

South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region

Source Protection Committee (SPC)

Minutes of Meeting SPC-03-2025

October 16, 2025

Bill Thompson called the meeting informally to order at 1:05pm.

Members Present:

Peter Dance, Chair

Municipal

Chris Gerrits, Katie Thompson, Michelle Flaherty, Tom Bradley

Economic/Development

Colin Elliott, John Hemsted, David Ketcheson, Jessica Neto, Rick Newlove

Public Sector

Geoff Allen, Bob Duncanson, Stephanie Hobbs, Cate Root

First Nations

Vacant

Liaisons

Jenee Wallace, Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit (SMDHU)
 Don Goodyear, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA)
 Julie Cayley, Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA)
 Ian Ockenden, Liaison, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA)

Staff Present

Bill Thompson, LSRCA	Kathy Hillis, LSRCA (minutes)
Mystaya Touw, LSRCA	Sheri Steinginga, NVCA
Chloe Zhang, LSRCA	Melissa Carruthers, SSEA

Guests

Shelly Cuddy, Durham Region	Lloyd Lemon, Lloyd Lemon Geoscience Consulting
Tavis Nimmo, Durham Region	
Gregory Meek, Durham Region	Sarah Lavoie-Bernstein, Kawartha CA

Regrets:

Tom Kurtz, Public Sector – Proxy to Stephanie Hobbs	Jeff Hamelin, Municipal Sector
Jennifer Best, Municipal Sector – Proxy to Chris Gerrits	Karen Koornneef, Public Sector
Michelle Jakobi, Municipal Sector – Proxy to Katie Thompson	
David Ritchie, Economic/Development – Proxy to John Hemsted	

1. Election of Acting Chair

Lynn Dollin's appointment as Chair of the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region Source Protection Committee expired on August 20, 2025. The position requires an Acting Chair until such time as the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks appoints a Chair, who must be appointed from Members of the Source Protection Committee.

Geoff Allen nominated Peter Dance for the position of Acting Chair. Nominations were called and no further nominations were put forward.

Moved by: David Ketcheson

Seconded by: John Hemstead

SPC-14-25 **Resolved That** the nominations for the position of Acting Chair be closed; and
Further That Peter Dance be appointed Acting Chair of the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region Source Protection Committee for the period from October 16, 2025, until such time as the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks appoints a Chair. **Carried**

Peter Dance accepted the nomination for the position of Acting Chair.

Acting Chair Peter Dance assumed the Chair at 1:08 pm.

2. Land Acknowledgement

Bill Thompson recited the Acknowledgement of Indigenous Territory.

3. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and Conflict of Interest

None declared.

4. Approval of Agenda

Moved by: Cate Root

Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC-15-25 **Resolved That** the agenda for the October 16, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee (SPC) be approved as presented. **Carried**

5. Adoption of Minutes

Moved by: Rick Newlove

Seconded by: Bob Duncanson

SPC-16-25 **Resolved That** the minutes of the June 12, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as circulated. **Carried**

6. Announcements

- a) Lynn Dollin's term ended in August. She has advised the Ministry that she is interested in being reappointed. The Minister will get to the appointment in due course.
- b) Introduction of Chloe Zhang who is the new Hydrogeologist at Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority.
- c) Amanda Kellett has taken a change in her career and is no longer able to represent the Economic Sector, so the position is vacant.
- d) For those with terms ending at the end of this year, the deadline for applications is October 18th.
- e) Bill to circulate material to the Committee from a webinar related to road salt, liability and water quality, led by Burlington Water Watch. They are advocating for similar changes as we are around liability for contractors applying salt.

7. Deputations

There were none.

8. Presentations

- a) A presentation by Lloyd Lemon, Lloyd Lemon Geoscience Consulting, regarding Staff Report SPC2.1 - Cannington Drinking Water Supply Nitrate WHPA-ICA and WHPA-E Assessment.

