

South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region

Agenda

Source Protection Committee Meeting SPC-03-2026

Thursday, July 23, 2026

1:00 – 4:00 pm

To be held virtually by Zoom video conference

Members

Peter Dance, Acting Chair

Municipal

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

Economic/Development

Colin Elliott, David Ritchie, Jessica Neto, John Hemsted, Rick Newlove, Sarah Kurtz

Public Sector

David Ketcheson, Geoff Allen, Ian Chadwick, Karen Koornneef, Stephanie Hobbs

First Nations

Chad McRae

Liaisons

Mohammed Ahmed, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP)

Don Goodyear, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA)

Julie Cayley, Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA)

Jennifer Vincent, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA)

Karen Kivilahti, Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit (SMDHU)

Staff

Bill Thompson, LSRCA

Chloe Zhang, LSRCA

Mystaya Touw, LSRCA

Kathy Hillis, LSRCA (minutes)

Ian Ockenden, NVCA

Sheri Steiging, NVCA

Melissa Carruthers, SSEA

Elizabeth Harrison, LSRCA

Guests

Christina Wieder, York Region Public Health Branch

Shelly Cuddy, Durham Region

Jeneé Wallace, SMDHU

Emily Goncalves, York Region

Maureen Blanchet, Durham Region

Tavis Nimmo, Durham Region

Regrets

Cate Root, Public Sector

Samantha Archibald, Economic/Development Sector – proxy to Sarah Kurtz

1. **Welcome and Opening Remarks**
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, July 23, 2026 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as presented.

6. **Adoption of Minutes**

Pages 4-18

Recommended: **That** the minutes of the Thursday, June 11, 2026 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 Bill Thompson, LSRCA regarding Regulatory Changes for Accelerating and Improving Protections for Drinking Water Sources.

Recommended: **That** presentation a) regarding Regulatory Changes for Accelerating and Improving Protections for Drinking Water Sources be received for information.

b) A presentation by Mystaya Touw, LSRCA regarding Revisiting Policies for Nutrient Management.

Recommended: **That** presentation b) and Staff Report 2.1 regarding Limitations of Nutrient Management Policies be received for information.

c) A presentation by Mystaya Touw, LSRCA regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-3.

Recommended: **That** presentation c) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-3 be received for information; and

Further That the existing policy FUEL-3 be removed and replaced with the proposed new FUEL-3 policy as written.

- d) A presentation by Mystaya Touw, LSRCA regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-4.

Recommended: That presentation d) and Staff Report SPC2.3 regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-4 be received for information; and

Further That the proposed revisions to fuel policy FUEL-4 be approved as written.

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 – Legal Matter

- e) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA discussing a legal matter regarding Summary of Consultation Comments Received – Proposed Amendment to Source Protection Plan to Address Nitrate Issue in Cannington.

SPC2.5 - Summary of Consultation Comments Received – Proposed Amendment to Source Protection Plan to Address Nitrate Issue in Cannington

15. Next Meeting and Adjournment

The next meeting of the Source Protection Committee is scheduled to be held on **Thursday, November 12, 2026.**

Agenda Items

1. Correspondence

There are none

2. Staff Reports

SPC2.1 - Revisiting Policies for Nutrient Management

Pages 19-21

That presentation b) and Staff Report 2.1 regarding Limitations of Nutrient Management Policies be received for information.

SPC2.2 - Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-3

Pages 22-24

That presentation c) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-3 be received for information; and

Further That the existing policy FUEL-3 be removed and replaced with the proposed new FUEL-3 policy as written.

SPC2.3 - Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-4

Pages 25-26

That presentation d) and Staff Report SPC2.3 regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-4 be received for information; and

Further That the proposed revisions to fuel policy FUEL-4 be approved as written.

SPC2.4 - Threat #5: The Management of Agricultural Source Material (Aquaculture)

Pages 27-28

That Staff Report SPC2.4 regarding Threat #5: The Management of Agricultural Source Material (Aquaculture) be received for information.

Source Protection Committee (SPC)

Minutes of Meeting SPC-02-2026

June 11, 2026

The Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm and Bill Thompson conducted the Roll Call.

Members Present:

Peter Dance, Acting Chair

Municipal

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

Economic/Development

Colin Elliott, David Ritchie, Jessica Neto, John Hemsted, Samantha Archibald

Public Sector

David Ketcheson, Geoff Allen, Ian Chadwick, Karen Koornneef

First Nations

Chad McRae

Liaisons

Bilal Kidwai, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP)
 Don Goodyear, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA)
 Julie Cayley, Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA)
 Ian Ockenden, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA)
 Karen Kivilahti, Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit (SMDHU)

Staff Present

Bill Thompson, LSRCA
 Chloe Zhang, LSRCA
 Mystaya Touw, LSRCA

Kathy Hillis, LSRCA (minutes)
 Sheri Steinginga, NVCA
 Melissa Carruthers, SSEA

Guests

Christina Wieder, York Region Public Health Branch
 Shelly Cuddy, Durham Region
 Emily Goncalves, York Region
 Sarah Lavoie-Bernstein, Kawartha Conservation
 Devin Hannan, SLR Consulting
 Behnam Doulatyari, Credit Valley Conservation
 Patty Meyer, Aqua Insight Inc.

