

Understanding the Amendments to the Trent Source Protection Plan

Municipal Guidance Document

March 2026

Table of Contents

Source Protection Plan	3
Section 36 Amendments	3
The Technical Rules	3
What Has Changed?	4
Timing of Establishing Risk Management Plans	4
Definitions of Existing and Future	4
Policy G-1(2)	4
Signage	4
Policy G-6(3)	4
Emergency Response Planning	4
Policy G-11(1)	4
Sewage	5
Policy S-3(2)	5
Policy S-3(3b)	6
Policy S-6(1)	6
Policy S-6(2)	6
Policy S-8(2)	6
Policy S-8(3)	6
Policy S-9 and S-10	6
Agriculture	6
Policy A-4(5)	6
Road Salt	7
Application of Road Salt	7
Policy R-1(3)	7
Policy R-1(4)	7
Policy R-1(5)	7
Policy R-1(6)	7
Policy R-1(7)	7
Storage of Road Salt	8
Policy R-5(1)	8
Policy R-5(2)	8
Policy R-6	8
Waste Disposal	8
Dense Non Aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPLs)	8
Snow Storage	9
Policy O-1	9
Policy O-3(2)	9
Transport Pathways	9
Policy OT-2(2)	10
Hydrocarbon Pipelines	10
Policy OT-6(1)	10
Appendix A	11
Appendix B	20

Introduction

Source Protection Plan

The Trent Source Protection Plan was developed under the *Clean Water Act, 2006* and has been in effect since January 1, 2015. It is a science-based plan to manage activities that have been identified in the Assessment Report as significant drinking water threats to municipal drinking water systems. This document was developed for municipalities that are responsible for implementing policies in the Trent Source Protection Plan to ensure that staff and elected officials understand their roles and responsibilities related to implementation of the Source Protection Plan.

This document highlights the changes to the Trent Source Protection Plan resulting from the Amendments under Section 36 of the *Clean Water Act* to ensure compliance with the 2021 Technical Rules and policy updates. Amendments to the Plan that were approved and came into effect on March 9, 2026

The role of the municipality includes the implementation of policies in the Source Protection Plan (SPP), and the appointment of Risk Management Officials and Inspectors. A separate document has been prepared for Risk Management Officials and Inspectors.

Section 36 Amendments

The *Clean Water Act, 2006* provides opportunities to amend Source Protection Plans from time to time to ensure that the Plans remain current and effective. There are four sections of the *Act* that enable amendments to be undertaken. Section 51 of the *Act* enables a Source Protection Committee (SPC) to make minor corrections and updates to the Source Protection Plan. Section 34 enables a Source Protection Authority to propose amendments and are typically initiated as a result of changes to municipal residential drinking water systems, such as the construction of a new well. Section 35 is used when the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) initiates an amendment.

Amendments under Section 36 of the *Act* are made from time to time to update and improve Source Protection Plans and Assessment Reports. This allows a Source Protection Committee to make improvements to policies that have proven to be less effective than expected or to reflect changes to the Technical Rules. The changes are reviewed and approved by the province after an extensive consultation process including public consultation.

The Technical Rules

The Technical Rules under the *Clean Water Act* were updated in 2021. These updates resulted in changes to the circumstances that define significant drinking water threats and activities. The intent of this document is to ensure that municipalities are aware of the changes and their impacts on the implementation of SPP policies.

What Has Changed?

Timing of Establishing Risk Management Plans

The current SPP requires that risk management plans be established within 2 years. This would typically only occur if amendments to the Source Protection Plan or Assessment Report resulted in new existing threats being identified or if the Risk Management Official becomes aware of an existing activity that requires a risk management plan that was previously unknown.

Definitions of Existing and Future

It is important to define what an existing or future activity is, because it can determine if an activity is prohibited or allowed to continue with a risk management plan. Policy G-1(2) was amended to clarify how this is determined, under certain circumstances such as a rotational agricultural activity or an activity in the process of approval through the municipal planning process.

