determined to be significant drinking water threats (as determined by the Technical Rules under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*) in areas near municipal groundwater wells and surface water intakes. The Source Protection Committee is proposing some amendments to the Source Protection Plans to improve the effectiveness of some policies and to address changes that were made to the Technical Rules.

Main Proposed Changes:

Above Grade Fuel Tanks more than 250 L

Above grade fuel tanks more than 250 litres, near municipal wells may need a risk management plan. A risk management plan will require regular inspections of the tanks and infrastructure. It may also include measures to protect the tank from damage from outdoor elements.

A **risk management plan** regulates activities that pose a significant threat to municipal drinking water sources.

The risk management plan includes best management practices designed to ensure that risks to the municipal drinking water source are reduced or eliminated. The plan is generally negotiated between the person doing the activity and a risk management official.



Above Grade Fuel Tanks more than 2,500 L

Large above grade fuel tanks near a municipal drinking water intake may need a risk management plan.



Fuel Handling and Storage: Anyone with an existing fuel risk management plan:

The policies requiring risk management plans for fuel are being amended to include a requirement to inspect fuel infrastructure, not just the tanks. Infrastructure relates to the equipment and systems needed to produce, distribute, store, monitor and dispense fuel.

Agriculture

Pesticides: In the original Source Protection Plan, policies requiring risk management plans and prohibition of pesticides were only applied to specific chemicals used as pesticide. The Technical Rules have changed so the policies are being amended. This will mean all pesticides in the most vulnerable areas will be prohibited when it is a new activity or require a risk management plan for existing activities.



Fertilizer (minor): The storage of fertilizer now applies to all fertilizers stored in any form.

Non Agricultural Source Material (minor): Definitions of significant threats were clarified in the Technical Rules so policies were amended to reflect the new rules.

Definition of existing activities (minor): The definition of an existing activity was corrected to include any farm activity that is part of the regular farm rotational activities and has occurred within the previous 10 years. This means that activities that are determined to be existing as part of the normal farm rotation, will not be prohibited.

Road Salt Storage

The policies are being amended to require municipalities to establish and enforce standards for any road salt storage over 100 kilograms. This means that road salt must be stored, so that it is not exposed to precipitation or runoff and to prevent it from contaminating drinking water sources.



Road Salt Application

The policies are being amended so that only parking lots with more than 50 parking spaces or greater than 1,500 square metres will require risk management plans.



Snow Storage

A new policy is being proposed to require risk management plans for snow storage on commercial and industrial parking lots or yards larger than 50 parking spaces or 1,500 square metres.



Dense Non Aqueous Phase Liquids (minor)

In the original Source Protection Plan, specific substances that were considered dense non-aqueous phase liquids required risk management plans for existing handling and storage and future activities were prohibited. The Technical Rules now provide a list of businesses that typically use dense non-aqueous phase liquids. The policies have not changed but risk management officials will be contacting businesses in vulnerable zones that are on the list to determine if a risk management plan is required for these substances. Small incidental amounts are exempt from the policies.

Dense non-aqueous phase liquids are chemicals that are denser than water. Even a small amount of these substances can cause a toxic level of contamination for human health and the environment.



Timing for Establishing Risk Management Plans (Minor)

The timeframe for amending or establishing a risk management plan will be shortened from 5 years to 2 years. It was 5 years in the original plan because risk management officials were starting from scratch and had to address all existing threats. Now that those risk management plans are in place, a 2 year timeframe is more appropriate.

For more information go to:

<https://trentsourceprotection.on.ca/>

Or Phone: 613-391-3915 Ext 246

Summary of the Trent and Ganaraska Source Protection Plan Amendments – Public Consultation