Link to the presentation – [Cannington Drinking Water Supply Nitrate WHPA-ICA and WHPA-E Assessment](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Colin Elliott: Was the surface water around well 8 tested?

Lloyd advised it was not tested.

Rick Newlove: Why would the municipality not purchase the adjacent land? Suggested that the municipality could negotiate with the landowner and say that can likely develop it if the municipality gets the other land and fixes the wells. This might be the cheapest route for the municipality to go. With the shallow nature how are they putting basements in; will they blast the rock out?

Shelly advised the landowner wants to develop the lands, so the municipality is trying to lease the land so that the landowner is compensated until he can develop it.

Development has been delayed as we are not able to get enough water to this area.

Lloyd advised that the soils are very shallow in this area, less than 3m deep; they are saturated with clay and when they excavate these drainage networks through there they are getting most of the top of the rock. This is part of Lloyd's concern about the

sensitivity of this area. In terms of blasting rock out. Lloyd confirmed that the rock is not that high, but it has been artificially drained for years.

Jessica Neto: What is the monitoring well network that is south of this area, and do you have anything lower and more south to see what the concentration of nitrate is from the farms? Will farmers south of this land see the nitrate issue shifted to their land?

Lloyd advised there is a monitoring network around all of the wells that extends well beyond the well fields, but there is definitely some error. This is part of what the municipality is looking at; what can we do with the monitoring well network to help support demonstrating that this has been effective. Lloyd advised that this area is unique as it is a basin, and all of the water from the highland comes up and this creek helps intercept the groundwater flow from the highland. It is obvious when you look at the monitoring results of where things go. The only way for this water to get to there is to go all the way down and come back up.

Colin Elliott: What is the concentration of nitrate in the two new wells that are not online yet? Are these 2 wells not more affected by the sewage systems than agriculture? The farmers are an easy one to blame.

Lloyd indicated the concentration is 4 to 4.5 mg/L. Lloyd responded that they are not likely affected by the local sewage systems, but it is possible.

Chris Gerrits: Why was well 6 decommissioned, and how is the nitrate? How old are wells 6 and 8? Well 6 was abandoned within the pumphouse but the pumphouse is still there. Were the wells not created without the current standards of minimum casing? Is well 6 providing a conduit?

Lloyd advised that well 6 is a GUDI well and the nitrate concentration was part of the problem. Lloyd advised the top of the rock is less than 6m below top of grade. Well 8 age – approximately 1971; well 6 is older. Lloyd confirmed the pumphouse is still the treatment system for wells 4 and 5. Lloyd advised that decommissioned well 6 was properly sealed during decommission and there are not concerns around the well casing,

John Hemsted: Well's 9 and 10 are a significant distance away from sewage problems. In the Arena Field well, was there not a DNAPL problem? It would be helpful if you could show the topography of the area.

Lloyd confirmed there has been a DNAPL problem and there are still trace amounts detected but nothing new. Lloyd commented that this is a very significant high ground which is a lot of the reason why they felt they could limit the extent of the ICA to 5 years. Some of these are questions that came back from MECP and is why they set on the 5 year limit.

David Ketcheson: There was a jump in nitrate levels in 2015 at the original and gravel pit wellfields, whereas there was a decreasing trend from 2005 - 2015. Was it figured out why? The downward trend may have resulted from farmers using minimal amounts of fertilizer due to an increase in fertilizer costs and farming practices. Why then did it increase?

Lloyd indicated they have not determined what caused this increase. The assumption is that it has something to do with the lands to the south. The decreasing trend through 2010 occurred in both wellfields. Lloyd indicated that is why the increase is less important than the issues of can we do something about it and will those things work. David Ketcheson responded that if you understand why it is increasing, then you can put policies in place to mitigate it. If you do not know why then you do not know if the policies implemented will be effective or not.

Cate Root: When wells 9 and 10 become active, can well 8 be removed altogether? How often were you monitoring?