Policy G-1(2)

Policy Text: *An existing significant drinking water threat is defined as the following:*

- *A lawful activity on the property that has occurred prior to the date that the Trent Source Protection Plan or any subsequent amendment takes effect, so long as it continues, and where there is an intention to continue such activity.*
- *An agricultural activity that the Risk Management Official has been able to verify has been part of a regular farm rotation and has occurred at least once within the previous 10 years.*
- *A lawful activity on the property related to a development proposal where an application or amendment was made under the Planning Act, Condominium Act, or Building Code Act, on a day before the source protection plan or any subsequent amendment takes effect, and the approval of the application is pending or has been granted.*
- *A lawful activity on the property that is related to a complete application made for the issuance or amendment of a prescribed instrument on a day before the source protection plan or any subsequent amendment takes effect.*

Signage

Policy G-6(3)

Policy G-6(3) was amended to give municipalities the flexibility to determining the most appropriate location for signage indicating vulnerable zones.

Emergency Response Planning

Policy G-11(1)

Policies OT-1 and G-11 were merged in the Trent Source Protection Plan as they were similar.

In the Trent Source Protection Plan the text of Policy G-11(1) has been updated and expanded to the following:

Municipalities shall update municipal emergency planning documents and any other relevant documentation to identify vulnerable areas where significant drinking water threats could occur and outline reasonable actions to be implemented if an emergency compromises these areas.

Municipalities should ensure they have effective and efficient internal communications protocols and training to ensure that when a spill or emergency event is reported, the correct people within the municipalities are notified as soon as reasonably possible.

Emergency management documents should:

- *Be reviewed annually and updated when notified of changes to the Trent Source Protection Plan.*
- *Include an explanation of the purpose of the “Drinking Water Protection Zone” signs and identify their locations in the municipality within the vulnerable areas.*

Sewage

The 2021 Technical Rules clarified the definitions of sewage threats and septic systems are now referred to as onsite sewage works.

For storm water management facilities and drainage system outfalls, the quality of the storm water (type of contaminants) now depends on the types of land uses that drain into the facility and the size of the impervious surface areas that generate the runoff transported through storm sewers or other transport pathways. The threat circumstances in the Technical Rules have been amended to use the percentage of impervious surface areas and the type of land uses to evaluate risks for Intake Protection Zones and Wellhead Protection Areas with various vulnerability scores.

In addition, the province’s effort to streamline approvals for low-risk sewage and storm water infrastructure through introducing Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals impacts SPP policies. The CLI approach replaces the requirement for an individual Environmental Compliance Approval for each system, with one approval for all low-risk municipal sanitary sewage collection systems and one approval for all low-risk municipal storm water management systems. Built into this new approval process are requirements to address source protection concerns. These include specific design criteria, reporting, operational and maintenance minimum requirements.

The following policy amendments were made to address the changes to the Technical Rules and the introduction of Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals.

Policy S-3(2)

This policy previously prohibited future sewage activities that are significant drinking water threats. It has been amended to exempt low risk systems that qualify for Consolidated Linear Infrastructure preauthorization.

Policy S-3(3b)

A new monitoring policy has been added that requires municipalities to report annually if future activities are preauthorized for a Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approval. The report will include terms and conditions in the approval that protect drinking water.

Policy S-6(1)

This policy was revised to reflect that emergency plans are already in place now, and need to be kept current. An example of pumping stations was also added to the text of the policy to help explain what is included in a system failure.

Policy S-6(2)

This monitoring policy was revised to include annual reporting on Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals.

Policy S-8(2)

This policy was revised to reflect that a stormwater management facility maintenance program is already in place.

Policy S-8(3)

This monitoring policy was revised to include Consolidated Linear Infrastructure.

Policy S-9 and S-10

These policies were revised to address storm water management facilities that are significant drinking water threats and do not require a Prescribed Instrument, and the *Building Code Act*, 1992 does not apply to the system.

Policy S-9 requires risk management plans for existing activities in the WHPA-A. Future activities are exempt except in a Wellhead Protection Area A where future activities would be prohibited by Policy S-10.

