



## South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region

### Agenda

#### Source Protection Committee Meeting SPC-02-2025

Thursday, June 12, 2025

1:00 – 4:00 pm

To be held virtually by Zoom video conference – [Zoom Link](#)

#### Members

Lynn Dollin, Chair

#### Municipal

Chris Gerrits, Jeff Hamelin, Katie Thompson, Michelle Flaherty, Michelle Jakobi, Jennifer Best, Tom Bradley

#### Economic/Development

Colin Elliott, John Hemsted, Amanda Kellett, David Ketcheson, Jessica Neto, Rick Newlove, David Ritchie

#### Public Sector

Geoff Allen, Peter Dance, Bob Duncanson, Stephanie Hobbs, Cate Root, Karen Koornneef

#### First Nations

Vacant

#### Liaisons

Karen Kivilahti, Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit (SMDHU)  
Don Goodyear, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA)  
Julie Cayley, Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA)  
Jennifer Vincent, Liaison, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA)  
Laura Collings, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP)

#### Staff

Bill Thompson, LSRCA	Ian Ockenden, NVCA
Mystaya Touw, LSRCA	Sheri Steiginga, NVCA
Kathy Hillis, LSRCA (minutes)	Melissa Carruthers, SSEA

#### Guests

Christina Wieder, York Region Public Health Branch  
Shelly Cuddy, Durham Region  
Jenee Wallace, SMDHU

#### Regrets

Tom Kurtz, Public Sector

1. **Welcome and Opening Remarks**

- a) Tom Bradley, new SPC Member
- b) Jennifer Vincent, new Liaison, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority

2. **Roll Call**

3. **Acknowledgement of Indigenous Territory**

4. **Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and Conflict of Interest**

5. **Approval of the Agenda**

**Pages 1-4**

**Recommended:** **That** the agenda for the Thursday, June 12, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as presented.

6. **Adoption of Minutes**

**Pages 5-12**

**Recommended:** **That** the minutes of the Thursday, April 10, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as circulated.

7. **Announcements**

- a) Chair

8. **Deputations**

There are none

9. **Presentations**

- a) A presentation by Mystaya Touw, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority regarding Official Planning & Source Water: An Update.

**Recommended:** **That** presentation a) regarding Official Planning & Source Water: An Update be received for information.

- b) A presentation by Bill Thompson, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority regarding item SPC2.3 - Policies for the storage of waste biomass.

**Recommended:** **That** presentation b) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Policies for the storage of waste biomass be received for information; and

**Further That** the Source Protection Committee adopt the recommended new policies to manage the threats of the storage of waste biomass; and

**Further That** staff be directed to incorporate the new policies in the draft amendment to the Source Protection Plan, Under Section 36 of the Clean Water Act.

c) A discussion regarding the role of the Source Protection Committee.

**Recommended:** **That** the discussion on the role of the Source Protection Committee be received for information.

**10. Determination of Items Requiring Separate Discussion**

(Reference Agenda Items on page 4 of the Agenda)

**11. Adoption of Items Not Requiring Separate Discussion**

**Recommended:** **That** the recommendations as set forth in the items not requiring separate discussion be approved, and staff be authorized to take all necessary actions to affect those recommendations.

**12. Consideration of Items Requiring Separate Discussion**

**13. Other Business**

**14. Closed Session**

**15. Next Meeting and Adjournment**

The next meeting of the Source Protection Committee is scheduled to be held on October 16, 2025 at the Churchill Banquet Hall.

## **Agenda Items**

### **1. Correspondence**

There are none

### **2. Staff Reports**

#### **SPC2.1 - Updated Threats Enumeration – Section 36 Amendment Pages 13-15**

**That** Staff Report SPC2.1 regarding Updated Threats Enumeration – Section 36 Amendment be received for information.

#### **SPC2.2 - Policies for the storage of waste biomass Pages 16-19**

**That** presentation b) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Policies for the storage of waste biomass be received for information; and

**Further That** the Source Protection Committee adopt the recommended new policies to manage the threats of the storage of waste biomass; and

**Further That** staff be directed to incorporate the new policies in the draft amendment to the Source Protection Plan, Under Section 36 of the Clean Water Act.