Jae Park, York Region
 Eric Daechsel, LSRCA
 Darren Campbell, LSRCA
 Melinda Morris, LSRCA
 Melissa Jones, SSEA
 Simran Panesar, York Region

Regrets:

Stephanie Hobbs, Public Sector
Sarah Kurtz, Economic Sector – Proxy to Samantha Archibald
Cate Root, Public Sector – Proxy to Dave Ketcheson
Rick Newlove, Economic Sector

1. Welcome & Opening Remarks

The Acting Chair thanked staff and the consultants for all of the work that went into preparing the reports for this meeting

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Chair recited the Acknowledgement of Indigenous Territory.

3. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and Conflict of Interest

David Ketcheson declared a pecuniary interest regarding Staff Report SPC2.5 - Section 36 Pre-Consultation Comments Received.

4. Approval of Agenda

Moved by: John Hemsted
Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC-09-26 **Resolved That** the agenda for the June 11, 2026 meeting of the Source Protection Committee (SPC) be approved as amended. **Carried**

5. Adoption of Minutes

Moved by: Geoff Allen
Seconded by: Ian Chadwick

SPC-10-26 **Resolved That** the minutes of the April 2, 2026 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be approved as circulated. **Carried**

6. Announcements

- a) Posting for applications for SPC Chair closed on May 11th. As of June 10th no names have been posted for any of the vacant positions.

7. Deputations

There were none.

8. Presentations

- a) A presentation from Patty Meyer. Aqua Insight Inc regarding staff report SPC2.1 - Updated Assessment of Wellhead Protection Area and Drinking Water Threats – Mono Wells within Nottawasaga Valley Source Protection Area.

Link to the presentation – [Orangeville and Mono Tier Three Water Budget and Source Protection Update Study](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Ian Chadwick: Is this area designated by the Province as one of the growth areas? Is intensification going on in the area because of this designation?

Patty responded that there was more talk about growth prior to 2011, but now all of the growth is in the Official Plan (OP), which Orangeville is updating. There was some growth but not as much as in the previous study. Chris Gerrits advised that Dufferin County has the same growth formula as everyone else, but it is designated at the County level where growth goes, so these factors can be considered and growth assigned to other communities in the County. The draft new Lands Needs Assessment puts the onus on intensification rather than sprawl, so Chris does not anticipate more than normal growth.

Katie Thompson: What planning horizon was used in the model?

Patty indicated there were some challenges establishing what the planning horizon was as there is not an updated OP for the area. Patty would need to get back with an answer.

David Ketcheson: One of the wells is a bedrock well and they would represent bedding plane fractures. How do you model a 15 micron fracture in terms of the hydraulic conductivities of the wells? There is a small lobe to the south for the WHPA for the Cardinal wells, and why is this occurring?

Patty advised they did an equivalent porous media approach that does not discretely represent any one fracture; it considers the bulk area of the rock, and considering the size of the study area, they cannot get down to what each fracture is. If you have a small site and you have a detailed understanding of where the fractures are onsite you can discretely represent them, but a different approach was used due to the size of the site. Based on calibration achieved during the pumping test it was determined that the porous media approach was suitable for the questions being asked. The lobe in the WHPA is due to the ground surface topography being a bit higher so the source of water is carrying down to the south, and other sources of water for Well 3 are taking a different path and straight to the west. The overburden in this area may be due to more stands of gravel and more groundwater recharge happening, causing the particles to move

through this area, whereas further to the north they may continue under a till and follow the regional groundwater directions.

Chris Gerrits: The lobe is near the Klondike test well that was constructed around 2021 and there is an active gravel pit in this area. It might represent a little more information that was available when the original model was run, so was this factored into it?

Patty confirmed this to be the case.

Peter Dance: There are no new threats in the NVCA area, but there are quantity issues, so why this discrepancy?

Patty indicated that all of the studies into significant drinking water threats are the same as the previous study, and this was a significant water quantity risk back then. So as they were existing there are no new threats.

David Ketcheson: Explain how well capture zones pass through watershed boundaries.

Patty advised that groundwater does not necessarily follow surface water boundaries, especially when there is pumping involved, because surface water boundaries are based on ground level topography. If you have a confining unit under the aquifer you are pumping, then that water will be disconnected from the surface water flow system. If you were pumping the Cardinal Woods well, the general flow direction is coming from west to east, and if this were the case it would end up looking very different. Especially in the area like the headwaters where many of the creeks are quite small. If it was a larger river you would expect it to be a flow divide where the capture zone would not extend beneath it. Portions of the Monora Creek are only a few feet wide. In this case there is separation between the ground surface and the bedrock production aquifers beneath.