Agriculture

Policy A-4(5)

The 2021 Technical Rules consider all pesticides as potential significant threats, not just certain chemicals. As a result, the application, handling and storage of small quantities of household pesticides are exempted from Policies A-1 and A-4 and instead rely on a specific Education and Outreach Program to manage these threats. This program needs to be developed, delivered on an ongoing basis and updated regularly because it is the only tool managing these smaller quantities of pesticides in vulnerable areas. Municipalities may delegate the responsibility to deliver an education and outreach program to their local Conservation Authority.

Road Salt

Road salt is an increasing concern across the province. There are changes in the 2021 Technical Rules related to road salt application and storage, which may result in an increased number of significant threats in vulnerable areas related to these activities.

Application of Road Salt

Several new policies aimed at the municipalities have been added to manage road salt application.

Policy R-1(3)

For roads, pedestrian pathways, sidewalks and parking lots owned by municipalities, this new policy was added requiring municipalities to prepare, review and update their salt management plan to ensure compliance with the current Environment Canada Code of Practice for the Environmental Management of Road Salts and Transportation Association of Canada documents. This activity previously required a risk management plan.

Policy R-1(4)

This new policy requires the municipality to develop and deliver an ongoing education and outreach program for road salt application on privately owned properties where road salt application is a significant threat, to raise the awareness of the impact of road salt on drinking water sources and provide best management practices.

Policy R-1(5)

This new discretionary policy encourages the municipality to monitor sodium and chloride levels in raw water at the water treatment plant during spring runoff and melt periods to determine the impact of road salt on the drinking water system. This will help to determine trends in sodium and chloride in the water. This is particularly important for municipal intakes because surface water can easily be contaminated during these runoff periods.

Policy R-1(6)

This new discretionary policy asks municipalities to consider design criteria for future parking lots and sidewalks that would reduce the requirements and impacts of road salt based on current best management practices.

Policy R-1(7)

This new monitoring policy requires municipalities to report annually on the implementation of the new policies related to road salt application.

Storage of Road Salt

The 2021 Technical Rules have reduced the amount of road salt storage that can be a significant drinking water threat from 500 tons or greater to as low as 10 kilograms. As a result, the road salt storage policies have been amended.

Policy R-5(1)

This is a new policy requiring municipalities to set and enforce standards for the storage of road salt in quantities over 100 kg. to prevent the exposure or potential exposure of stored road salt to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snow melt. Municipalities are encouraged to consider a by-law for this, and a sample is included in Appendix B.

Policy R-5(2)

This new monitoring policy relates to Policy R-5(1) and explains the Annual Reporting requirements.

Policy R-6

This new policy requires the municipality to develop and deliver an ongoing education and outreach program to address smaller quantities of road salt storage. It should be targeted in areas where the smaller quantities are significant drinking water threats but could also be expanded to other areas.

Waste Disposal

The waste disposal threats have been amended to clarify the risk associated with each threat and align with the *Environmental Protection Act*.

The policies in the Source Protection Plan related to waste disposal were revised to clarify the definitions, and improve how the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks manages waste threats.

Dense Non Aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPLs)

The DNAPL policies did not change significantly but the 2021 Technical Rules list types of business that typically use DNAPLs instead of listing chemicals in the tables of circumstances.

The Applicable Activities for the DNAPL policies were modified as the policies only apply to commercial and industrial activities. Household quantities are exempt from the Part IV policies and will instead be addressed through education and outreach.

Snow Storage

The 2021 Technical Rules only consider snow from predominantly commercial or industrial areas or a storm water drainage system outfall that serves as a Snow Disposal Facility, as significant threats. In the Trent Source Protection Region, snow is often moved to an area for storage where it will eventually melt referred to as “snow dumps”. These typically do not have Environmental Compliance Approvals but may be located in vulnerable areas. In consultation with MECP, it was determined that because a significant portion of the snow being relocated is likely from commercial or industrial areas, they could be considered significant drinking water threats under the new rules.

Policy O-1

This policy directs municipalities to assess the feasibility of relocating snow dumps to locations outside vulnerable areas. A risk management plan is required if the snow dump cannot be relocated outside the vulnerable area.