Lloyd advised well 8 is still the largest producing well, so the hope is that by changing the patterns and adding wells 9 and 10, there will be a reduction in pumping of water from well 8, which hopefully will change the nitrate levels. Shelly advised monitoring is pretty constant. They are monitoring wells monthly with a real time analyzer that measures hourly.

Jessica Neto: Is there anything to help figure out why there is an increasing trend on both sides of Cannington? Are we just assuming it is from agriculture? It is odd that they are both almost the same.

Lloyd advised that the two things the systems have in common are the amount of agricultural land. There have not been any substantial increases in development or land changes.

Chris Gerrits: It is unusual to have all the wells come online at the same time? Is there consideration for changing how the system operates to draw in better quality of water.

Shelly believes the operation has adjusted so that well 8 does not come on when levels reach 8 mg/L, but the levels are still going up.

Geoff Allen: When all the wells operate at once, is the water from well 8 being diluted?

Lloyd advised it is mixed in the same standpipe. The well water being consumed is still safe, even when well 8 is high.

David Ketcheson: Is climate change an issue?

Lloyd believes David Ketcheson's previous comment about costs of fertilizer is more accurate. Lloyd reviewed precipitation values and there was no correlation between rainfall and nitrate levels.

Peter Dance: Did you try to quantify nitrate sources based on landuses?

Lloyd advised that no mass balance concentration reviews were done. In this area there are very few sewage systems, and the amount per person per day is probably very low compared to amount per tonne of fertilizer being added.

Colin Elliott: What is the nitrate concentration in the drinking water?

Greg advised they did some sampling around town and the average coming out of the standpipe is around 3 to 4 mg/L. The mixing is part of the reason the wells are run all at once rather than sequentially.

Moved by: Jessica Neto

Seconded by: Rick Newlove

SPC-17-25 **Resolved That** presentation a) and Staff Report SPC2.1 regarding the Cannington Drinking Water Supply Nitrate WHPA-ICA and WHPA-E Assessment be received for information. **Carried**

b) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA, regarding Staff Report SPC2.2 – Policy Options to Address Nitrate Threats in the New WHPA-ICA (Nitrate) in the Community of Cannington.

Link to the presentation – [Policy Options to Address Nitrate Threats in the New WHPA-ICA \(Nitrate\) in the Community of Cannington](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Colin Elliott: Can you give us an idea of the type of farming practices in Cannington? Are the farming practices the same as large, 100-acre farms?

John Hemsted advised it is small parcels due to the topography, with steep changes in topography. Yes, the farming practices are pretty much the same.

David Ketcheson: How much time do we have? We know it took a long time to do risk management plans (RMP), so to complete 953 RMPs, it will likely take years. In four years time how high will the nitrate be, by the time we start implementing the RMPs? In Lafontaine we are seeing positive effects, and how long did this take, which would give us a rough idea of how much time we have? Getting policies implemented in a timely manner will be tough. Was the timing considered with the policy recommendations put forward? If we put an ICA on the lands, would subdivision development be prohibited until the ICA is taken off?

Bill advised it will not be 953 RMPs as some will be septic inspections. The required timeline is 5 years, which will be a push to complete. The risk management official (RMO) can focus on properties with the larger risks. Lafontaine policies came into effect

in 2016, and we are seeing improvements in 10 years, although some changes predated the RMPs. Bill advised that there is a lag in timing. Shelly advised the policy would not prohibit septic, only the WHPA-A, so the landowner can still put septic in, however he would still have to show that background nitrate is below 10, which is it not, so regardless of the source protection policy he would not be permitted to go on septic. The landowner is holding off as he is waiting for connection to the sanitary system so he can put more homes in.

Jessica Neto: With the Lafontaine policies put in place, what was the response by the farming community and the effects on their livelihoods?