## South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region

### Source Protection Committee (SPC)

#### Minutes of Meeting SPC-01-2025

April 10, 2025

The Chair called the meeting to order at 1:03pm.

#### Members Present:

Lynn Dollin, Chair

#### Municipal

Chris Gerrits, Jeff Hamelin, Katie Thompson, Michelle Flaherty, Michelle Jakobi, Jennifer Best

#### Economic/Development

Colin Elliott, John Hemsted, Amanda Kellett, David Ketcheson, Jessica Neto, Rick Newlove, David Ritchie

#### Public Sector

Geoff Allen, Peter Dance, Bob Duncanson, Stephanie Hobbs, Cate Root, Karen Koornneef

#### First Nations

Vacant

#### Liaisons

Don Goodyear, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA)

Ian Ockenden, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA)

#### Staff Present

Bill Thompson, LSRCA

Mystaya Touw, LSRCA

Kathy Hillis, LSRCA (minutes)

Sheri Steiginga, NVCA

Melissa Carruthers, SSEA

#### Guests

Shelly Cuddy, Durham Region

Tom Bradley, York Region

Rachel Blackwell, Simcoe Muskoka District  
Health Unit (SMDHU)

#### Regrets:

Tom Kurtz, Public Sector

Julie Cayley, Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA)

## 1. Welcome & Opening Remarks

The Chair introduced new Member Karen Koornneef.

## 2. Land Acknowledgement

The Chair recited the Acknowledgement of Indigenous Territory.

## 3. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and Conflict of Interest

None declared.

## 4. Approval of Agenda

Moved by: John Hemsted

Seconded by: Stephanie Hobbs

SPC-01-25      **Resolved That** the agenda for the April 10, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee (SPC) be approved as presented. **Carried**

## 5. Adoption of Minutes

Moved by: Cate Root

Seconded by: Rick Newlove

SPC-02-25      **Resolved That** the minutes of the October 10, 2024 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as amended. **Carried**

## 6. Announcements

There were none.

## 7. Deputations

There were none.

## 8. Presentations

- a) A presentation by Bill Thompson, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, on Source Protection Committee: the year to come.

Link to the presentation – [Source Protection Committee: the year to come](#)

Bill will advise all Members next week whose term is ending this year and explain the process.

## QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Peter Dance: Have concern about updating of Well Head Protection Areas. Rather than settling into something that is basically administered by staff, how does the Committee think about bringing recommendations forward to be proactive and what will the mechanism be?

Bill responded that the Ministry heard from a number of source protection authority staff with concerns so they are outlining a process to update technical aspects. This will hopefully be reinvigorated now that the provincial election is over. We have still have a vacancy for a hydrogeologist which limits our ability to work on this. If the Committee would like other items added to agendas, they can do so and staff will support as they are able. Lynn advised that the source protection committee chairs meeting was pushed due to the election and has yet to be rescheduled.

Moved by: Peter Dance  
Seconded by: Rick Newlove

SPC-03-25      **Resolved That** presentation a) on Source Protection Committee: the year to come be received for information. **Carried**

b) A presentation by Mystaya Touw, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, regarding Staff Report SPC2.1 – Annual Report on Plan Implementation (to December 31, 2024).

Link to the presentation – [Annual Report on Plan Implementation \(to December 31, 2024\)](#)

The following numbers have been updated from the staff report due to new septic systems being added as Threats and the percent of total inspections calculated reflecting all of round 3 rather than just those completed in 2024:

- An estimated 2,132 require inspection each 5 years
- 835 3rd round inspections completed (39%)

## QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Geoff Allen: When will Clearview and Springwater septic inspections begin?

Mystaya advised that it is 3<sup>rd</sup> round inspections that have yet to begin. Many municipalities have planned to conduct them in 2025/26. Mystaya will refer to the notes submitted on the dates for Clearview and Springwater and will advise Geoff.

Lynn Dollin: When are they due?