Policy O-3(2)

Policy O-3(2) requires the municipality to develop and deliver an education and outreach program designed to raise awareness of the impact snow storage on drinking water sources and best management practices. Municipalities may delegate the responsibility to deliver an education and outreach program to their local Conservation Authority.

Transport Pathways

A transport pathway is a human-made feature on the landscape that can redirect the natural flow of water to increase the rate or quantity of flow to a drinking water intake or well and can include ditches, wells and excavations.

Municipalities are responsible for notifying the Source Protection Committee when reviewing development applications where Transport Pathways may be created or expanded.

Ontario Regulation 287/07 (under the *Clean Water Act*) contains the following notification requirements pertaining to transport pathways:

27 (3) If a person applies to a municipality for approval of a proposal to engage in an activity in a wellhead protection area or a surface water intake protection zone that may result in the creation of a new transport pathway or the modification of an existing transport pathway, the municipality shall give the source protection authority and the source protection committee notice of the proposal and shall include a description of the proposal, the identity of the person responsible for the proposal and a description of the approvals the person requires to engage in the proposed activity.

Transport Pathways can impact both wellhead protection areas and intake protection zones. The mandatory notification is required because an activity that modifies or creates a transport pathway may affect groundwater vulnerability, which can increase the vulnerability score within a Wellhead Protection Area or the size and shape of an Intake Protection Zone.

It is important to determine if a transport pathway will result in an increased vulnerability score in a Wellhead Protection Area. The vulnerability score in a WHPA-A is always the maximum score of 10. Where a Wellhead Protection Area B is located in a highly vulnerable aquifer, the vulnerability score will also be the maximum score of 10. This situation occurs throughout Ontario. Although a maximum vulnerability score of 10 cannot be increased, the creation of a transport pathway could result in an increased risk to drinking water sources. This is because transport pathways can result in contaminants from land-based activities in surface water or runoff to reach groundwater more easily. This highlights the importance of reviewing the potential for increased risk/vulnerability, and not just the potential increase in vulnerability score.

Policy OT-2(2)

Additional measures to address transport pathways were added to this policy by expanding the applicable area outside the WHPA- A and IPZ-1.

Within Wellhead Protection Areas B and C, E (E with a score of 8 or 9) and Intake Protection Zones 2 (with a vulnerability Score of 8 or higher), the municipality shall:

- Consult with the Source Protection Authority to determine the impact of the proposal to create a transport pathway.
- Require the proponent to demonstrate that the municipal water supply is not endangered including identification of best management practices to be implemented.
- Incorporate a condition of approval for development applications that any wells on the subject property that are no longer in use or are substandard be decommissioned or repaired in accordance with Ontario Regulation 903.

The municipality will also:

- Prohibit future earth energy systems in a WHPA A.
- Require a qualified hydrogeologist to oversee the design and installation of new earth energy systems in a WHPA B.
- Keep records of the location, size and design of new earth energy systems within the Wellhead Protection Areas.

Hydrocarbon Pipelines

The 2021 Technical Rules include hydrocarbon pipelines as significant drinking water threat. New policies were created to address the new threats and identify pipeline companies as the implementing body

Policy OT-6(1)

New Policy OT-6(1) includes a variety of implementing bodies including municipalities. This is a discretionary policy that recommends collaboration of various stakeholders, including municipalities, to evaluate spills in tributaries outside of the 2-hour time of travel (IPZ 2) and the impact of any such spills on municipal drinking water systems.