Moved by: Jennifer Best

Seconded by: Samantha Archibald

SPC-11-26 **Resolved That** presentation a) and Staff Report SPC2.1 regarding Updated Assessment of Wellhead Protection Area and Drinking Water Threats – Mono Wells within Nottawasaga Valley Source Protection Area be received for information. **Carried**

b) A presentation by Sheri Steiginga, NVCA regarding Staff Report SPC2.2 - Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Mono.

Link to the presentation – [Orangeville-Mono Tier 3 & Mono Wellhead Protection Area update, Town of Mono](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

David Ketcheson: What has been shown is that there is a significant problem with water quantity in this area. If we are trying to be cooperative with our other source water protection groups, what will be done to address this water quantity problem?

Peter agrees that the water quantity issue is alarming. The 20% reduction in baseflow to creeks is a ridiculous standard, especially if doing more than one study. However the Committee needs to only consider the changes before them. Generally the Committee should be aware of quantity issues and how they work. Sheri advised that there is a Joint Water Management Users Association and the overall municipalities using water in the area have a joint management agreement in place to discuss this issue, so the municipalities are well aware of this and what is happening because of it. There was a meeting of all of the agencies in February to discuss this. Chris Gerrits attended this meeting. Chris advised that the process started about 10 years ago, led by the CTC Source Protection Region staff, but with all three source protection areas and municipalities participating. It is the only area in the Province required to have a joint water management committee. The water management committee has laid out triggers that will dictate when this work is to be done, right down to the cost sharing agreement. Behnam Doulatyari confirmed that it is top of mind for all of the municipalities. The joint agreement has committed the four municipalities to beyond what is required under the *Clean Water Act*, specifically within local area A that has been identified as being under significant stress, to make sure that the model that is used is updated based on triggers (5% increase in takings; 5% increase in land use). Beyond that the policies are directed at the municipalities and the Province to ensure the stability of municipal supply is protected, requiring that any expansion in urban boundaries or new development to consider this. There is also a policy directed at the Province to look at the Tier 3 results when issuing permits, but we cannot speak to how the Province uses that information or the modelling, which has been a point of contention operationally, and how they look at cumulative impact. Locally the town has limitations in their permits to take water to consider impact and to do proactive monitoring. In terms of land use, what was reaffirmed at the committee meeting was the shared responsibility. As part of this amendment, CVC will be attending all Council meetings of the four municipalities and the County. Dufferin County is anticipating updating their OP and growth management study in 2027, and this study will go forward around the same time. It has been committed to that this will be considered in all of these studies.

Moved by: Chris Gerrits

Seconded by: Michelle Flaherty

SPC-12-26 **Resolved That** presentation b) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Mono be received for information; and

Further That the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee agree that the proposed amendments to the Town of Mono chapter of the Assessment Report is advisable. **Carried**

- c) A presentation by Devin Hannan, Golder & Associates regarding Staff Report SPC2.3 - Amendment to the Lafontaine Drinking Water System – Technical Report prepared by SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. on behalf of the Township of Tiny, September 2, 2025.

Link to the presentation – [Georgian Sands and Lafontaine Water Supply System Wellhead Protection Area Modelling and Vulnerability Scoring Updates](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Colin Elliott: Has the nitrogen level come down in the last 5-6 years in the Lafontaine wells? There is 17-year travel, and has it changed much in the last several years? Severn Sound has done a lot of work in that area with the farmers, so it would be nice to see the nitrogen levels going down.

Melissa answered this in presentation d), showing that the trend is decreasing.

David Ketcheson: Why did Well 1-1 fail, and given the close proximity that Well 14-2 has been put up are we expecting Well 14-2 to have a similar problem? If Well 1-1 was clogged, did you account for that in the numeric model by lowering the permeability around the well to account for the clogging?

Devin advised that Well 1-1 was drilled in 1967. There was build-up in the screen of siltation and metal, and some rehabilitation work was done but they could not get the same yield from this well. It is not an issue with the aquifer itself, but instead that the well had come to the end of its useful life and needed to be replaced. Melissa added that the casing itself was also falling apart and needed replacing. Devin advised that any issues that might have arisen due to clogging of the screen, would be viewed as very localized. Well 14-2 is 12 m away so the flow pattern would be unaffected by the issues at Well 1-1. Considering Well 1-1 is no longer pumping, the aquifer behaviour at Well 14-2 would be unaffected by anything at the Well 1-1 location.

Moved by: Jessica Neto
Seconded by: Ian Chadwick

SPC-13-26 **Resolved That** presentation c) and Staff Report SPC2.3 regarding an amendment to the Lafontaine Drinking Water System – Technical Report prepared by SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. on behalf of the Township of Tiny, September 2, 2025, be received for information. **Carried**

- d) A presentation by Melissa Carruthers, SSEA regarding Staff Report SPC2.4 - Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Lafontaine Wellhead Protection Areas within the Township of Tiny.

