



**South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region**

**Source Protection Committee (SPC)**

**Minutes of Meeting SPC-04-2025**

**December 11, 2025**

The Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 1:01 pm and Bill Thompson conducted the Roll Call.

**Members Present:**

Peter Dance, Acting Chair

**Municipal**

Chris Gerrits, Michelle Flaherty, Michelle Jakobi, Jennifer Best, Tom Bradley

**Economic/Development**

Colin Elliott, John Hemsted, Jessica Neto, Rick Newlove

**Public Sector**

Bob Duncanson, Stephanie Hobbs, Tom Kurtz, Cate Root, Karen Koornneef

**First Nations**

Vacant

**Liaisons**

Don Goodyear, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA)

Julie Cayley, Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA)

Jennifer Vincent, Liaison, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA)

Bilal Kidwai, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP)

**Staff Present**

Bill Thompson, LSRCA

Mystaya Touw, LSRCA

Chloe Zhang, LSRCA

Melissa Carruthers, SSEA

Kathy Hillis, LSRCA (minutes)

Ian Ockenden, NVCA

Sheri Steinginga, NVCA

**Guests**

Christina Wieder, York Region Public Health Branch

Shelly Cuddy, Durham Region

Emily Goncalves, York Region

Sonya Kleywegt, MECP

Lloyd Lemon, Lloyd Lemon Geoscience Consulting

Gary Hendy, Gaman Consultants Inc.

Michael Jung, RV Anderson

Andrew Fors, RV Anderson

Stephane Sabeau, Barrie

Dylan Patterson, New Tecumseth

Rika Law, RV Anderson

Ian Todhunter, New Tecumseth

**Regrets:**

Katie Thompson, Municipal - proxy to Tom Bradley  
David Ritchie, Economic/Development - proxy to John Hemsted  
Geoff Allen, Public Sector - proxy to Cate Root  
David Ketcheson, Economic/Development - proxy to Chris Gerrits  
Jeff Hamelin, Municipal

**1. Welcome & Opening Remarks**

**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: Rick Newlove  
Seconded by: Cate Root

SPC-25-25 **Resolved That** the agenda for the December 11, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee (SPC) be approved as presented. **Carried**

**5. Adoption of Minutes**

Moved by: Bob Duncanson  
Seconded by: Rick Newlove

SPC-26-25 **Resolved That** the minutes of the October 16, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as circulated. **Carried**

**6. Announcements**

- a) We have not yet heard from the Ministry on the reappointment of Lynn Dollin as Chair.
- b) Membership changes are occurring on January 1, 2026. The Chair thanked Bob Duncanson and Tom Kurtz for their years of service as their terms are ending. New Members are Sarah Kurtz, Ian Chadwick and Samantha Archibald.

**7. Deputations**

There were none.

**8. Presentations**

- a) A presentation by Sonya Kleywegt, MECP, regarding Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) activities by MECP.

- Conclusions: PFAS levels in environmental media in Ontario are generally low, except with a contaminating source.
  - Regulated PFAS (e.g. PFOS, PFOA) levels are generally declining.
  - Un-regulated PFAS (e.g. short-chain PFAS) trends are less certain and further monitoring is required.
- What's Next? The Ministry continues to:
  - Conduct environmental monitoring for PFAS across all media.
    - Introduced an enhanced PFAS method in 2025 for drinking water and surface water.
  - Review the latest information and initiatives from academia, industry, and governmental agencies from other jurisdictions to determine if updated policies and benchmarks are required.
  - Works with Federal/Provincial/Territorial partners (including Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment) to develop ecological benchmarks, where applicable.
  - Investigate enhanced monitoring (passive samplers) and analysis (non-target analysis, Total Organic Fluorine, etc.) coupled with in vitro bioassays (e.g. CALUX) to better understand total PFAS impacts to the environment.
  - Work with partners through COA-funded projects to enhance monitoring, better understand impacts and investigate remediation technology (groundwater).

## **QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

Cate Root: How would our private septic systems impact wells or water sources based on proximity?

Sonya advised we are looking at large subsurface systems and are hoping to get some monitoring data on that. They have looked at septic systems and you will get a broad breadth of what is detected, especially with individual septic systems as it will depend on the type of chemicals used in your products or commercial products like clothing and detergents. There is a concern as we have seen with other contaminants that septic systems can contaminate the drinking water wells, however the concentrations we have seen so far with private septic systems are quite low. For that reason we are working with some conservation authorities on testing of domestic wells and have found the same result. That does not mean they cannot affect the source so we are trying to do outreach on the types of products where you may find PFAS and to get safer alternatives.

Jessica Neto: You said you are seeing an increase in C4 chains. Is there a specific reason for this?

Sonya responded that with the C8 (8-chain) carbons, with industry you regulate one chemical and they just replace it with another one, and then it takes another 20-years to

regulate that next chemical. They took the chain with the C8s and cut them in half so are using C4s which have the same properties as those chemicals but are not as persistent or perhaps as toxic, but as we continue to learn more about the shorter chains, we are learning that they have some other toxicity concerns as well. That is why we are seeing the index as they cut them in half or found another replacement, but until we get caught up with all of these chemical managements and how Health Canada is going to manage PFAS as a class, they just continue to generate new chemicals.