Appendix A

Municipality – Changes to Relevant Implemented Policies

Policy Number	New Policy Text – Text Shown in Red Indicates Changes	Impact
G-1(2) Policy re-written	An existing significant drinking water threat is defined as the following: a) A lawful activity on the property that has occurred prior to the date that the Trent Source Protection Plan or any subsequent amendment takes effect, so long as it continues, and where there is an intention to continue such activity. b) An agricultural activity¹ that the Risk Management Official has been able to verify has been part of a regular farm rotation and has occurred at least once within the previous 10 years. c) A lawful activity on a property related to a development proposal where a complete application or amendment was made under the Planning Act, Condominium Act, or Building Code Act, on a day before the source protection plan or any subsequent amendment takes effect, and the approval of the application is pending or has been granted. d) A lawful activity on the property that is related to a complete application made for the issuance or amendment of a prescribed instrument on a day before the source protection plan or any subsequent amendment takes effect.	The original G-1(2) and G-1(3) were meant to explain the definition of an existing activity, particularly when an activity was in the process of being approved or was a rotational agricultural activity not occurring every year. The Committee simplified and combined these two policies into one policy (G-1(2)) and clarified the intent.
G-6(3)	Purchase, install, and maintain the signs designed by the province in collaboration with the applicable source protection authorities. Municipalities shall determine the location of the signs. Where feasible, the signs will be	This policy was modified to allow more flexibility in determining the appropriate location of the source water road signs.

	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.	
G-7(2)	Land uses that include the following activities are not permitted where these activities would be a future significant drinking water threat, unless stated otherwise in this source protection plan: a) 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 b) The application or storage of agricultural source material; c) The management of agricultural source material (i.e., aquaculture); d) The application, handling, or storage of non-agricultural source material; e) The application, handling, or storage of commercial fertilizer; f) The application, handling, or storage of pesticide; g) The handling or storage of road salt; h) The storage of snow; i) The handling or storage of fuel; j) The handling or storage of a dense non aqueous phase liquid; k) The handling or storage of an organic solvent; or l) The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard. Footnote: The following policies relate to section 57 (prohibition) of the <i>Clean Water Act</i>: G-1(1-2,4); A-4(1); F-1; R-6; D-2; N-2; O-2; Q-2; and W-4(1).	This is a definition policy that previously omitted waste disposal site as being subject to prohibition. That was corrected because some future waste disposal sites are subject to a prohibition policy (W-4(1)).

G-11(1)	Municipalities shall update municipal emergency planning documents and any other relevant documentation to identify vulnerable areas where significant drinking water threats could occur and outline reasonable actions to be implemented if an emergency situation compromises these areas. Municipalities should ensure they have effective and efficient internal communications protocols and training on these protocols to ensure that when a spill or emergency event is reported, the correct people within the municipalities are notified as soon as reasonably possible. Emergency management documents should: - Be reviewed annually and when notified of changes to the Trent Source Protection Plan, then updated as necessary. - Include an explanation of the purpose of the “Drinking Water Protection Zone” signs and identify their locations within the vulnerable areas.	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. 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 G11 policies. The Ganaraska Source Protection Authority wanted to keep the status quo in terms of these two policies because of concerns related to the 4001 and pipeline corridors cross the Ganaraska area.
S-3(2)	Except for low-risk systems that qualify for Consolidated Linear Infrastructure preauthorization, all other future occurrences of the activity are prohibited. This does not apply for an activity that meets the conditions of Policy S-3(1).	As a result of the 2021 Technical Rules, the sewage threat subcategories have changed for sewage threats. Another consideration that needed to be contemplated was the introduction of Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approval for low-risk sewage facilities. These approvals are still considered Prescribed Instruments. Policies S-3(1) and S-3(2) were meant to restrict future sewage facilities that would be high risk threats to drinking water. 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.
S-3(3b) (new sub-policy)	Where a proposed future activity is preauthorized for a Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approval, the municipality shall prepare, by February 1 each year, a report a summary of terms and conditions in any Consolidated	The Municipalities should report on terms and conditions in any Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals for future systems. Policy S-3(3b) was added as a monitoring policy to provide this information through Annual Reporting.