Link to the presentation – [Section 34 Amendment – Lafontaine, Township of Tiny](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

David Ketcheson: The plume is moving toward the Georgina Sand wells, so have these wells increased pumping to offset the Lafontaine wells? Is there a longer term issue with nitrate that will need to be addressed?

Melissa advised that it is assumed that it is potentially moving, but the levels are staying lower than they were, so it is hard to tell. With this particular well being replaced and having such low nitrate levels and the municipality blending the water, there is a little bit of flexibility as to keeping those nitrate levels low, but it hard to say. This is the value of the annual reporting as we know the levels annually.

Peter Dance: Is there something being done in terms of education and outreach (E&O) to the residential areas to help them understand their role with fertilizer in keeping nitrate levels low?

Melissa advised that the residential areas in Lafontaine are in a prohibition situation, so it is not really E&O. However the prohibition letter has been issued with a lot of E&O. In addition, two in person education sessions have been conducted, with presentations from SSEA, municipalities, health units and landscape contractors. Bill commented that one of the challenges of source water protection is knowing when risk management works, except in the cases where there are pre-existing contaminate issues. Seeing the nitrate levels decreasing in the Lafontaine area is very encouraging. Paul Maurice is a local farmer who has been an ambassador in this area, and seeing the results of the works being down by the farmers is encouraging. There was a pre-exisitng issue with TCE in the Coldwater drinking water system, and those levels have decreased enough so that we can take this issue off. Both of these demonstrate times when water quality has improved.

Jessica Neto: Is there a date scheduled for the turn on of that well?

Melissa said not at this point as it is subject to the Section 34 amendment, and once approval of the source water piece can happen, the licensing and approval can happen and turning the well online will come after that.

David Ketcheson: Why are we seeing increasing nitrate levels in the Georgian Sands wells, especially when we have prohibition on?

Melissa advised that there were previous studies to try to determine where these nitrates were coming from and what is the anticipated timeline of when we could see some changes. There is anywhere from 14 to 34 years that we will see these changes. We are not sure but are assuming that things are moving and we are now seeing things in the Georgian Sands area, but not at the highest levels of Lafontaine so we are in a good position. The annual reporting is being used to ensure things are not going off the rails.

Dave Ritchie: Have the issues been resolved that were going wrong with the new well in Midland on Balm Beach Road?

Melissa advised that they have done the 90-day pump test and the Town of Midland is waiting on the results of that report.

Moved by: Chris Gerrits
Seconded by: David Ketcheson

SPC-14-26 **Resolved That** presentation d) and Staff Report SPC2.4 regarding Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report Update – Lafontaine Wellhead Protection Areas within the Township of Tiny be received for information; and

Further That the South Georgian Bay – Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee agree that the proposed amendments to the Tiny chapter of the Assessment Report is advisable. **Carried**

e) A presentation by Mystaya Touw, LSRCA regarding Staff Report SPC2.5 - Section 36 Pre-Consultation Comments Received.

Link to the presentation – [Pre-Consultation Comments S.36 Amendment](#)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Ian Chadwick: Do we have a role as an advocate for consistency across regulations, like the issues Barrie Waste and Recycling Corporation raised? Can we make a presentation or include recommendations in our update that the Province make things consistent for all parties and across all regulations? Can we do or say anything about the salt use on the Highway 400 corridor? Do we have any role in that or is it out of our hands? Can we ask the Province to look into alternatives to salt that would have less of an impact on source protection?

Mystaya confirmed that the Committee can submit comments to MECP, as part of this amendment for changes we would like them to make going forward. These comments can be compiled and included in the final submission. Bill advised that the challenge with the highway is that it is provincial jurisdiction, and the tool we have for salt is a risk management tool that is implemented by the municipalities, and they have no jurisdiction over the Province. The Committee could prepare a list of items to send back to MECP as deficiencies in the *Clean Water Act*. This Committee did this in 2014/15 when the original plan was submitted, and some of those changes were made. The other option is to develop a non-legally binding policy, which the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) may not follow. Bilal Kidwai clarified that all feedback is welcome, especially to the MTO where Highway 400 crosses areas with known salt issues. Feedback from MTO will likely relate to the *Highway Safety Act*, saying that salt application is a safety measure, but they would likely want to work with the Committee on reducing salt issues.

ACTION ITEM: Bill recommended coming back to a future meeting with a staff report proposing either a non-legally binding policy in the amendment directed at MTO, and/or a comment towards MECP that would accompany the final submission when the Minister reviews it for approval.

Peter Dance: There are cases where there are more stringent regulations inside a source protection area than outside, which is part of the inconsistency. There also is varying policies across the source protection regions (SPR). What options might we look at to deal with the inconsistencies in regulations?