Policy #	Explanation of Change	Reason for Change	Impact of Change
G-1(2)	Policy G-1(2) defines an existing significant drinking water threat. For agricultural activities, Policy G-1(2)b defines an existing activity as one that has been engaged in at some point within the 10 year period prior to the approval of the Trent Source Protection Plan. Policy text changed to: b) An agricultural activity that the Risk Management Official has been able to verify has being part of a regular farm rotation and has occurred at least once within the previous 10 years.	The previous 10-year period is a fixed time-period and the committee realized that this was not the intent of the policy. The intent was to recognize the rotation nature of agricultural activities and consider any agricultural activity taking place in the last ten years, as part of the regular farm rotation, to be an existing activity.	No Impact
G-1(3)	Policy Removed. With the assistance of some of the municipal representatives on the Committee who have planning experience, a recommendation was developed to remove G-1(3) and describe in more general terms what would define an existing threat by amending Policy G-1(2).	In the approved Section 36 Workplan, the Committee identified that Policy G-1(3) was redundant. The Committee also was concerned that by trying to list all circumstances to consider in determining if a proposed activity would be existing, could create confusion and the possibility that something could be missed.	No significant impact.
G-5	Added “r) Conveyance of a Liquid hydrocarbon by a pipeline” under the list of applicable activities	Liquid hydrocarbon pipelines were added as a significant drinking water threat under the new Technical Rules	New hydrocarbon pipeline policies (HP) were added to the plan, see the HP section for more information.
G-6(3)	Text was added to afford the municipalities flexibility to determine the most feasible location for Source Protection Road Signs: “Municipalities shall determine the location of	The Section 36 Work Plan had identified that Policy G-6(3) did not allow any flexibility that would let the municipalities to determine the most feasible location for road signs.	No significant impact.

	the signs. Where feasible, the signs will be placed, at a minimum, where municipally maintained roads are located within wellhead protection areas with a vulnerability score of 10 and/or intake protection zones or a wellhead protection area E with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher.”	The Committee approved adding to the policy text, wording that would afford the municipalities flexibility to determine the most feasible location for the road signs.	
G-6(6)	A new sub-policy stating: “Pipeline owners should post sufficient and visibly noticeable liquid hydrocarbon pipeline identification signage for pipelines located in wellhead or intake protection areas. In addition, ‘do not anchor’ signs should be posted when there is a submerged pipeline in the area of a navigable waterway.” Policy G-6(7) was added as a monitoring policy for G-6(6).	Policy G-6(6) was a new policy added, related to signage for hydrocarbon pipelines. The policy requests that owners of pipelines place sufficient signage in locations of pipelines in Wellhead Protection Areas and Intake Protection Zones. The committee also thought it would be advisable to have “Do Not Anchor” signs in locations that are navigable waterways where pipelines are located on the bed of the waterway.	There would be some cost related to creating, installing and maintaining these signs.
G-7(2)	The following was added to the list of activities that are not permitted where these activities would be a future significant drinking water threat, unless otherwise stated in the plan: “The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act and the activity would not require a Prescribed Instrument.” A footnote was also added.	Policy G-7(2) is a Land Use Planning policy that lists activities that are subject to prohibition policies in the Source Protection Plan. The list should include waste disposal sites that are prohibited by Policy W-4(1) but are missing in the original plan. The Committee approved adding small quantities of waste to the list and also adding a footnote to the policy, listing which Prohibition Policies in the plan were related to Policy G-7(2).	This is simply a definition policy so there would be no economic impact.
G-8	After some consultation with some Risk Management Officials, the Committee approved changing Policy G-8(1) to read “If it is determined that an existing activity requires a risk management plan, the risk management plan must be established and complied with, within 2 years.”	The Section 36 Work Plan had identified that Policy G-8(1) had timelines for compliance that were not going to be met. The original policy required all necessary Risk Management Plans be established within 5 years of the approval of the Source Protection Plan. The MECP granted an extension to complete all necessary Risk	The changes to Policy G-8(1) and G-8(2) would not result in any significant economic impacts.

	<p>The Committee also approved removing the existing Policy G-8(2) because it was originally written to prioritize the development of Risk Management Plans for existing activities when the Source Protection Plan first came into effect. It is no longer necessary. Policy G-8(2) was changed to read “A future activity that requires a risk management plan cannot proceed until a risk management plan has been established and provisions in the risk management plan are complete.”</p>	<p>Management Plans by the end of 2022. This extension solved the immediate problem. Then the Committee debated what would be a reasonable compliance time period moving forward. The 5-year period was reduced to 2 years now that the most of the existing threats have been managed. The Committee created the new Policy G-8(2) to address future activities that do not require a Building Permit or Planning application. This policy mimics the requirements of the Section 59 notification process.</p>	
G-11	<p>OT-1 Policies regarding Emergency Management Documents merged into G-11 in the Trent Source Protection Plan only.</p>	<p>The Section 36 Work Plan had identified that both Policy G-11 and OT-1 needed to be amended. Upon further review, the Committee decided that the two policies had similar intent. In order to simplify these policies, the Committee decided that for the Trent Source Protection Plan, the best approach would be to merge the OT-1 policies into the G-11 policies. The Ganaraska Source Protection Authority, through consultation with the Ganaraska Municipal Working Group, wanted to keep the status quo in terms of these two policies.</p>	<p>No significant impact.</p>
S-2	<p>Policy S-2(1) is a prescribed instrument policy that relies on the MECP to manage significant sewage threats by reviewing Prescribed Instruments to ensure adequate measures are in place to manage significant drinking water threats. Policy S-2(1) was amended to include a minimum requirement to ensure Prescribed Instruments that manage significant threats, contain a reference to applicable source protection vulnerable area and protocols for emergency responses related to protecting drinking water.</p>	<p>While the Committee understands that Prescribed Instruments have measures to protect the environment, there has not been enough detailed reporting to ensure that specific measures to protect drinking water sources are in place or have been added. This concern was raised because there have been examples of prescribed instruments that do not include adequate or correct measures.</p>	<p>More work may be required by MECP in relation to prescribed instruments.</p>