	Linear Infrastructure Approvals that are protecting drinking water and make that report available to the applicable Source Protection Authority.	
S-6(1) Policy change	~~Within two years~~ Ensure that there is a current emergency response plan in place that is suitable to respond to a system failure (i.e pumping stations) that could result in the introduction of pathogens into surface water or groundwater.	This policy was updated because the 2 year time period was intended for the beginning of the program in 2015 but now all emergency response plans have been updated, so it is no longer needed. The policy now requires that emergency response plans stay current.
S-6(2)	The municipality shall prepare, by February 1 each year, an annual summary of the actions it has taken to achieve the outcomes of the source protection plan policies and make that report available to the applicable Source Protection Authority. Recommended contents of the report include, but are not limited to: a) Updates or amendments to the plan; b) A summary of training undertaken in support of the plan; and c) A summary of incidents that required the use of the emergency response plan. d) A summary of terms and conditions in any Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals that are protecting drinking water.	A new clause was added to this monitoring policy requiring that municipalities additionally report on terms and conditions in any Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals for future systems.
S-6(3) Policy change	~~Within one year,~~ Prioritize any maintenance and asset management activities to ensure that facilities located in vulnerable areas are given adequate priority.	This policy was updated because the one year time period was intended for the beginning of the program in 2015 but now the initial prioritization has been completed, so it is no longer needed.
S-8(1)	~~This policy was removed.~~	This policy became redundant because the amended Policy S-32 now achieves the same result.
S-8(2)	~~Develop and implement a stormwater management program within two years.~~ Ensure a stormwater management facility maintenance program is in place. The program will require regular inspection of stormwater management facilities to ensure that they are being sufficiently maintained such that the facility is not a significant drinking water threat.	There was a slight text adjustment to Policy S-8(2) because the original text reflects actions to be taken when the Source Protection Plan was first approved for initial stages of implementation in 2015. The update aligns the policy with the current phase of ongoing implementation and does not change the intent of the policy.
S-8(3)	The municipality shall prepare, by February 1 each year, an annual summary of the actions it has taken to achieve the	This monitoring policy was amended to include annual reporting related to the new Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals.

	outcomes of the source protection plan policies and make that report available to the applicable Source Protection Authority. Recommended contents of the report include, but are not limited to: a) A summary of activities undertaken as part of the maintenance program for the preceding calendar year. b) A summary of terms and conditions in any Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Approvals that are protecting drinking water.	
A-4(5) – New Policy	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.	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” and agreed to create a new policy A-4(5), requiring municipalities to develop and initiate an 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.
R-1(3) – New Policy	Where the existing and future application of road salt on roads, pedestrian paths, sidewalks and parking lots owned or maintained by the Municipality is a significant drinking water threat, the Municipality shall prepare or, review and update their salt management plan to ensure compliance with the most up-to-date Environment Canada’s Code of Practice for the Environmental Management of Road Salts and Transportation Association of Canada documents.	In the original Source Protection Plan municipalities needed a risk management plan for road salt application. As most municipalities have salt management plans it was decided that the policy should be changed so that those plans manage the drinking water threats and that these plans follow recognized standards.
R-1(4) – New Policy	Where the existing and future application of road salt on privately owned roads, 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 awareness of the impact road salt has on drinking water sources and best management practices to help reduce the negative impact.	The municipalities must develop and carry out an ongoing education and outreach program for road salt application in areas where road salt application would be a significant drinking water threat.
R-1(5) – New Policy	The Municipality is encouraged to monitor sodium and chloride levels in raw water at the water treatment plant	This is a non-legally binding policy that suggests municipalities should test raw water at the water treatment plant for sodium and chloride