Mystaya advised it is five years from when it was last inspected.

Amanda Kellett: Some municipalities have yet to start their zoning bylaw updates. What is the status of these updates?

Mystaya advised Springwater has not yet started, and their official plan amendment is still in progress. Jennifer Best advised that a lot of municipalities have an upper tier municipality and they are waiting on growth management numbers since the province introduced a number of changes, and this results in a delay in at the official plan stage, and when you get your official plan done the next thing that comes is zoning. Any updates to source protection policies will be captured in the official plan, and once that is approved will move into the zoning bylaw.

Peter Dance: If the official plans and zoning bylaws are updated so that people could check a map, that would help people know what applies to their property, and deal with some of the difficult issues that come to the Committee. Are there workarounds that can help push the municipalities forward with source protection policy issues? Peter has requested an update at the next meeting on where we may have some options for workarounds and/or send a letter to municipalities to indicate the importance.

Chris Gerrits: Doing a lot of work to protect water resources but there is a piece of federal land in the middle that is unprotected. Perhaps advocate for inclusion of federal lands in the process. First Nations groups are following similar requirements.

Bill advised that the Ministry previously reached out to National Defence for inclusion of lands such as Base Borden but conversations fell off the table. It is worth revisiting. Lynn commented that this is similar to the work we have done in engaging with First Nations, but the federal government does not seem as interested in voluntarily participating. Bill advised that the province has established best practices for source protection for non-municipal systems where people want to opt in, and we have been working with Beausoleil First Nations on these voluntary packages. If National Defence is interested the province would likely be interested in making this another example of cooperation. Bill asked if anyone has a connection at National Defence to advise him. John Hemsted commented that this is not dissimilar to the federal airport lands. There are two wells at the Central Regional Airport servicing Oro-Medonte and various municipal storage plants to the north of that with flow travelling under the airport. The municipality does a great job of managing the systems but we do not know anything about the flow under federal lands. Lynn advised she is the Vice Chair of the Lake Simcoe Regional Airport. Ian Ockenden will approach his contact at Base Borden to see if they are doing anything to protect the Well Head Protection Area. David Ketcheson advised that it was a test site for putting DNAPLs into the environment, in a contained manner, which yielded interesting results.

Colin Elliott: When is Springwater starting the 5-year cycle of septic inspections?

Katie advised some is this summer and some is next summer. Katie to find out dates and advise Colin.



David Ketcheson: How much more are we finding out on these 5-year cycles after we have identified problems in the 1<sup>st</sup> round? Is there a need to rectify that if there are not a lot of problems; is money being spent well?

Bill reviewed the results of the 1<sup>st</sup> vs 2<sup>nd</sup> round and the results were not very different. Bill did not expect the results to be so similar, so the question will be what will the results of the 3<sup>rd</sup> round look like?

Katie Thompson: Looking to the future with new systems coming online and looking at the ABCD Threat count, has the Ministry provided any guidance on how they will deal with a column A change, and how will the new Municipal Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Approvals (CLI ECA) fit into that column A numbers, or has it been downloaded to keep track of?

Mystaya clarified that there is a large spreadsheet that risk management officials have to complete as part of annual reporting, and the guidance has been to not change the number in column A. We have not received any instructions on updates so no changes to be made for now. Bill advised that with respect to the CLI ECA it will be up to the municipality to come up with those numbers for us. Bill is getting mixed messages from the Ministry on updates to column A, so he is following up. We may use our S.36 amendment process as a bookkeeping exercise to bring the numbers more in line with what is being seen on the landscape. Bill will report back to the risk management officials.

Katie Thompson: What is the Ministry stance on Environmental Activity and Sector Registry's (EASR) as many things have moved from an Environmental Compliance Approval to an EASR that would account for Threats? Are they reporting these numbers to us? Are they considering them prescribed instruments or is it a grey area?

Mystaya advised they have not finalized some of the transfers to EASRs, for example the stormwater proposal is imminent. We have not heard how they are advising to deal with it as they have not yet confirmed that stormwater sites are EASRs. Bill confirmed they have not made the decision with respect to stormwater, but there are other activities being managed by EASRs that used to be through the ECA process. The Ministry considers them prescribed instruments and the province is not reviewing them so there is a gap there that we do not know yet how to solve.