Bill advised that to try to maintain consistency between the SPRs, at the staff level they compare notes with the neighbouring SPR to hopefully eliminate inconsistencies. However it is ultimately up to each SPC to develop approaches that are right for their source protection area. The issue that was raised by a landowner in their comments related to source water protection, but it is consistent across the SPRs. However one piece of legislation says a stormwater management pond is required, while another piece of legislation says that pond is a Threat to drinking water. The Committee could tailor a policy that smoothed out that conflict. However the only option would be to not put in a prescribed instrument governing that stormwater management pond. The pond in question is immediately adjacent to a well, so is a little risky. Katie Thompson advised that some of the concern is that there are gaps in the prescribed instrument process that do not recognize all of the significant drinking water threats. It would be great if the Province addressed all of the significant threats when they need to issue an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA). It is the duplication that they have to deal with the Province and the municipality. Bill advised this is out of the scope of the source protection plan, so the only way to address this would be to amend the *Clean Water Act*.

Colin Elliott: Would like to see the Agriculture reps discuss the changes to the Agriculture policy before they go to MECP. Ten years ago when the plans for source water were being prepared, the people we had the biggest problem with was the Ministry of Agriculture. Would like to see agriculture changes be discussed by the Committee before going to the Ministry. Barrie was let off the hook with a few times with less salt, but the salt levels in Kempenfelt Bay keep going up so there has to be an alternative.

Bill advised that some of the comments provided by Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness will require additional consideration of this Committee.

ACTION ITEM: Staff to report back at a future meeting before comments are submitted to the Province.

Moved by: John Hemsted

Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC-15-26 **Resolved That** presentation e) and Staff Report SPC2.5 regarding Section 36 Pre-Consultation Comments Received be received for information.
Carried

David Ketcheson abstained from the discussion and vote on this matter.

f) A presentation by Mystaya Touw, LSRCA regarding Staff Report SPC2.6 - Environmental Registry of Ontario Postings 026-0302: "Communal drinking water and wastewater system municipal consent requirements".

Link to the presentation – [ERO 026-0302 "Communal drinking water and wastewater system municipal consent requirements"](#)

Moved by: Jennifer Best

Seconded by: Katie Thompson

SPC-16-26 **Resolved That** presentation f) and Staff Report SPC2.6 regarding Environmental Registry of Ontario Postings 026-0302: "Communal drinking water and wastewater system municipal consent requirements" be received for information. **Carried**

g) A presentation by Bill Thompson, LSRCA regarding Source Protection Region Update.

Link to the presentation – [Source Protection Region Update](#)

Moved by: John Hemsted

Seconded by: Jessica Neto

SPC-17-26 **Resolved That** presentation g) regarding Source Protection Region 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

Item SPC1.1 was identified under items not requiring separate discussion.

Moved by: Dave Ketcheson

Seconded by: Chris Gerrits

SPC1.1 – A letter dated May 8, 2026 from Conservation Ontario regarding Conservation Ontario's comments on "Communal drinking water and wastewater system municipal consent requirements" (ERO#026-0302)

SPC-18-26 **Resolved That** correspondence SPC1-1 as listed in the agenda be received for information. **Carried**

11. Consideration of Items Requiring Separate Discussion

There were no items requiring separate discussion.

12. Other Business

- a) Chad McRae: SPC1.2 correspondence regarding Urgent Concerns Regarding Water Levels and Water Quality in Lake St. John is appended to the minutes as SPC1.2. Bill advised that Lake St. John is not in any conservation authority watershed or the SSEA watershed, so we cannot officially help. There is no municipal drinking water systems on the Lake so it is not in this Committees jurisdiction legally. Staff is aware of the harmful algae blooms but has no jurisdiction to do anything about it. MECP released a program called Best Practices in Drinking Water Source Protection which was designed to be a simplified source protection program that communities can take on voluntarily. There was a funding program to help communities through the process and Bill was working with a representative from the Lake St. John Cottage and Home Owners Association to submit a grant application to develop a watershed plan/source protection plan to identify the sources of nutrients contributing to the plumes, however the grant program is on hiatus so no funding available at this time. As a result there is nothing staff can do at this time, other than helping them out unofficially. The water quantity issue is additionally complicated as the Lake is part of the Trent-Severn Waterway, so it is under federal jurisdiction. This morning Bill looked at the water level gauge and can confirm that the level is below the long-term average in the summer, and above the long-term average in the spring. There appears to be flooding in the spring and low levels in the summer, so it appears that the issues identified are partially water levels being controlled to deal with climate change concerns.

13. Closed Session

None.

14. Next Meeting and Adjournment

Moved by: Jessica Neto

Seconded by: Ian Chadwick

SPC-19-26 **Resolved That** the next meeting of the Source Protection Committee to be tentatively scheduled to be held on Thursday, July 23, 2026 from 1-4 pm to be held virtually. **Carried**

Moved by: Katie Thompson

Seconded by: John Hemsted

SPC-20-26 **Resolved that** the June 11, 2026 meeting of the Source Protection Committee be adjourned at 3:38 pm **Carried**

The Honourable Mike Harris Minister of Natural Resources Ministry of Natural Resources 99
Wellesley Street West, Room 6630 Toronto, ON M7A 1W3

RE: Urgent Concerns Regarding Water Levels and Water Quality in Lake St. John

Dear Minister Harris,

I am a long-term resident of the Washago area, having lived here since 1988, and I am writing to you today to express my grave concerns regarding the deteriorating state of Lake St. John and the surrounding water systems.