S-3	<p>The sewage threat sub-categories have been updated as a result of the 2021 technical rule changes. The threat subcategories were updated for all Sewage policies. Policy S-3 was modified slightly to address the low-risk systems that qualify for Consolidated Linear Infrastructure preauthorization. Policy (3b) was added as a monitoring policy for Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals.</p>	<p>Policy S-3 is meant to prohibit future sewage facilities that would be high risk threats to drinking water.</p> <p>The Committee decided not to change Policies S-3(1) and S-3(2) except to add an exemption for future low-risk systems that would qualify for Consolidated Linear Infrastructure preauthorization.</p> <p>Additionally, the Committee felt that the Municipalities should report on terms and conditions in any Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals for future systems. Policies S-3(3b) was added as a monitoring policy to provide this information.</p>	<p>Some work required by municipal staff to report on terms and conditions in any consolidated linear infrastructure approvals for future systems.</p>
S-6	<p>Policy S-6(1) originally required an emergency response plan within two years. Now that these plans are in place the Policy now requires a current emergency response plan. "Pumping stations" added to the policy text for S-6(1). Policy S-6(2) is a monitoring policy for S-6(1). The requirement that municipalities provide "a summary of terms and conditions in any Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals that are protecting drinking water" was added to the list of what their annual report should entail.</p>	<p>The main issue with Policy S-6(1) is that the text of the policy should identify pumping stations as a component of the system that could fail and lead to a release of pathogens.</p> <p>Policy S-6(2) requires the municipalities to report annually a summary of the action taken to achieve the outcomes of the source protection plan policies. The Committee felt that this reporting should include a report of terms and conditions in any Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals for existing systems that are brought into the approval.</p>	<p>Some work required by municipal staff to fulfill the requirements of the two amendments.</p>
S-8	<p>As a result of the new threat subcategories in the 2021 Technical Rules, some adjustments were necessary in Policy S-8. Policy S-8(1) became unnecessary because the Policy S-2 achieves the same outcome. The Committee approved removing Policy S-8(1). Slight text adjust for S-8(2) to remove a reference to developing a stormwater management program</p>	<p>The slight text adjustment to Policy S-8(2) is because the original text reflects actions to be taken when the Source Protection Plan was first approved for initial stages of implementation. The update aligns the policy with the current phase of ongoing implementation and does not change the intent of the policy. The Committee felt that this reporting should include a report of terms and conditions in any Consolidated Linear</p>	<p>No significant impact.</p>

	within 2-years. Reporting on Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approval was also added.	Infrastructure Approvals for existing systems that are brought into the approval.	
Agriculture	The Committee approved adding to the pesticide preamble: "For practical reasons, pesticides applied or used in small quantities such as household use, are exempt from Policies A1 and A-4 and will instead be addressed through education and outreach."	It would not be practical to require risk management plans for small incidental quantities of household pesticides.	Minor impact to add to the education and outreach program.
A-2(3) & A-3	The following was added to the Prescribed Instrument agriculture policies: "At a minimum, the Prescribed Instrument shall include reference to the applicable source protection vulnerable area and where not already required, protocols for emergency responses related to protecting the drinking water source."	Policies A-2(3) and A-3 are prescribed instrument policies that relies on OMAFRA to manage significant sewage threats by reviewing Prescribed Instruments to ensure adequate measures are in place to manage significant drinking water threats. If there are not adequate measures, OMAFRA is required amend the Prescribed Instrument to include additional measures to protect drinking water sources. The OMAFRA is required to report annually on the action it has taken to achieve the outcomes of this policy. While the Committee understands that Prescribed Instruments have measures to protect the environment, there has not been enough detailed reporting to ensure that specific measures to protect drinking water sources are in place or have been added. The Committee felt that a minimum requirement would be to ensure Prescribed Instruments that manage significant threats contain a reference the applicable source protection vulnerable area and where not already required, protocols for emergency responses related to protecting drinking water. One of the problems at Walkerton was that the farmer didn't know the municipal well was right next to his agricultural property so identifying the vulnerable area the Prescribed Instrument is	Work required by OMAFRA to reference the applicable vulnerable areas and protocols for emergency responses related to source protection, if not already in Prescribed Instruments.