	during spring runoff and melt periods to determine the impact of road salt on the drinking water system.	during periods of peak runoff and snow melt to determine the impact of road during these times. This is particularly important where the source is surface water.
R-1(6) – New Policy	Municipal planners should consider design criteria for future parking lots and sidewalks that would reduce the requirements and impacts of road salt based on current best management practices.	This is a non-legally binding policy that recommends the amount of road salt getting into the drinking water source could be reduced by using design criteria and best management practices in plans for new parking lots and sidewalks.
R-1(7) – New Policy	The municipality shall prepare, by February 1 each year, an annual summary of the actions it has taken to achieve the outcomes of the source protection plan policies and make that report available to the applicable Source Protection Authority. Recommended contents of the report include, but are not limited to: c) A summary of activities undertaken to prepare and update their salt management plans d) A summary of activities undertaken to deliver the education and outreach program related to road salt e) Any water quality data related to sodium and chloride in the raw water at the water treatment plant.	This is a new monitoring policy requiring annual reporting for the newly added road salt policies that the municipalities must implement.
R-5(1) – Municipality now implementer	Set and enforce standards for road salt storage over 100 kg. that would prevent the exposure or potential exposure of road salt to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snow melt.	This Policy would probably be accomplished through the adoption of a bylaw. A sample bylaw is provided in Appendix B.
R-5(2) – New monitoring policy	The municipality shall prepare, by February 1 each year, an annual summary of the actions it has taken to achieve the outcomes of Policy R-5(1) and make that report available to the applicable Source Protection Authority.	This is a new monitoring policy requiring annual reporting specific to Policy R-5(1).
R-6 – Municipality now implementer	Where the existing and future storage of road salt is greater than 10 kg and is exposed to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or runoff, or greater than 100 kg and is potentially exposed to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snowmelt, the Municipality shall develop and initiate an ongoing education and outreach program designed to raise the awareness of the impact road salt has	The municipalities must develop and carry out an ongoing education and outreach program for road salt storage in areas where road salt storage would be a significant drinking water threat.

	on drinking water sources and best management practices to help reduce the negative impact.	
W-2(2)	~~The use of land for waste disposal is prohibited.~~ ~~Future occurrences of the activity are prohibited.~~	The language in this policy was improved but it does not change the intended effect.
D-1 and D-2	The Applicable Activities text was amended so that it is clear that these policies apply to commercial and industrial use, not household use.	This change was a clarification and does not alter the intent of the original policy.
O-1(1)	Assess the feasibility of relocating the activity ~~Snow Dump~~ to a site where it would not be a significant drinking water threat ~~within one year~~ . If an appropriate alternate site is identified, the activity will be relocated to the alternate site ~~within two years~~ .	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 realized that these limitations exclude a common occurrence in our region. Quite often snow is just moved to an area where it is out of the way and can melt. The Committee calls these locations “Snow Dumps”. These are sometimes located in vulnerable areas. 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. Therefore, the Committee decided to keep the policies in Policy O-1 but make them specifically for snow dumps. At the same time, a Prescribed Instrument Policy was added to address storm water drainage system outfalls that serve as Snow Disposal Facilities.
O-3(2) – New Policy	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.	The new policy O-3(1) now requires risk management plans for parking lots or yards greater than 50 spaces or 1,500 square metres. Policy O-3(2) requires the municipality to develop and initiate an 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 approach would be in line with other proposed amendments that rely on education and outreach, such as road salt application with lots fewer than 50 parking spots.
OT-2(2) Policy rewritten	Municipalities shall give the source protection authority and the source protection committee notice of the transport pathway proposals in a WHPA or IPZ as per Section 27(3) of O. Reg. 287/07.	In WHPA-A or IPZ-1, the municipality will not approve any proposal to create a new transport pathway unless the application includes a statement from a qualified person stating that the proposal will not significantly increase the vulnerability of the municipal water source