Cate Root: Can you speak to the health impacts of those chemicals?

Sonya indicated that the health impacts documented include thyroid disruption, immuno disease, certain cancers, sensitivities to vaccinations in children; a whole breadth of health impacts from C8s PFAS and PFOA and some of the longer chains. We are just getting some of the information out now with some of the shorter chains. The C6 are included in the Health Canada biomonitoring surveys and we look at ages 6-70, and 99% will have at least one PFAS in their bloodstream. We are seeing them in everyday products used for cooking and clothing. Anything that is water resistant and stain resistant contains these chemicals so we are seeing it in the blood of almost every Canadian.

Karen Koornneef: Wondering about the mobility of PFAS and how they interact with other chemicals that are in the water. Have you looked at the impact on agriculture as they water farms with it so is it building up in our food more than other systems?

Sonya responded that they have looked at studies of vegetation and in North Bay due to the contamination of Trout Lake and vegetation growth, and we do see in some different types, primarily leafy lettuce, there is accumulation of some of the shorter chain PFAS and in the roots are longer chain, so they can build up based on the concentration you are using for irrigation. Biosolid application has not seen significant uptake of PFAS which could be how the biosolids are applied (direct injected versus incorporation) as well as the time lapse from when you can grow crops on a field where biosolids were applied. When it comes to looking at the different PFAS and their mobility, they are not a typical compound as they have both the hydrophilic and hydrophobic ends to them so they are hard to predict as they act differently.

Moved by: John Hemsted

Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC-27-25 **Resolved That** presentation a) regarding Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) activities by MECP be received for information. **Carried**

b) A presentation by Lloyd Lemon, Lloyd Lemon Geoscience Consulting, regarding Staff Report SPC2.1 - Updated Assessment of Drinking Water Threats – Alliston Well Water

Supply System– Technical Report prepared by Lloyd Lemon Geoscience Consulting on behalf of the Town of New Tecumseth, October 23, 2025.

Link to the presentation – [Updated Assessment of Drinking Water Threats: Alliston Well Water Supply System](#)

## **QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

Chris Gerrits: What happened to the 2004 model? A lot of effort was put into developing the models, so there may have needed to be some duplication of effort to create this model. A reminder that we need to back up and file data properly.

Lloyd advised that it was not found, same for the 2010 model. When the Golder team went from 2004 to 2010, they took all the original nine components from 2004 and created the 2010 model. Now they have taken all of the geological information and that is stored in the Oak Ridges Moraine package. We have everything but the numerical model for the Alliston community. Gary Hendy advised that a lot of work was put into locating this finite element model. A decision was made to develop a finite difference model and move forward, which was built with far better data as they had the 32-day aquifer test. Peter Dance commented that on the municipal side, when developing contracts for this type of work we need to ensure the contract includes providing the data for public access. Lloyd advised he had all of the reports from the 2004 model, and Ian Ockenden was able to provide the reports from the 2010 model. If the 2023 scope of work was to put new wells beside existing wells at the same pumping rates, than this information was not required, but the scope did change to increase the pumping rates. Don Goodyear advised that the days of consultants considering their work to be proprietary are gone so that this will not happen again. Lloyd confirmed that by using old data, a working model was developed within a few days.

Cate Root: There are still 37 risk management plans that need to be done. Will they be done before the extra pumping needs to be carried out?

Bill advised his expectation is no. Until the source protection plan is amended the risk management official does not have the legal authority to require RMPs. The SPP gives the RMO five years to bring those RMPs into effect, which allows them to prioritize the biggest risks and develop relationships. Lloyd indicated that these are not clearly identified as activities that exist yet, so wondered if there is an opportunity to do the confirmation that there is actually an activity in place that will require an RMP, before the plan is updated? Bill confirmed that Lloyd has done a desktop assessment which is appropriate for this stage of analysis. That level of windshield screen and conversations with affected homeowners and businesses can happen at anytime, but they do not have the authority until the SPP is in place. In terms of the number of RMPs, Lloyd advised that the majority are the application of road salt so they are still trying to figure

out what the appropriate policies will be for that with the new rules. Bill clarified that we have policies that apply with respect to the application of road salt.

Peter Dance: Well 10 was built but did not perform as planned so it became a back-up well. How does Well 10 proceed into the future or is it just put on the shelf?

Lloyd advised they are waiting for the Town to advise on how to proceed. Currently they have decided to get the Permit to Take Water for Well 10 for a lower pumping rate, but at this time the Town has not made any measures to add it to the drinking water system. Well 10 has been included in this Amendment as a replacement to Well 5 and not in addition to it, so if it is added no further amendment is needed.

Moved by: Bob Duncanson

Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC-28-25 **Resolved That** presentation b) and Staff Report SPC2.1 regarding Updated Assessment of Drinking Water Threats – Alliston Well Water Supply System– Technical Report prepared by Lloyd Lemon Geoscience Consulting on behalf of the Town of New Tecumseth, October 23, 2025 be received for information. **Carried**

c) A presentation by Sheri Steiging, NVCA, regarding Staff Report SPC2.2 – Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Technical Report in support of the New Tecumseth (Alliston) S.34 WHPA update.