David Ketcheson: Am I correct that when you go through the EASR application, there is a question on source water protection, and if you check that box you are kicked out of the EASR?

Bill's understanding is that is not correct, and EASRs can apply in vulnerable areas, and if you check yes the proponent has to do more work to show you manage the Threat, but the province does not give oversight of that review. Amanda advised that you have to

attest that you have considered source water protection but not to say that to be in a source water protection area when it is your ability to use EASR. Bill will report back with more guidance from the province if we can get it.

Lynn Dollin: Her municipality has a lot of septic inspections, and the 1<sup>st</sup> round resulted in a lot of landowner anger. Round 2 became easier. Are other people getting this pushback and what is the response when septs are being inspected annually by the installer yet we are saying it needs to be inspected again for a fee? Who has it right and can we learn from their best practices? On the appeals, is it the whole official plan (Midland) amendment and zoning bylaw amendments (Tiny) that are being appealed or just source water aspects?

Melissa advised they are site specific amendments being appealed and not source water specific.

David Ritchie: In Ramara, the Bayshore Village wastewater system still has not been resolved. How has it been let go for this long? Does the Committee have any influence on resolving this? The consultant suggested a whole new treatment process.

Don advised that the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority has been involved in some discussions with the Township of Ramara and the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks on that treatment system. The Conservation Authority agrees that more advanced treatment would benefit the lake. The challenge the province has is around language in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan prohibiting new wastewater treatment plants. All parties are trying to find a way to reconcile those challenges, as well as cost implications.

Moved by: Katie Thompson

Seconded by: Jeff Hamelin

SPC-04-25 **Resolved That** presentation a) and Staff Report 2.1 regarding Annual Report on Plan Implementation (to December 31, 2024) be received for information; and

**Further That** Source Protection Authority staff be directed to rate progress as “Progressing Well/On Target”; and

**Further That** the Source Protection Committee utilize section II of the Annual Report to comment on the progress made to date, as described in the Issues section. **Carried**

- c) A presentation by Bill Thompson, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, regarding Staff Report SPC2.2 – MECP ‘early engagement’ comments on draft Source Protection Plan update.

Link to the presentation – [Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks 'early engagement' comments on draft Source Protection Plan update](#)

## **QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

Jennifer Best: For the municipalities, are they involved in the pre-consultation stage to gather their feedback?

Bill advised that we had a workshop with each upper tier municipality when the Source Protection Plan was drafted. This type of consultation will be done again in the next couple of months.

Jessica Neto: Letters to property owners often get ignored, so do you do follow up on past letters?

Bill advised we are required to send letters during pre and public consultation and put notices in newspapers, so there will be a couple of reminders.

David Ritchie: What types of biomass? We had a similar issue in the Holland Marsh when they were cleaning potatoes. Is this the type of thing that is trying to be resolved?

Bill advised what type of biomass is exactly the question being raised with the province. It is a real mixed bag of items, including animal carcasses, bioproducts from harvesting crops, wood waste. Bill needs to sort this out before reporting back and make a reasonable recommendation to the Committee. If the Ministry is concerned about all aspects of biomass, there may be different approaches eg. education on wood waste; non agricultural source materials on other waste; risk management plans.

John Hemsted: Waste element came into being if someone was washing more than 51% of the material going through their plant. Their own stuff was okay but once they hit 51% of someone else's, that triggered a waste material.

Colin Elliott: A couple years ago they were building a sports complex in Orillia and they found a bunch of barrels of bad stuff which was leaking into the Lake. Were you consulted on that and the clean up?

Bill was not aware of this, and Orillia is outside of the Conservation Authority jurisdiction. Peter advised that the sports complex was on a former foundry site. There was a lot of waste onsite. The building was moved, and there was a lot of monitoring data collected. It was hard to pinpoint where the waste was. If it was a couple barrels that would be easy, but some was at depth so hard to work around. Data is likely still being collected. Will likely have to have a discussion on the scale of items to know when to deal with as waste eg. a few cans versus potato washing flooding the Marsh. We will need guidance on this.