Melissa advised the Lafontaine and Cannington ones are almost switched in terms of farmers vs residents affected. Their livelihood was not affected as most of the farmers had already changed their practices, so the focus was on record keeping of these changes. It takes a lot more time to develop the RMPs with the agricultural community. Julie advised it was not just focussed on the agricultural community as it was anything that contributed nitrate eg. lawn fertilizer on private and public lands. Working with homeowners on their lands proved more difficult than working with farmers. Bill confirmed that any commercial and residential use of fertilizer would be prohibited.

David Ketcheson: If this does not work, what is the alternative for this community? Sometimes it takes years to implement the alternative and to get through the approvals process. Are you hoping for the best and preparing for the worst - a continued increase in nitrate levels? If it will take a long time, does an alternative need to start being worked on now, just in case?

Shelly advised that the EA for wells 9 and 10 began in 2011 but the process has yet to be completed so they are still not online. As a result Durham is exploring all avenues.

Rick Newlove: How close is municipal drinking water, and can they not tie into this system?

Greg advised Beaverton is the closest community but they do not have capacity to take on Cannington. They are looking at further options for blending some of the water before it gets into the distribution system, before it gets to the first customer, which would give the ability to lower the levels and keep the well online.

Cate Root: If the well was on a hill rather than in a basin would that affect it? If there was a well on the far side, on the top of the hill, what would happen? Is there a sewage system in Cannington or is it all septic?

Lloyd advised the Gravel Pit well is on higher ground, and the Arena Field well is in part of the basin for the Beaver River. The groundwater and bedrock are under pressure, and every time the well is turned on it goes down, which is very concerning. It is a very small part of the entire catch basin. Many studies have been done to locate water, and if you

went to the far side on top of a hill there would not be water. If you drilled down to 15m to look for water in the bedrock there would not be any water. The community has water and there is wastewater services to some subdivisions, but private septs elsewhere.

Melissa advised that Tiny Township levels have gone above 10 mg/L if nitrate, and when this happens they have gone to a blended system. They need to provide notice when this happens so they have to go door-to-door and provide bottled water until the nitrate levels go down.

Rick Newlove: Have you looked at more storage systems so that you pump when the nitrates are low?

Greg advised that to build a larger storage container they would lose chlorine residual, which may cause issues like biofouling from stagnate water.

Jessica Neto: Have you found any relationship for the cyclical nature of the levels?

Lloyd advised that no relationship has been found. Greg confirmed that levels are highest from August throughout the winter, which Lloyd indicated is probably related to recharge.

Moved by: Stephaine Hobbs

Seconded by: Cate Root

SPC-18-25 **Resolved That** presentation b) and Staff Report 2.2 regarding Policy Options to Address Nitrate Threats in the New WHPA-ICA (Nitrate) in the Community of Cannington be received for information; and

Further That policies FERT(ICA)-1 through FERT(ICA)-4 and ASM(ICA)-1 through ASM(ICA)-4 be amended to apply to the Cannington Issue Contributing Area; and

Further That policies FERT(ICA)-1 through FERT(ICA)-4 and ASM(ICA)-1 through ASM(ICA)-4 be further amended to prohibit the application or storage of agricultural source material or commercial fertilizer in the WHPA-E of the Cannington Issue Contributing Area; and

Further That the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee agree that the proposed amendments to the Source Protection Plan and the Durham Region chapter of the Assessment Report are advisable. **Carried**

- c) A presentation by Shelly Cuddy, Durham Region, regarding Staff Report SPC2.3 regarding Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Technical Report in Support of the Sunderland s.34 WHPA Update.

Link to the presentation – [Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Technical Report in Support of the Sunderland s.34 WHPA Update](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

David Ketcheson: Why is it expected that well 4 is not going to sand in like well 3 did?

Shelly advised that well 3 was designed in an emergency and test capacity. It was not designed for long term use. Well 4 is being designed for long term use.