My concerns stem from two primary issues that have severely impacted our local environment and community:

1. **Water Level Management:** Over the past three years, the operation of the lock system on Switch Road has resulted in significantly lower water levels. In my nearly forty years of experience on this lake, I have never seen these levels so low; I have personally struck rocks with my boat motor, a hazard that was non-existent in previous decades.
2. **Water Quality and Algae Blooms:** Concurrent with these water level issues, our community has faced severe blue-green algae blooms over the past three years, which pose a significant risk to the health of the lake, local wildlife, and residents.

I have a history of successful advocacy regarding the environmental integrity of this area. In 2018, I brought to the attention of the Brechin Council the issue of sewage dumping on Monk Road, which contributed runoff into Mud Lake and, by extension, Lake St. John. The Council voted unanimously to eliminate this practice, proving that corrective action can be taken when the facts are presented.

I am now seeking your intervention to review the management of the lock system on Switch Road. The current management practices are causing irreparable harm to our local ecosystem and recreational safety. I kindly request a formal review of the water control measures and an investigation into the cause of the recent, aggressive algae blooms.

Thank you for your time and for your commitment to the natural resources of Ontario. I look forward to your response and would appreciate information on the next steps the Ministry intends to take regarding this critical matter.

Sincerely,



Chris Francis

Subject: Urgent Environmental Concerns: Lake St. John Water Levels and Algae Blooms

Dear Jill Dunlop, MPP,

I am a long-term resident of the Washago area, residing here since 1988, and I am writing to you today to seek your assistance regarding the environmental health of Lake St. John.

I have attached a formal letter addressed to the Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Mike Harris, regarding two critical issues: the severe lowering of water levels caused by recent operations at the Switch Road lock system, and the alarming increase in blue-green algae blooms over the past three years.

As my representative, I would appreciate your support in bringing these concerns to the Ministry's attention. My goal is to initiate a formal review of the water management practices at the lock system and to investigate the root causes of our lake's declining water quality.

Previously, I successfully worked with the local council in 2018 to stop harmful sewage runoff into our local watershed. I am hopeful that, with your advocacy, we can achieve a similarly positive result for the preservation of Lake St. John.

I look forward to hearing from you and would welcome a discussion on how we might best address these issues. Thank you for your time and your service to our community.

Sincerely,



Ontario

Source Protection Committee Meeting SPC-03-2026

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: July 23, 2026

Subject: Limitations of Nutrient Management Policies

Recommendations:

That presentation b) and Staff Report SPC 2.1 regarding Limitations of Nutrient Management Policies be received for information.

Purpose of Staff Report:

To provide the Committee with an update on the on-going limitations of policies in the Source Protection Plan for nutrient management. This includes policies for agricultural source material, non-agricultural source material (NASM), commercial fertilizer, and livestock.

Background:

The current tools and policies available for the management of nutrient related drinking water threats (agricultural source material, commercial fertilizer, livestock) leave some potential gaps in drinking water protection and risk mitigation.

The tools that may apply to these threat activities include nutrient management strategies, nutrient management plans. Both of these tools are considered prescribed instruments, however only nutrient management strategies are reviewed and approved by provincial staff.

As discussed at the June 11, 2026 Source Protection Committee (SPC) meeting, comments received from the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness (OMAFRA) during pre-consultation on the Section 36 amendment package highlighted these existing gaps and the ministry clarified what they do and do not review.

Changes proposed for the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, would have enabled source protection committees to include policies stating that risk management officials can review agricultural prescribed instruments, particularly those not reviewed by provincial staff, and require additional risk management measures if those in place are not sufficient to

Item SPC2.1

manage the drinking water threat. This change however did not materialize in the now approved changes to the Act and the new regulation Ontario Regulation 210/26.

Issues:

In simple terms, nutrient management strategies are focused on storage of nutrients (such as agricultural source material) and/or outdoor livestock yards or confinement areas, and are reviewed and approved by the ministry. Nutrient management plans, which are not reviewed, deal more with the application of nutrients such as agricultural source material, or commercial fertilizer. So, while any drinking water threats are deemed managed through both tools and the policies direct OMAFA to review the instruments, only one is reviewed and approved under the *Nutrient Management Act*.

The policies in the source protection plan aimed at OMAFA, discuss the review of both strategies and plans. Provincial staff submitted comments through pre-consultation on the Section 36 amendment stating that they only review nutrient management strategies and NASM plans, not nutrient management plans. Nutrient management plans, which deal with application activities, are still considered a prescribed instrument despite the lack of oversight, meaning that without changes to the *Clean Water Act* a risk management plan policy cannot also be applied. This remains a gap in oversight in the management of drinking water threats, and while the focus of the *Nutrient Management Act* and the tools underneath it is nutrients, many of these threat activities are also a concern due to the potential for pathogens. Further, the prescribed wording for PI policies recently announced appears to require us to continue to direct OMAFA to review and put terms and conditions on nutrient management plans, despite the fact that OMAFA does not have a process for doing so.