Rick Newlove: The tree waste will likely be dealt with like firewood in that you cannot move it to a different area.

Moved by: Bob Duncanson

Seconded by: Geoff Allen

SPC-05-25      **Resolved That** presentation c) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) 'early engagement' comments on draft Source Protection Plan update be received for information. **Carried**

#### 9. Determination of Items Requiring Separate Discussion

No items were identified under items requiring separate discussion.

#### 10. Adoption of Items Not Requiring Separate Discussion

No items were identified under items not requiring separate discussion.

#### 11. Consideration of Items Requiring Separate Discussion

There were no items requiring separate discussion.

#### 12. Other Business

None.

#### 13. Closed Session

None.

#### 14. Next Meeting and Adjournment

Moved by: Katie Thompson

Seconded by: Michelle Flaherty

SPC-06-25      **Resolved That** the next meeting of the Source Protection Committee scheduled to be held on Thursday, June 12, 2025 from 1-4 pm as a virtual meeting; and

**Further that** the April 10, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be adjourned at 2:15 pm **Carried**

# Item SPC2.1

## Source Protection Committee Meeting SPC-02-2025

### Staff Report Number: SPC2.1

**To:** South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee

**From:** Mystaya Touw, Sourcewater Protection Specialist, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

**Date:** June 12, 2025

**Subject:** Updated Threats Enumeration – Section 36 Amendment

### Recommendations:

**That** Staff Report SPC2.1 regarding Updated Threats Enumeration – Section 36 Amendment be received for information.

### Purpose of Staff Report:

The purpose of this Staff Report is to provide the Committee with an update on the estimated number of possible Threats proposed to be added through the Section 36 amendment to the Source Protection Plan to which a Prescribed Instrument, Risk Management Plan, or Prohibition policy may apply.

### Background:

The process of estimating Threats on the landscape in the Source Protection Region is referred to as Threats Enumeration and is one of the items Early Engagement comments from the Ministry asked to be addressed for our Section 36 amendment to the Source Protection Plan.

These added Threats are the result of the 2021 Technical Rules, and/or the proposed change in Intake vulnerability scoring methodology, which will raise the vulnerability scores of several Intake Protection Zones.

### Issues:

Through desktop analysis Staff have estimated the number of properties that may now meet the threshold for a Significant Drinking Water Threat as result of changes brought in through the Section 36 Amendment, and that would be subjected to Prescribed Instrument (e.g. environmental compliance approvals) or Part IV policies (i.e. risk management plans). This desktop analysis used mainly publicly available data sets such as assessment roll numbers, vulnerable areas mapping, waste registries, air photos, Threat circumstances, etc.

## Item SPC2.1

*Table 1. List of estimated New Threats added through the S.36 Amendment to the Plan (Prescribed Instrument & Part IV policies)*

Threat Type	Number of Potential Threats
Waste Generation	53
Waste Transfer & Processing	1
Septics	170
Stormwater	2
Fertilizer Handling & Storage	1
Pesticides Application	105
Pesticide Handling & Storage	4
Salt Application	37
Salt Storage	97
Snow Storage	80

It is important to note that this is likely an overestimate when it comes to waste generation, application of pesticides, salt and snow Threat counts, as this analysis flags places where the activities are more likely to occur, not places where they are already confirmed.

In cases of similar Threat types, it is also possible that multiple Threats could be addressed through a single instrument, such as one risk management plan addressing salt application, salt storage and snow storage on the same property. The salt and snow numbers include many possible Threats in the Barrie wellhead protection area-issue contributing area. The number of new Threat for the application of salt is lower than that of salt storage because properties in WHPA-A of the wellhead protection area-issue contributing area in Barrie already had (where required) risk management plans for salt application. They may, however, require amendments to those risk management plans to include salt storage and/or snow storage as new Threats through this amendment as those circumstances have changed.