Moved by: John Hemsted

Seconded by: Jessica Neto

SPC-19-25 **Resolved That** presentation c) and Staff Report SPC2.3 regarding Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Technical Report in Support of the Sunderland s.34 WHPA Update be received for information.
Carried

d) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA, regarding Staff Report SPC2.4 – Policy Implications of the Change to Vulnerable Area Mapping at the Sunderland Drinking Water System.

Link to the presentation – [Policy Implications of the Change to Vulnerable Area Mapping at the Sunderland Drinking Water System](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Chris Gerrits: At the appropriate time, it would be good to let the Ministry know that amendments like this are not a good use of time. They are an administrative change, but there currently is no mechanism to make these simple changes. Lake Erie SPC has already drafted something highlighting this inefficiency, so perhaps it can be reviewed and a recommendation be brought back at another meeting.

Bill agrees that some amendments are a bookkeeping exercise. Recommendations have been made to the Ministry on ways to streamline. A comment can be included in the cover letter to the Ministry indicating this is not a good use of time.

Moved by: Rick Newlove

Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC-20-25 **Resolved That** presentation d) and Staff Report SPC2.4 regarding Policy Implications of the Change to Vulnerable Area Mapping at the Sunderland Drinking Water System be received for information; and

Further That the South Georgian Bay - Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee agree that the proposed amendments to the Durham Region chapter of the Assessment Report are advisable. **Carried**

Staff is directed to draft a letter to the Ministry with the Committee's recommendation to streamline housekeeping amendments, and report back to the committee with the draft letter.

Colin Elliott: Advised that he likes these recommendations being brought to the Committee.

Peter Dance indicated there can be two parts of the process. The idea is that staff not go through the time consuming process for these bookkeeping amendments, but will still report to the committee on the changes. Bill to report back on the draft letter.

- e) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA, regarding Staff Report SPC2.5 - Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Technical Report in Support of the Woods of Manilla s.34 WHPA Update.

Link to the presentation – [Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Technical Report in Support of the Woods of Manilla s.34 WHPA Update](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Peter Dance: Advised he appreciates we are working with a neighbouring source protection authority and not duplicating work. This well change is not trivial whereas the previous one was, so this speaks to the challenge in determining an effective process.

Chris Gerrits advised that this is not a replacement well but adding a new well onto a property. Bill advised that this is the headwaters of the aquifer, so a small change can have a significant impact on the change in shape of the WHPA.

Moved by: Geoff Allen

Seconded by: Cate Root

SPC-21-25 **Resolved That** presentation e) and Staff Report SPC2.5 regarding Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Technical Report in Support of the Woods of Manilla s.34 WHPA Update be received for information; and

Further That the South Georgian Bay - Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee agree that the proposed amendments to the Kawartha Lakes chapter of the Assessment Report are advisable. **Carried**

- f) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA, regarding Staff Report SPC2.6 - Update on Nitrate in Raw Water at Midhurst Valley Drinking Water System (Springwater Township).

Link to the presentation – [Update on Nitrate in Raw Water at Midhurst Valley Drinking Water System \(Springwater Township\)](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Colin Elliott: The first well is 400 feet, is the 2nd one 400 feet as well? Less than a kilometre to the east there was a chemical spill about 12 years ago, and the people along that road are getting supplied with water as they cannot use their wells. How do they blame it on agriculture at 400 feet? It will not be for long as they are building houses over most of it.

Bill believes it is 400 feet but will get back to Colin to confirm. Bill does not know a lot about that spill so will discuss with Colin offline. Bill did advise that the only thing we are seeing with that well today is nitrate and there are no other contaminants. David Ketcheson will provide a report on this to Bill.

Cate Root: They are treating the water and it is safe. Why can they not treat the Cannington water?

Bill advised they can treat the water, but it is very costly. The Midhurst Valley treatment is new technology, but Durham can look into a similar treatment.