	For any municipal approvals for the construction of Transport Pathways within WHPA A or IPZ 1, the municipality shall not approve any proposals unless the application includes a statement from a qualified person stating that the proposal will not significantly increase the vulnerability of the municipal water source to being contaminated by land-based activities as identified in the source protection plans. The statement from the qualified person and any background information may be subject to review by a third party peer review. Prior to approving any applications for the construction of Transport Pathways within WHPA B and C, E (E with a score of 8 or 9) and IPZ 2 (with a vulnerability Score of 8 or higher), the municipality shall: 1. Consult with the SPA prior to approving any applications to determine the impact on the vulnerable area (including changes to the delineation or vulnerability score of the WHPA or IPZ that would require amendments to the Assessment Report and or Source Protection Plan). 2. Require the proponent of development applications to demonstrate that the municipal water supply is not endangered including what best management practices would be used to mitigate any adverse effects of proposed transport pathway. 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 in accordance with Ontario Regulation 903. For Earth Energy (Geothermal) Systems, in addition to their role under the <i>Building Code Act</i>, municipalities are strongly encouraged to require additional measures to ensure that new earth energy systems within Wellhead Protection Areas do not endanger the raw water supply of a municipal drinking water system. The municipality should: - In WHPA A, prohibit all types of earth energy systems.	to being contaminated by land-based activities. This is similar to the original policy. Additional measures were added to address transport pathways. Within Wellhead Protection Areas B,C, and E (E with a score of 8 or 9) and Intake Protection Zones 2 (with a vulnerability Score of 8 or higher), the municipality shall: - Consult with the Source Protection Authority to determine the impact of the proposal for a new transport pathway. - Require the proponent to demonstrate that the municipal water supply is not endangered including any best management practices. - Requiring the decommissioning of any unused well or repair of any substandard wells on the subject property, as per Ontario regulation 903. The municipality will also: - Prohibit future earth energy systems in a WHPA A. - Require a qualified hydrogeologist to oversee the design and installation of new earth energy systems in a WHPA B. - Keep records of the location, size and design of new earth energy systems within the Wellhead Protection Areas.
--	--	---

	- In WHPA B, require a qualified hydrogeologist oversee the design and installation of new earth energy systems (with the exception of horizontal closed looped systems) to ensure that the construction meets the requirements of the <i>Ontario Building Code</i> and will not result in the contamination of the groundwater. - Keep records of the location, size and design of new earth energy systems within the Wellhead Protection Areas. For any other municipal approvals for the construction of Transport Pathways within WHPA A, B and C, E (for E with a score of 8 or 9) and IPZ 1 and 2 (with a vulnerability score of 8 or higher), the municipality shall consult with the SPA prior to approving any applications to determine the impact on the vulnerable area (WHPA or IPZ) and to determine what best management practices would be required in the design to mitigate any adverse effects of proposed transport pathway. ~~In a WHPA A or IPZ 1, establish a bylaw prohibiting the approval of a proposal to engage in an activity that will result in the creation of a new transport pathway (including geothermal heating systems).³~~ ~~This bylaw must be established within one year.~~	
OT-6(1) – New Policy	Parks Canada, the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, municipalities, and conservation authorities are encouraged to evaluate spills in tributaries outside of vulnerable areas and their impact on municipal drinking water systems.	This is a non-legally binding policy that calls for collaboration of various stakeholders to evaluate spills in tributaries outside of the 2 hour time of travel (IPZ 2) and the impact of any such spills on municipal drinking water systems.

A Guidance Document for Risk Management Officials includes the details of changes related to Part IV Policies.

Appendix B

Sample Road Salt Storage Bylaw (DRAFT)

In the following areas:

All WHPA As

WHPA B 10

IPZ/WHPA E 9/10

Whereas improperly stored road salt in areas exposed to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snow melt, in a vulnerable area identified in the Trent Assessment Report under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, where road salt storage would be a significant drinking water threat, can negatively impact surface and ground water drinking water sources;

And whereas the Trent Source Protection Plan, Policy R-5(1) under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, requires municipalities to set and enforce standards for road salt storage in quantities over 100 kilograms to prevent the exposure or potential exposure of stored road salt to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snow melt when that storage is in a vulnerable area identified in the Trent Assessment Report where road salt storage would be a significant threat;

Now therefore the Council of XXXXXXXX enacts the following:

That in areas where road salt storage would be a significant drinking water threats, uncovered or uncontained road salt storage in quantities greater than 100 kilograms is not permitted;

And that in areas where road salt storage would be a significant drinking water threat, any road salt stored in quantities greater than 100 kilograms, that is stored in a container, building, shed, or dome or covered in any manner such as a tarp, is done in a manner that does not allow road salt to runoff into surface water or infiltrate groundwater;

And that any container, structure or cover used to store road salt in quantities greater than 100 kg. must be maintained or replaced if it is not preventing road salt from running off into surface water or infiltrate into groundwater.