Similarly, many agricultural properties may already have a risk management plan in place that could be amended to include application of pesticides if need. It is also possible that some of the application of pesticides potential new Threats listed here already have a risk management plan for pesticides, however, it would still require a risk management official's time to confirm if the risk management plan need to be amended from applying to a specific pesticide to pesticides in general per the 2021 Technical Rules. Ultimately, the number shown here is

## Item SPC2.1

estimating the number of properties or potential Threats requiring risk management officials' time and review under new technical rules and amended policies, rather than confirmed Threats. The potential application of pesticides, and handling and storage of pesticides, Threats listed has been reduced when compared to the original conservative numbers brought to the Committee in 2023. The new more detailed and targeted analysis results presented here show a more realistic estimate of where threats are likely to be occurring.

The Threats Enumeration process yields a list of the number of places these activities may be occurring that could meet the circumstances, not a list of confirmed Threats. It will be up to Risk Management Officials and Ministry staff to determine if the activity is occurring through Threats Verification, which generally takes place after the Amendment is approved. Though Risk Management Officials will be given the option to review these numbers in more detail during the consultation process as well.

Overall, the numbers of potential Threats, while they have changed somewhat with further investigation, are similar enough that the relative policy and workload implications are unchanged.

### Summary:

This report provides an update to the Committee on the number of enumerated possible Threats that could be added through the Section 36 Amendment to the Source Protection Plan. These numbers will be provided to the Ministry to address their early engagement comments and included in future Section 36 Amendment packages for review, consultation and approval. These numbers are likely still an overestimate. Further Threats Verification work will occur after Amendment approval.

### Recommendations:

**It Is Therefore Recommended That** Staff Report SPC2.1 regarding Updated Threats Enumeration – Section 36 Amendment be received for information.

### Prepared by:

Mystaya Touw, Sourcewater Protection Specialist

### Recommended by:

Bill Thompson, Manager, Watershed Plans & Strategies

# Item SPC2.2

## Source Protection Committee Meeting SPC-02-2025

### Staff Report Number: SPC2.2

**To:** South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee

**From:** Bill Thompson, Manager, Watershed Plans and Strategies, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

**Date:** June 12, 2025

**Subject:** Policies for the storage of waste biomass

### Recommendations:

**That** presentation b) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Policies for the storage of waste biomass be received for information; and

**Further That** the Source Protection Committee adopt the recommended new policies to manage the threats of the storage of waste biomass; and

**Further That** staff be directed to incorporate the new policies in the draft amendment to the Source Protection Plan, Under Section 36 of the Clean Water Act.

### Purpose of Staff Report:

The purpose of this Staff Report is to introduce the Committee to the storage of waste biomass as a potential threat under the Clean Water Act, and to propose Source Protection Plan policies to address that threat.

### Background:

The Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks amended the Technical Rules governing the Source Protection Program in 2021, which included changing some of the subcategories of activities to which the Clean Water Act would apply, and the circumstances wherein those activities could be deemed to be Significant Drinking Water Threats.

Since 2022, the Source Protection Committee has been reviewing policies in the Source Protection Plan in light of these changes, culminating in a draft update to the Plan which was submitted to the Ministry in October 2024 for early engagement (the first stage of consultation). In their review, Ministry staff noted that one new subcategory of waste was missed: the storage of waste biomass.



## Item SPC2.2

### Issues:

The waste management regulation under the *Environmental Protection Act* (RRO 1990, Reg. 347) defines what is and isn't waste under Ontario's legal framework. According to that Regulation, waste biomass is defined as:

*Organic matter that is derived from a plant or animal, that is available on a renewable basis and that is,*

*(a) waste from harvesting or processing agricultural products or forestry products,*

*(b) waste resulting from the rendering of animals or animal by-products,*

*(c) solid or liquid material that results from the treatment of wastewater generated by a manufacturer of pulp, paper, recycled paper or paper products, including corrugated cardboard,*

*(d) waste from food processing and preparation operations, or*

*(e) woodwaste*

In practice, waste biomass refers to material which is a byproduct or waste material from manufacturing processes. Under the Environmental Protection Act, anyone storing waste biomass will require an Environmental Compliance Approval from the Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks. If the material is stored in an area where it meets the circumstances to be a significant drinking water threat, Source Protection Plan policies would need to be in place to manage the threat.