David Ketcheson: In an ideal world, can you do more frequent sampling and see if there is greater variability in the levels?

Bill advised there is an autosampler on the well, but they were having technical issues with it for the first year it was in operation, so the data is messy. The data provided here is more accurate. Springwater samples every minute, and if the highest point of concentration was pulled out for every day it is a really straight line. Bill will circulate the data on this.

Jessica Neto: Are there agricultural operations in this area? Should we see a reduction in nitrate due to the minimal agricultural land use.

Bill advised the amount of agriculture in the area is minimal, as much of this area is developed. Colin Elliott confirmed there are 300 homes. The earliest data Bill has seen for this area is from 2014, and it is about the same as it is today, but is slightly lower so believes we are not seeing active sources of nitrate but instead historical nitrate that will be in the aquitard for some time. Peter Dance added that it takes time for the water to travel to the depth so you will not see a change for some time. Bill confirmed that since we have not seen a change in 11 years, it could be decades before we see a reduction. Ian pointed out there are 2 provincial groundwater wells within the WHPA-D along Snow Valley Road, and there are no nitrate issues there, so wherever the nitrate is coming from it is not from that direction of travel.

Moved by: John Hemsted

Seconded by: Colin Elliott

SPC-22-25 **Resolved That** presentation f) and Staff Report SPC2.6 regarding Update on Nitrate in Raw Water at Midhurst Valley Drinking Water System (Springwater Township) be received for information. **Carried**

- g) A presentation by Mystaya Touw, LSRCA, regarding Staff Report SPC2.7 – Update on Stormwater Approvals - EASR.

Link to the presentation – [Update on Stormwater Approvals – EASR](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

David Ketcheson: On the removal, do we have any RMPs for stormwater in place?

Mystaya advised we do not yet because we were planning to add this policy in the section 36 update so it is not officially in the source protection plan. There are no existing facilities with risk management plans.

Moved by: Rick Newlove

Seconded by: Katie Thompson

SPC-23-25 **Resolved That** presentation g) and Staff Report SPC2.7 regarding Update on Stormwater Approvals - EASR be received for information; and

Further That the policy recommendations to add policy MON-7 and remove and replace policy SEWG(a)-2 be approved. **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

- a) Peter Dance: Requests that staff come back with respect to the Cannington situation with notes on Education, and for the RMPs - timelines, fairness, priorities, so we understand what that means and understand the resources it is taking and have thought about what it is going to take to make a difference quickly, in the broader context of our discussion earlier on efficiency.
- b) Stephanie Hobbs: Has there been any discussion among source protection authority staff or committees on the proposed changes on Regulations for Permits to Take Water (PTTW)? They are making it easier for people to re-enact a previously revoked approval. In the original posting they proposed that when you transfer your property the PTTW would automatically be transferred, yet nobody would know what the new owner was doing, but this part has been removed and is not being included. Bill advised that there

has been discussion, particularly about lapsed permits. There was some discussion, particularly around the point of transferring permits. Through the Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO) some concerns were flagged at the staff level. Bill was not aware that a decision has been made so he will review it. The legislation has not been enacted yet. If a permit has been revoked you can reapply within a year, but not sure how rigid they are on reissuance. That was the nature of the staff comments as sometimes there is a reason for the revocation, where other times it may be fine. David Ketcheson commented that if we have a WHPA-Q1 or WHPA-Q2 and a permit has been revoked prior to the application for WHPA-Q1 or 2, but on reissuance it may cause issues, which is a problem. The Committee directs staff to review those types of situations that may affect source water policies and report back.

13. Closed Session

None.

14. Next Meeting and Adjournment

Moved by: Jessica Neto

Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC-24-25 **Resolved That** the next meeting of the Source Protection Committee scheduled to be held on Thursday, December 11, 2025 from 1-4 pm virtually via Zoom; and

Further that the October 16, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be adjourned at 3:40 pm. **Carried**