		in, is an easy ask for an important risk mitigative measure.	
A-4(1)	Text was added to A-4(1), stating “This prohibition does not apply to the application of pesticide when it is ordered by Health Units, the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks or municipalities for health or environmental purposes.”	The committee decided that there could be situation when a future pesticide prohibition could be problematic if the pesticide use was for human health or environmental reasons, for example spraying for West Nile Virus. The Committee decided to add this exemption in Policy A-4(1).	No significant impact.
A-4(5)	The Committee approved adding a new Must Conform Specify Action Policy A-4(5) with the policy text: “Where small quantities of pesticide that would be existing or future significant drinking water threats, the Municipality shall develop and initiate an ongoing education and outreach program designed to raise the awareness of the impact of pesticide use on drinking water sources and best management practices to help reduce the negative impact.”	It would not be practical to require risk management plans for small incidental quantities of household pesticides so Education and Outreach would be a better approach.	Minor impact to add to the education and outreach program.
Fuel	Above Grade Fuel Tanks. The threat circumstances have changed in the technical rules so that above grade fuel tanks greater than 250L with a vulnerability score of 10 and greater than 2500L with a vulnerability score of 9 or higher will now be significant drinking water threats.	Fuel policies will apply to these above grade tanks.	For existing above grade tanks, risk management plans will be required. There may be some costs for the owners to comply with measures in the risk management plans. Future above grade tanks will be prohibited in these zones.
F-2(2)	Text was added to the fuel policy to include fuel tanks and “fuel infrastructure”, and that the frequency of inspection change from “no less than every 5 years” to “no greater than every 5 years”. The following definition of infrastructure was added to the policy preamble: “Infrastructure relates to the equipment and	The Committee also decided to add the requirement to inspect fuel infrastructure to coincide with the requirement to inspect fuel tanks. The Committee also corrected an error in the text describing the frequency of inspections.	Fuel tank owners may require more frequent inspections by a TSSA-certified technician. The cost of doing a thorough inspection would be justified if it saved the cost of a spill.

	systems needed to produce, distribute, store, monitor and dispense fuel.”		
Road Salt Policies	The pre-amble to the Road Salt Policies was updated to align with the new Technical Rules, including the description of when road salt application is a significant threat, and the parameters of when road salt storage is a threat.	As a result of the 2021 Technical Rule changes there is a potential for a substantial increase in the number of significant road salt application significant threats.	New Risk Management Plans may be required. There will be some cost to municipalities if they haven’t already developed salt management plans.
R-1(3) to R-1(7)	New road salt sub-policies were added for municipalities, including preparing or updating salt management plans, developing education and outreach programs, monitoring sodium and chloride levels in water treatment plants, considering design criteria for parking lots and sidewalks, and a monitoring policy to report on the above.	The Committee consulted with staff including some Risk Management Officials to determine a more practical approach than negotiating a risk management plan for every significant threat, resulting in these proposed changes.	Potential work required for road staff and planners to implement and monitor the new policies. Some cost may be incurred for the increased education and outreach. Additional testing for sodium and chloride concentrations will be an additional cost.
R-5	The applicable activity was updated for road salt storage to include “in a quantity over 100 kg when exposed or potentially exposed to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snowmelt”. The new policy requires the municipalities to set an enforce a standard for proper road salt storage. The text in R-5(1) was amended to reflect the above change, and a monitoring policy R-5(2) was also added.	As a result of the 2021 Technical Rule changes substantially smaller amounts of stored road salt will be considered significant threats, starting at 10 kilograms. Previously the minimum threshold for road salt storage 500 tonnes. The Committee had to consider the impact of such a drastic change. After much discussion and some consultation with the MECP it was decided that education and outreach in Policy R-6 would be appropriate for amounts of 10 kilograms up to 100 kilograms. For storage over 100 kilograms, municipalities will be required to set and enforce a standard for road salt storage to ensure proper storage of salt and to prevent it from getting into surface water or groundwater. This approach was deemed to a more practical approach than negotiating risk management plans for so many road salt storage activities.	Some work required by municipalities to set and enforce a standard for road salt storage.