The circumstances wherein the storage of waste biomass can become a significant drinking water threat are the same as those that apply to the storage of processed organic waste:

### Storage of Waste Biomass: Circumstances and Vulnerability Score Required for Significant Threat

Circumstances	WHPA: Vulnerability Score for Above Grade Storage	WHPA: Vulnerability Score for Partially Below Grade Storage	WHPA: Vulnerability Score for Below Grade Storage	IPZ/WHPA-E: Vulnerability Score for Above Grade Storage	IPZ/WHPA-E: Vulnerability Score for Partially Below Grade Storage	IPZ/WHPA-E: Vulnerability Score for Below Grade Storage
< 0.5 tonnes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
0.5-5 tonnes	N/A	10	10	10	10	N/A
> 5 tonnes	10	10	10	9-10	9-10	N/A
Pathogens (any amount)	WHPA-A/B 10	WHPA-A/B 10	WHPA-A/B 10	8-10	8-10	10

## Item SPC2.2

As the storage of waste biomass is governed by the *Environmental Protection Act*, any management of this threat the Committee wishes to exercise would be through a Prescribed Instrument, implemented by MECP.

Two other subcategories of waste to which the *Clean Water Act* applies are similar, namely **processed organic waste** and **non-agricultural source material**. **Processed organic waste** means waste that is predominantly organic in composition and has been treated by aerobic or anaerobic digestion, or other means of stabilization, and includes sewage residue from sewage works. **Non-agricultural source material** includes the following, if it is intended to be applied to land as nutrients:

- Pulp and paper biosolids
- Sewage biosolids
- Anaerobic digestion output
- Any other material, that not from an agricultural source, but is being applied to land as a nutrient.

Policies which apply to the storage of non-agricultural source material were not changed as part of this update to the Source Protection Plan. Policies which apply to the storage of processed organic waste (which was also a new threat subcategory) were written to have the same effect as the storage of non-agricultural source material. Given the similarity of waste biomass to these two other types of waste, a similar approach to its storage could be taken, with policies which could say (proposed new text in **bold**, removed text with a ~~strikeout~~):

The existing and future handling and storage of processed organic waste **or waste biomass** is prohibited within WHPA-A and IPZ-1 where the activity is or would be a significant drinking water threat.

Where the handling and storage of processed organic waste **or waste biomass** is a significant drinking water threat MECP shall ensure that the Environmental Compliance Approval prohibits ~~its~~ handling and storage ~~of processed organic waste~~ within a WHPA-A and IPZ-1, and includes appropriate terms and conditions to ensure the activity ceases to be a significant drinking water threat outside of WHPA-A/IPZ-1. The Environmental Compliance Approval shall also list the relevant Drinking Water System and activity(ies) which is a significant drinking water threat

### Summary:

Source Protection Plan policies are required for one additional new threat subcategory: the storage of waste biomass. Waste biomass is a broad category of waste, but all such biomass relates to material which is a by-product or waste product of manufacturing

## Item SPC2.2

processes, and is currently managed by MECP through an Environmental Compliance Approval process. Given the similarities between the storage of waste biomass and the storage of non-agricultural source material or processed organic waste, a similar policy approach could be taken. This approach would manage existing threats, and future threats located outside the WHPA-A or IPZ-1, and prohibit those within the WHPA-A or IPZ-1.

### Recommendations:

**It Is Therefore Recommended That** presentation b) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Policies for the storage of waste biomass be received for information; and

**Further That** the Source Protection Committee adopt the recommended new policies to manage the threats of the storage of waste biomass; and

**Further That** staff be directed to incorporate the new policies in the draft amendment to the Source Protection Plan, Under Section 36 of the Clean Water Act.

### Prepared by:

Bill Thompson, Manager, Watershed Plans and Strategies