Link to the presentation – [Alliston Wellhead Protection Area Update, Township of New Tecumseth](#)

Moved by: Rick Newlove

Seconded by: Tom Bradley

SPC-29-25 **Resolved That** presentation c) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Technical Report in support of the New Tecumseth (Alliston) 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 New Tecumseth chapter of the Assessment Report is advisable. **Carried**

d) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA, and Melissa Carruthers, SSEA regarding Staff Report SPC2.3 – Status of Water Quality ‘Issues’ in the Source Protection Region.

Link to the presentation – [Status of Drinking Water Issues](#)

Moved by: Jessica Neto  
Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC-30-25 **Resolved That** presentation d) and Staff Report SPC2.3 regarding Status of Water Quality 'Issues' in the Source Protection Region be received for information; and

**Further That** staff be directed to use the amendment to the Source Protection Plan currently underway to remove the Issue and Issue Contributing Area associated with Trichloroethylene at the Coldwater drinking water system;

**Further That** staff be directed to leave all other Issues and Issue Contributing Areas in the Assessment Report unchanged; and

**Further That** staff be directed to respond to Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (herein "Ministry") that there is sufficient evidence for delisting of the Coldwater drinking water Issue, but not sufficient evidence for delisting of other Issues in the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region. **Carried**

e) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA, regarding Changes to the Clean Water Act and its Regulations.

Link to the presentation – [Changes to the Clean Water Act and its Regulations](#)

Moved by: John Hemsted  
Seconded by: Tom Bradley

SPC-31-25 **Resolved That** presentation e) regarding Changes to the Clean Water Act and its Regulations be received for information. **Carried**

f) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA, regarding Proposed Conservation Authority Consolidation.

Link to the presentation – [Proposed Conservation Authority Consolidation](#)

## QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Stephanie Hobbs: The map does not include the Midland peninsula, which is part of our source protection area. How did they come up with the boundaries?

Jennifer Vincent confirmed that is correct as the jurisdiction of a conservation authority will not be changing. Peter clarified that this is entirely about conservation authorities and not source protection regions. This source protection region has two areas that are not part of a conservation authority. Jennifer advised that the Province largely followed the Great Lakes Basin mapping, but did not change any conservation authority

boundaries and they are still watershed based, so entire CAs are amalgamated with no current individual CA boundary changing. Peter commented that a big part of their driver was to have some municipalities deal with fewer CAs, but this was not always the case. Jennifer gave the example that Amaranth is now part of three regional conservation authorities and has gone from dealing with approximately 30 different municipalities to over 200. Chris commented that as Dufferin County is the headwaters of many rivers, there was not likely a scenario where they remained untouched, and they are now just a smaller part of a larger organization.

Cate Root: This seems similar to what the Province wanted to do in reducing the number of District Health Units. The faster approvals for development sounds like what the Province wants and we can take note of what happened with a number of development issues just before the last election.

Jennifer confirmed parallels have been made to proposed reorganization of the District Health Units.

Cate Root: Can the SPC ask for comments to be submitted to the Environmental Registry of Ontario posting on our behalf regarding the proposed conservation authority consolidation?

Peter indicated that there is only speculation at this time as to whether or not there will be any changes to source protection authorities. Bill advised that some source protection committees have put in comments on the value of the source protection program and requested that no changes be made to the program. Don advised that the LSRCA Board of Directors is submitting a comment recommending that no changes be made to source protection regions and their programs. Cate suggested that the SPC comment be that although the Province is suggesting money will be saved, there may be less oversight which may mean development may occur more quickly but without proper review. Bill can draft a letter from the SPC focussing on the source protection program and not the CA program as that is not part of the SPC's mandate. Jennifer Best supports commenting on the source protection program only. Rick Newlove agrees that any letter must be strictly on source protection.

Moved by: Rick Newlove

Seconded by: Tom Bradley

SPC-32-25 **Resolved That** presentation f) regarding Proposed Conservation Authority Consolidation be received for information. **Carried**

### **AMENDMENT**

Moved by : Rick Newlove

Seconded by: Cate Root

SPC-33-25      **Further That** the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee submit a comment to the Environmental Registry of Ontario speaking to the value of the source protection program and the importance of local input to that program, and that the jurisdictions of the source protection authorities remain the same and not be expanded. **Carried**

### **RESULTANT MOTION**

The resultant motion reads as follows:

**Resolved That** presentation f) regarding Proposed Conservation Authority Consolidation be received for information; and

**Further That** the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee submit a comment to the Environmental Registry of Ontario speaking to the value of the source protection program and the importance of local input to that program, and that the jurisdictions of the source protection authorities remain the unchanged. **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:      Tom Bradley

Seconded by:   Chris Gerrits

SPC-34-25      **Resolved That** the next meeting of the Source Protection Committee be scheduled; and

**Further that** the December 11, 2025 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be adjourned at 3:50 pm **Carried**