R-6	The applicable activity was updated to include road salt “over 10 kg when exposed to precipitation or runoff from”. R-6 was changed from a prohibition policy to a strategic action policy, and the implementer changed from RMO to Municipality. The policy text was updated to define the parameters of road salt storage for this policy to include “a quantity greater than 10 kg and exposed to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snowmelt, or a quantity greater than 100 kg and potentially exposed to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snowmelt” and for the municipality to “develop and initiate an ongoing education and outreach program designed to raise the awareness of the impact road salt has on drinking water sources and best management practices to help reduce the negative impact”	As mentioned in the previous section, the Committee decided that education and outreach was an appropriate policy tool to use for smaller amounts of exposed road salt (over 10 kilograms). It would not be reasonable to prohibit such small amounts of road salt.	Municipal staff will be required to develop a specific road salt storage education and outreach program.
Waste Policies	The pre-amble and threat summary table was updated.		
W-1	The MECP-implemented prescribed instrument policy was updated to include: “At a minimum, the Prescribed Instrument shall include reference to the applicable source protection vulnerable area and protocols for emergency responses related to protecting the drinking water source.”	Policy W-1 is a prescribed instrument policy that relies on the MECP to manage significant waste threats by reviewing Prescribed Instruments to ensure adequate measures are in place to manage significant drinking water threats. If there are not adequate measures, the MECP is required to amend the Prescribed Instrument to include additional measures to protect drinking water sources. The MECP is required to report annually on the action it has taken to achieve the outcomes of this policy. While the Committee understands that Prescribed Instruments have measures to protect the environment, there has not been enough detailed reporting to ensure that specific measures to protect drinking water	There will be some MECP staff time required to complete this review and update but this additional requirement is justified because it is important that the prescribed Instrument policy is effective in managing specific drinking water threats not just general environmental threats.

		sources are in place or have been added. The Committee felt that a minimum requirement would be to ensure Prescribed Instruments that manage significant threats contain a reference to the applicable source protection vulnerable area and protocols for emergency responses related to protecting drinking water.	
DNAPL and Organic Solvents	The pre-amble was updated to remove the list of circumstances that to be met that determine whether the activity is a significant drinking water threat. The update to the pre-amble also clarifies this applies to intake protection zones or wellhead protection area-E's with a vulnerability score of 9 or higher, and that for wellhead protection areas A-C, these are significant threats regardless of the grade at which handling or storage occurs.	The DNAPL Threat Summary section of the Source Protection Plan states "for practical reasons, DNAPLs present in very small quantities (e.g. Household cosmetics) were not considered significant drinking water threats." DNAPLs can likely be found in most homes and the committee originally decided that it would not be practical to have RMPs for these situations. It is similar for businesses that use incidental amounts of DNAPLs.	No significant impact.
D-1 & D-2	The 'applicable activities' were updated to include the bolded text in the following: "The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid for commercial or industrial use and/or the handling and storage of an organic solvent is an existing significant drinking water threat"	Trent Source Protection Committee approved adding to Policy D-1 "for commercial or industrial use" in the Applicable Activities after "The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid" and "or small incidental quantities" after "e.g. household cosmetics" to clarify what is meant by very small quantities. DNAPLs can be found in most homes and the committee decided that it would not be practical to have RMPs for these situations. However, the current policy text does not make that distinction. By Consensus the Trent Source Protection Committee approved adding for Policy D-1 "for commercial or industrial use" in the Applicable Activities after "The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid".	No significant impact.

Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM) Policies	The Threat Summary section was updated to clarify the definition of NASM, and to add “processed organic waste” to the list of examples. “Biosolids” was also added to the ‘Application’ section.		
N-1(1)	The implementer (previously just OMAFRA) was updated to include MECP. The policy text was amended to include: “At a minimum, the Prescribed Instrument shall include reference to the applicable source protection vulnerable area and protocols for emergency responses related to protecting the drinking water source. “	Policy N-1 originally required OMAFRA to manage existing Category 2 and 3 NASM Threats with Prescribed Instruments. However, MECP does inspections and compliance reviews of some Category 2 and 3 NASM prescribed instruments, so they should be named in Policy N-1(1) as an implementer in Policy N-1 with some addition wording to explain their role.	Work required by MECP in relation to NASM prescribed instruments.
N-1(2)	Policy N-1(2) is a new prescribed instrument policy for OMAFRA, prohibiting the approval for prescribed instruments for NASM prohibited by policy N-2.	Policy N-1 did not address future threats presumably because our N-2 prohibits future Category 2 and 3 NASM. This means OMAFRA could approve a Prescribed Instrument for something that is prohibited by our N-2 Policy (IPZ or WHPA B). So the Committee decided to add a new N-1(2) instructing OMAFRA from not approving any Prescribed Instruments for future NASM that are prohibited by N-2.	No significant impact.
N-2	“except non-farm herbivorous manure” was added to the policy text for N-2.	Policy N-2 prohibits future NASM except for Category 1 NASM. However, manure from non-farm herbivorous animals is Category 1 NASM and should be prohibited. The Committee decided to rectify this situation by changing the policy text to “This policy does not apply for non-agricultural source material listed as Category 1 non-agricultural source material except for non-farm herbivorous manure as per the General Regulation (O. Reg. 267/03) made under the Nutrient Management Act, 2002.	No significant impact.

N-3	The applicable activities were amended to reflect existing threats instead of future threats. The policy text was also amended to substitute non-“agricultural source material” with “herbivorous manure”	Policy N-3 is a Part IV policy that addresses existing Category 1 NASM. However, only manure from non-farm herbivorous animals is a significant threat, so the policy text was amended to reflect that it only applies to manure from non-farm herbivorous animals.	No significant impact.
Snow Storage Policies	<p>Threat summary significantly updated to reflect new technical rules. The storage of snow is now a prescribed drinking water threat under the Clean Water Act, 2006 under two circumstances:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A stormwater drainage system outfall that serves a Snow Disposal Facility. 2) The infiltration or discharge of snowmelt from snow storage on a site where the predominant land use is commercial or industrial, by any means other than a stormwater drainage system outfall. <p>The Applicable Activity section was also amended from just including “snow not stored along the side of a road or as a result of snow plowing”, to “where the snow storage is managed by an Environmental Compliance Approval or a Snow Dump not managed by an Environmental Compliance Approval and contains snow from mixed land uses including Commercial or Industrial”</p>	The updates were made to reflect to the new technical rules. Originally Policy O-1 dealt with any snow storage areas in vulnerable areas where the snow storage would be a significant threat. As a result of the new technical rules, only snow from predominantly commercial or industrial areas or a storm water drainage system outfall that serves as a Snow Disposal Facility, can be considered significant threats. The Committee was concerned about “Snow Dumps” that are not managed by a prescribed instrument. After discussions with the MECP it was agreed that snow dumps could have snow brought from commercial and industrial areas and could therefore be considered a significant threat.	
O-1(1)	The policy text was updated to amend the word “activity” to “snow dump”, and to remove the reference to a time period.	The Committee realized that these limitations exclude a common occurrence in our region. Quite often snow is just moved to an area where	No significant impact.

		<p>is out of the way and can melt. The Committee calls these locations “Snow Dumps”. These are sometimes located in vulnerable areas.</p> <p>The MECP was consulted on this gap and it was determined that because some of the snow being relocated will be from commercial or industrial areas that snow dumps could be significant drinking water threats under the new rules.</p> <p>Therefore, the Committee decided to keep the policies in Policy O-1 but make them specifically for snow dumps.</p>	
O-1(4) & O-1(5)	Two new prescribed instrument policies were added, with MECP as the implementer, for existing and future occurrences of the threat.	These policies were necessary to apply to any snow storage that is managed by a prescribed instrument.	Minor work required by MECP in relation to snow storage prescribed instruments.
O-3(1)	A new Risk Management Plan policy added for snow storage: “The activity is designated for the purpose of section 58 of the Clean Water Act, 2006 for commercial or industrial parking lots greater than 50 parking spaces or 1500 square meters. The risk management plan will be prepared in accordance with the general provisions given in policy G-8.”	A new policy for snow storage was added that will require risk management plans for existing or future significant drinking water threat, where the snow is stored in larger areas in which the predominant land use is Commercial or Industrial.	New Risk Management Plans may be required.
O-3(2)	The committee added a Specify Action Must Conform Policy O-3(2) with the following policy text: “Where the existing and future snow storage on commercial or industrial parking lots or properties is a significant drinking water threat, the Municipality shall develop and initiate an ongoing education and outreach program designed to raise the awareness of the impact snow storage has on drinking water sources and best management practices to help reduce the negative impact.”	This policy will specifically address snow storage threats for smaller commercial and industrial parking lots.	Minimal impact and this can be done in conjunction with the Road Salt Education and Outreach policy.

Aquaculture Policies: Q-3 & Q-4	A new strategic action policy, Q-3, was added for aquaculture, relating to the Stirling Issue Contributing Area, with MRNF as the implementer. The new policy aligns with Prohibition Policy Q-2, stating “MNRF shall not issue aquaculture permits in the Stirling Issues Contributing Area”. A monitoring policy (Q-4) was also added to related to Q-3 to ensure applications for aquaculture licences located in the Stirling Issues Contributing Area are being reported annually.	Policy Q-2 prohibits future aquaculture in the Stirling Issues Contributing Area. The Committee determined that a complementary policy (Q-3) should be added to the Source Protection Plan that would instruct the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry not to issue any permits or licenses for future aquaculture in the Stirling Issues Contributing Area to avoid the inadvertent approval of projects that are prohibited by the Source Protection Plan. The monitoring policy Q-4 was added to ensure applications for aquaculture licences located in the Stirling Issues Contributing Area are being reported annually.	MNRF will need to monitor the issuance of permits or licences in the Stirling Issues Contributing Area.
OT-2(2)	The Committee approved adding the words “or repaired” to Policy OT-2(2) after “decommissioned.” The new policy is to read: “3. Incorporate a condition of approval for the development application(s) that any wells on the subject property that are no longer in use or are substandard are decommissioned or repaired, In accordance with Ontario Regulation 903.”	There may be some circumstances where a well is still necessary so the option to repair was added.	Minimal impact.
Hydrocarbon Pipeline Policies	New Hydrocarbon Pipeline policies were added (HP-1 to HP-9) as a result of the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) revising Ontario Regulation 287/07 in 2017 to include “The establishment and operation of a liquid hydrocarbon pipeline” as a prescribed drinking water threat.	As a result of the 2021 Technical Rule changes, the establishment and operation of hydrocarbon pipelines are now included as prescribed drinking water threats. The Committee had to develop a set of policies to address these significant threats, while also considering that the pipeline industry is already heavily regulated.	See below.
HP-1 to HP-5 (Trent Plan) L-2(1 to 5) Ganaraska Plan	HP-1 to HP-5 are new strategic action policies, with the owner of the pipeline as the implementer (including regulators and approval authorities for HP-3). HP-1: sets out requirements for environmental protection	In 2019, a Trent Conservation Coalition working group was established to consult with regulators and the pipeline companies. The regulators consulted with were the National Energy Board, the Ontario Energy Board and the Technical	More work required by the owners of the pipelines to meet the requirements of policies HP-1 to HP-5.

	<p>programs, emergency management programs and emergency procedure manuals. HP-2: with regard to hydrocarbon pipelines crossing a body of open water this is considered a significant drinking water threat, the pipeline owner is to meet the current industry best practices . HP-3: that source protection authorities be included in the consultation process and be given the opportunity to provide feedback for new pipelines, changes to a pipeline or change in material being transported in a pipeline. HP-4: that the applicable source protection authority is advised of any abandonment or change of use of any pipelines. HP-5: that watercourses in the Lower Trent Source Protection Area, within IPZ 1, IPZ 2 and IPZ 3 with a score of 9 or 10 are to be considered when deciding on valve or equipment placement.</p>	<p>Standards and Safety Authority. Trans-Northern Pipeline Inc. and Enbridge Pipelines Inc. are the owners of the two pipelines in the area. After several meetings with the regulators and owners a draft set of policies were developed to take to the Committee. These policies do not duplicate existing regulations but addressed identified gaps related to protecting the sources of drinking water. The Committee reviewed the draft policies and made some minor suggestions to improve them prior to approving them. The polices focus mostly on emergency response related to the drinking water systems.</p>	
<p>HP-6 (Trent Plan) L-2(6) Ganaraska Plan</p>	<p>HP-6 is a new strategic action policy with Conservation Authorities as the implementer. This policy is to ensure that CAs are to provide the pipeline owners with information on watershed characteristics, flood warnings and statements and other local data for the purposes of source protection.</p>	<p>It is important to provide this information to the pipeline owners because pipelines cross watercourses where flooding and erosion could cause problem for the pipelines.</p>	<p>More work required by applicable Conservation Authorities (Lower Trent and Ganaraska) to communicate this information.</p>
<p>HP-7 (Trent Plan) L-2(7) Ganaraska Plan</p>	<p>HP-7 is a new strategic action policy with the hydrocarbon pipeline regulators as the implementer. It states that “drinking water threats are to be included in inspection programs where a liquid hydrocarbon pipeline or a potential release from a liquid hydrocarbon pipeline would be considered a significant drinking water threat.”</p>	<p>See HP-1 to HP-5 explanation.</p>	<p>Work required by the pipeline regulators to meet the requirements of the policy.</p>

<p>HP-8 (Trent Plan) L-2(8) Ganaraska Plan</p>	<p>HP-8 is a new monitoring policy for Lower Trent and Ganaraska Conservation Authorities to request and report on information from the owner of the pipeline, pertaining to the results of the integrity inspections and significant pipeline maintenance that occurred within vulnerable areas.</p>	<p>See HP-1 to HP-5 explanation.</p>	<p>More work required by applicable Conservation Authorities (Lower Trent and Ganaraska) to communicate this information.</p>
<p>HP-9(Trent Plan) L-2(9) Ganaraska Plan</p>	<p>New policy HP-9 is similar to HP-1 addressed above, however the applicable activities for this policy specifically address moderate and low threats, where HP-1 to HP-8 are for significant threats. This is the only moderate and low threat policy in the plan.</p>	<p>See HP-1 to HP-5 explanation.</p>	<p>More work required by the owners of the pipelines to meet the requirements of the policy.</p>

2023 Trent Conservation Coalition Assessment Reports - Section 36 Amendments

Section	Reason	Change
Table 1 in Intro	Outdated Threat #s	Updated Table – Threat Numbers
Table 2 in Intro	Outdated Threat #s	Updated Table – Threat Numbers
Throughout	Technical Rule 16.3e	“Location Monitoring Wells” to “Monitoring Locations”
Sec. 4.4.2.4.3 & Sec.5.4.2.4.3	Impervious % new mapping methodology	Explanation of methodology added
Section 4.4.3 and 5.4.1.2	Description of Conditions	Updated as per the new Technical Rules
Various sections	New prescribed threat - pipelines	Change 21 prescribed threats to 22
Sec. 5.3.2.28 Sec. 5.4.5	Technical Rules 139 & 141	Removal Millbrook as a condition
Table 4.4-1	Technical rules	Add 22 pipelines
Table 4.4-4	Outdated Threat #s	Update Table – Threat Numbers
Table 5.4-3	Outdated Threat #s	Update Table – Threat Numbers
Sec. 6.2.7	Technical Rule 8	Removal section – Vulnerability scores are no longer assigned for Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas.
Table 6.3.2	Technical Rule 8	Remove bottom two rows because they relate to vulnerability scores for Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas.
Throughout	Technical Rule 8	Vulnerability scores are no longer assigned for Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas.
Throughout	PHASE I Technical Rules	Change “septic system” to “onsite sewage system”
Throughout	Update the Name of the Ministry	“Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change” to “Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks”
Throughout	Population	Numbers updated
Introduction	Committee members	Updated
Throughout	Improvements	Minor editorial changes
Trent Assessment Report only		
Sec. 5.3.4.1	Technical Rule	Description of the new category – WHPA-ICA for the Stirling Drinking Water System
Sec. 5.4.5	Technical Rules- Millbrook Condition	Addition of statement that a “condition” does not exist at Millbrook
Ganaraska Assessment Report Only		
Throughout	Technical Rules – Pipelines	Changed local threats for pipelines to prescribed threats.
Section 4.2	Cobourg IPZ-2	Updated because of increased development
Section 4.2.3	IPZ Vulnerability Assessment	Statement explaining that no changes were made to the vulnerability analysis of the Great Lakes Intakes.

Section 4.3.2.3	Correction	Removed “the most recent Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change”
Section 4.4.4	Updates related to modeling threats	Updates re: Pipelines, Marine Gas Storage and Disinfection Failure at a Wastewater Treatment Plant
Section 5.4.1.1	Correction	Removal of “The Technical Rules describes the requirements under which a Source Protection Committee can add activities to be considered locally as drinking water threats with the appropriate approval by the Director.”
Throughout	Update	Significant threat numbers in text.