Summary:

Nutrient management plans are prescribed instrument tool that is not reviewed or approved by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Agribusiness. They apply to threats such as the application of agricultural source material, and the application of commercial fertilizer. There were changes proposed on the Environmental Registry of Ontario that would have allowed risk management officials to review the plans and require risk management plans if they deemed one necessary. These changes were not included in the now approved changes to the Clean Water Act and the new regulation Ontario Regulation 210/26. This remains a gap in the source protection program and the management of drinking water threats.

Item SPC2.1

Recommendations:

It Is Therefore Recommended That presentation b) and Staff Report SPC 2.1 regarding Limitations of Nutrient Management Policies be received for information.

Prepared by:

Mystaya Touw, Sourcewater Protection Specialist

Recommended by:

Bill Thompson, Project Manager, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

Source Protection Committee Meeting SPC-03-2026

Staff Report Number: SPC2.2

To: South Georgian Bay - Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee

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

Date: July 23, 2026

Subject: Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-3

Recommendations:

That presentation c) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-3 be received for information; and

Further That the existing policy FUEL-3 be removed and replaced with the proposed new FUEL-3 policy as written.

Purpose of Staff Report:

The purpose of this Staff Report is to provide the committee with an opportunity to reflect on the effectiveness of fuel policy FUEL-3 and consider updates as part of the S.36 amendment to the source protection plan.

Background:

The handling and storage of fuel is one of 22 drinking water threat activities outlined in the *Clean Water Act*, 2006.

Policy FUEL-3 states that the local Source Protection Authority shall request from the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) inspection reports on Private Fuel Outlets in areas where the handling and storage of fuel is a significant drinking water threat. To aid in the implementation of Part IV policies, the TSSA will provide this information to the Source Protection Authority for distribution to Risk Management Officials (RMO). The local source protection authority will report back to TSSA any data about leaks and other concerns observed, as they relate to TSSA's mandate to enforce O. Reg. 213/217 (as amended).

The FUEL-3 policy was not intended to manage threats, but to provide information to RMOs in doing their jobs, as it was believed at the time that TSSA would be doing inspections based on a 2018 Auditor General's report, but as of 2023 that recommendation was still listed as 'in-progress' rather than implemented.

Item SPC2.2

This policy is legally binding towards the source protection authority, but not towards the TSSA. As such, requests for inspection reports are not received as often as requested, yet every year the policy is reported as ‘implemented’. The lead source protection authority did receive information from TSSA in 2025; however, the inspections were few and far between. Overall, this policy may not be adding much value to the program as currently written.

Issues:

The topic was discussed with risk management officials, and they were not in favour of doing away with the policy altogether as they still saw some value in using the policy to make the TSSA aware of their concerns about fuel storage and to help start conversations.

Other policy options may exist for the committee to consider. Other source protection regions have policies directed at the TSSA and the ministry they work with, the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement, that puts the reporting requirement onto the TSSA and the ministry. These are also legally binding policies, and they are included in those regions’ annual reporting from provincial bodies.

Additionally, the committee could consider asking that inspections in source water vulnerable areas be prioritized. A new or updated policy would require consultation with the TSSA and the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement, within the Section 36 amendment process.

The proposal is to replace the current FUEL-3 policy with the wording below:

***NEW* FUEL-3:**

- By February 1st of each year the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) and the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement shall report on the number of inspections of fuel sites where the handling and storage of fuel would be considered a significant drinking water threat. TSSA is also encouraged to prioritize inspections in these vulnerable areas where fuel could be considered a significant threat.

Summary:

The current policy FUEL-3 directs source protection authority staff to contact Technical Standards and Safety Authority annually to collect information about inspections of fuel sites in source water vulnerable areas. Staff do not always receive a reply and the information received in 2025 shows they have not done many inspections. It is proposed that the existing FUEL-3 policy be replaced with an updated policy directed at TSSA and the

Item SPC2.2

Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement, putting the onus on them to report. A recommendation that they prioritize inspections in source water vulnerable areas is also proposed.

Recommendations:

It Is Therefore Recommended That presentation c) and Staff Report SPC2.2 regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-3 be received for information; and

Further That the existing policy FUEL-3 be removed and replaced with the proposed new FUEL-3 policy as written.

Prepared by:

Mystaya Touw, Sourcewater Protection Specialist

Recommended by:

Bill Thompson, Bill Thompson, Project Manager, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

Source Protection Committee Meeting SPC-03-2026

Staff Report Number: SPC2.3

To: South Georgian Bay - Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee

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

Date: July 23, 2026

Subject: Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-4

Recommendations:

That presentation d) and Staff Report SPC2.3 regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-4 be received for information; and

Further That the proposed revisions to fuel policy FUEL-4 be approved as written.

Purpose of Staff Report:

The purpose of this Staff Report is to provide the Source Protection Committee with an overview of the challenges of implementing policy FUEL-4 as currently written and to consider proposed policy revisions requested through comments on the S. 36 Amendment pre-consultation.

Background:

The handling and storage of fuel is one of 22 drinking water threat activities outlined in the *Clean Water Act*, 2006.

Policy FUEL-4 states that municipalities shall develop a by-law to require the removal of fuel tanks from abandoned properties within 1 year of known abandonment, and unused tanks from occupied properties once no longer in use within vulnerable areas where the handling and storage of fuel is or would be a significant drinking water threat.

This policy has a lower successful implementation rate throughout the source protection region than other policies.

Issues:

Municipalities and risk management officials have noted that the policy is difficult to implement as there is no notification mechanism to inform them of where fuel tanks exist and when they are considered abandoned. Some municipalities have also been unsure how enforcement of the by-law would work and what staff would have the authority to enforce it.

Item SPC2.3

Staff at the City of Barrie used the opportunity to comment through pre-consultation on the S.36 amendment to the source protection plan to note the issue and to provide some alternative policy wording they thought might be more workable for their municipality and hopefully others. Their suggested amendment is to change the wording from “develop a by-law” to “develop a process.” Staff felt that establishing a process to identify abandoned fuel tanks and encourage their removal would be more realistic than adopting a municipal by-law, which could be difficult to implement and enforce.

The committee may wish to discuss what this process could potentially look like, as well as how the committee and the ministry would evaluate implementation.

Proposed policy amendment text:

FUEL-4:

- Municipalities shall develop a [REMOVE] ~~by-law~~ [ADD] **process** to require the removal of fuel tanks from abandoned properties within 1 year of known abandonment, and unused tanks from occupied properties once no longer in use within vulnerable areas where the handling and storage of fuel is or would be a significant drinking water threat.

Summary:

Policy FUEL-4 is one of the least successfully implemented policies in the source protection plan as currently written. Feedback received from the City of Barrie during pre-consultation on the S. 36 amendment suggested changing the wording from “municipalities shall develop a by-law” to “municipalities shall develop a process.” The proposed change may be a more flexible solution that municipalities are better able to work with than the current policy.

Recommendations:

It Is Therefore Recommended That presentation d) and Staff Report SPC2.3 regarding Review of Fuel Policy FUEL-4 be received for information; and

Further That the proposed revisions to fuel policy FUEL-4 be approved as written.

Prepared by:

Mystaya Touw, Sourcewater Protection Specialist

Recommended by:

Bill Thompson, Project Manager, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

Source Protection Committee Meeting SPC-03-2026

Staff Report Number: SPC2.4

To: South Georgian Bay - Lake Simcoe Source Protection Committee

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

Date: July 23, 2026

Subject: **Threat #5: The Management of Agricultural Source Material (Aquaculture)**

Recommendations:

That Staff Report SPC2.4 regarding Threat #5: The Management of Agricultural Source Material (Aquaculture) be received for information.

Purpose of Staff Report:

The purpose of this Staff Report is to bring forward a request received through pre-consultation on the Section 36 amendment to the Source Protection Plan with respect to aquaculture.

Background:

Aquaculture is one of 22 drinking water threat activities outlined in the *Clean Water Act*, 2006.

Aquaculture involves farm-raising cultured fish either on land or in the water. Land-based facilities cultivate fish using tanks, raceways or ponds that have water aeration and circulation systems to oxygenate the water and to remove waste products. Cage operations cultivate fish in cages directly in lakes and rivers. Pathogens are the main potential concern with aquaculture.

Aquaculture is a unique threat, in that there are no circumstances outlined in the Technical Rules in which it would be considered a significant drinking water threat. It can be considered a low or moderate threat.

The Source Protection Plan does not currently contain a policy for aquaculture.

Item SPC2.4

Issues:

While aquaculture threats cannot be significant, the City of Barrie recommended the Committee develop a policy to address low and moderate aquaculture threats in their pre-consultation comments on the s.36 amendment.

Following the most recent changes to the Clean Water Act, 2006 and the new regulation (Ontario Regulation 210/26), this suggestion is no longer possible as Source Protection Authorities have now been required to remove any prescribed instrument policies that govern moderate and low threats governed by prescribed instruments. Aquaculture activities require environmental compliance approvals, which are prescribed instruments.

Summary:

The aquaculture is drinking water threat for which there can be only low or moderate threats to drinking water under the Technical Rules. The Plan does not currently contain a policy for aquaculture, and while a policy was proposed in feedback received on the Section 36 amendment, such a policy is no longer possible under provincial regulations.

Recommendations:

It Is Therefore Recommended That Staff Report SPC2.4 regarding Threat #5: The Management of Agricultural Source Material (Aquaculture) be received for information.

Prepared by:

Mystaya Touw, Sourcewater Protection Specialist

Recommended by:

Bill Thompson, Project Manager, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority