SAC Schedule of Meetings

June 17	Advance materials (Agenda, Revised ToR, draft schedule of meetings, summary of 1st SAC and confidential section) sent to SAC
June 19 1:30-3:30	Introductory meetings of Jim, Deb, with Wendy Ren
June 18	New SAC website up and running
June 23rd	SAC meeting • Review of Legislation • Protection Plan Primer • Detailed SAC Work Plan and schedule of meeting leading to late September submission of Draft Plan
	July 7th -Send/post on new website advance material for July 14th
June 25 or 26	Meeting of the SAC and SciAC Co-chairs, MOE and facilitators
July 14th	Joint meeting of SAC with SciAC • SciAC presentation – work done to date and status (4 reports) (Co-chairs of SciAC) (linkages to legislation) • Quick review of introductory chapter (front end materials on goals, objective, sample indicators, etc.) • Water quantity • Samples/examples from other relevant "Plans" to help members visualize the contents (may be covered under protection plan primer)
	July 23rd – Send/post on new website advance material for July 30th
July 30th I	SAC meeting • Invasive species • Climate change • Cold water fish community
	July 30th – Send/post on new website advance material for August 6th
Aug 6th	Joint meeting of SAC with SciAC • Water quality
	Aug 6th – advance material for the Aug 13th
Aug 13th	Natural heritage features Shoreline protection Hydrological features Aquatic habitat features (lake, tributaries)
	Aug 13th - Send/post on new website advance material for Aug 20th
Aug 20th	• Financing Strategy • Governance
	Aug 20th – Send/post on new website advance material for Aug 27th
Aug 29th	• Recreational Opportunities • Other… to be determined
	Sept 2nd – Send/post on new website advance material for Sept 8th
Sept 8th	• Final review of the draft plan • Input into the public consultation plan
Late Sept	• Government internal approvals

Aquatic Life and Habitat

Questions/Comments from SAC	Policy Development Team Response at Meeting
The Endangered Species Act is fairly rigorous and is very enforceable. Why do we need to reinforce something that has a pretty stringent piece of legislation behind it? It creates a lot of confusion and a lot of misinterpretation.	Agreed – suggested policy has been removed
They are provincial standards, but obviously very concentrated in southern Ontario. My concern is, they carry guns, so my members are going to listen to them. They can arrest you and put you in jail. If it comes to a conflict, I would suggest that my members would listen to them. Do not make things conflict.	The idea is not duplication; the idea is to make sure we have enough protection in the Lake Simcoe case, rather than using the DFO operational statements that are nationally or provincial standards.
One of the other questions posed in the documents talked about other uses of different policies. My suggestion would be to make use of current partnerships that are already up and running and very successful. One that comes to mind is the OFAH and MNR Invasive Species Program. With a small additional investment, we will see higher returns in outreach and education. That is mainly due to the business relationship the Federation has with MNR. It would not take a large investment to double the number of contacts we get within a year.	Agreed – the MNR/OFAH partnership is recognized within the suggested policies of the invasive species section of the plan
With regards to the 30 m buffer around streams, I know what it does, I know why you want it, but if you have a stream that is running through someone's farm and they have to do both sides of it, that is a fair chunk of land out of there. I think you are going to have to take a look at that for your financial instrument and see what can be done and you will probably get a little more uptake if it looks to be interesting. Grey and Bruce Counties have started a plan similar to that. It is for streams and lakes. One of the Conservation Authorities in the area has a 5-year plan where they pay the farmer so much to take it out. They are planting trees, fencing, etc. We do do some of that, but when you start talking about 30 m back from each side, that is a lot of acreage if you are going across a 100-acre farm.	Although from an environmental perspective, a 30-meter buffer could perhaps be optimal, it is not always possible due to site-specific conditions and limitations. Cost-share efforts for setting aside productive agricultural land can be a challenge in Ontario due to the high economic value of land. In some areas of the Lake Simcoe watershed buffers are simply not feasible (e.g. the Holland and other Marshes) either for financial reasons, or for the site-specific characteristics and environmental cost-benefit offered. Several cost-share programs, including those offered by some Conservation Authorities, have provided opportunities for farmers to offset some buffer establishment costs, and efforts continue to make those costs eligible in cost-share programs for the Lake Simcoe watershed, though the Environmental Farm Plan and other stewardship programs.
If I had to do it all over again, from when we first started the Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition, rather than making phosphorous (P) our banner, I would have made it fish. It would not just have lake trout; it would have been bass, etc. It is not just about the quantity of the fish, it is whether they are edible. If bass is so filled or mercury, or benzene or toluene, and you do not want to eat it because your estrogen count is going to go through the roof, it takes a certain amount of the joy. Up until now, I have always only spoken on behalf of my organization, but on my own behalf, about fishing being a stressor. It is just the opposite. If you want to teach	It is more than just lake trout. As a fisheries biologist, it is more than just about lake trout. We have a family cottage on Lake Trout Lake and you look at that lake's watershed and it is, compared to Lake Simcoe's watershed, 100% healthier. There are no algae problems; there is very little weed growth. However, as a cottage association, we are very worried about dissolve oxygen (DO) and losing lake trout. Our warm water fish community is healthy, they are not being threatened.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Policy Development Team Response at Meeting
kids respect for nature, you are not going to teach them out of books, you are only going to teach them by being involved. You are not going to teach them from waterskiing, or jet skis. If you teach a kid to catch some crayfish and go and catch their supper, kill the fish, fillet it and eat it, the next time they go into a food store and buys a fish, they will have a little more respect for what it is that he is buying. Maybe should make fish the symbol, and not just the lake trout.	
The problem with using the lake trout as the solo star, taking centre stage, is that it becomes very easy for people to say, they are getting better. People cannot quite correlate. It is hard for people to understand that in 1970, the lake was in such bad shape that the lake trout stopped breeding. Yet, people did not notice anything was wrong with the lake until maybe the last 5 or 10 years. It is an anomaly, it is hard to pin your hopes on one superstar, particularly when people say it is getting better so what we are doing is maybe not too bad. We have to get over that. Whether you back the trout up with a chorus of other lake creatures.	Agreed – the aquatic life section takes an ecosystem approach to the issue – focusing its attention on all fish communities not just the lake trout.
We really need to tie education about invasive species to immediate action. I do not think it is really worth our time to just generally educate people about invasive species, but if that is tied to stewardship goals and specific groups, clubs, and anglers groups, that is definitely the way to go and I think you will see a lot more bang for the buck that way. Also, making invasive species information very specific, for example, having information about invasive fish and wild lake trout in ice huts and making that a requirement. That sort of thing is a very good, tangible, specific way to get the message out there. I think we really need to engage them because of course they really care.	Agreed – see stewardship and invasive species sections/policies
I would like to see some basic consumer education and outreach about P at the till, or on the shelf. I really like the idea about P free products being required in the Lake Simcoe watershed before the federal regulation kicks in. There are a lot more interesting partnerships that could happen with businesses in the watershed that would help to support that.	Is that something for this new stewardship committee to deal with or is it separate from that?
The potential action #2 is about adopting PWQOs for subwatersheds and requiring action plans for point and non-point sources of P. I would argue probably at least for sewage treatment plans, the CofAs are the action plan and those are in place, at least for our plans, I think they are all very up to date. In some cases there were revised because of the regulation. That is soft of taken care, it is one of those separated gaps from what is already done. I think you would want to think very hard about applying the PWQOs to non-point sources with the implications of that is in terms of costs and retrofitting. If we do not know what the sources are specifically, I do not know how you are going to apply those and who you apply them to.	This is up for discussion; that is why we are here. The main intent of that point was to address the situation that may occur that you may hit 7 mg/L in the lake, getting to your point, but there are still negative impacts on the aquatic communities and habitats in specific locations, or hot spots, around the watershed. If any has feedback on how best to improve that suggestion, we would love to hear it because that is the intent of what we were trying to do there.
“Require water taking permits to provide for the sustainability of aquatic communities and their habitats (e.g. cumulative impacts and extraction timings, etc.). Is the intention here that you	I think the actual details still need to be worked out. What we were trying to emphasize is that that process considers more than just the application that is being put forward on the

Questions/Comments from SAC	Policy Development Team Response at Meeting
would have the permit seeker look at cumulative impacts?	table. Theoretically, you could have 100 water takings of less than 50,000 L per day, that all have an impact, a cumulative impact. You may met all the hydrological needs of a system, but you may still be not necessarily meeting the ecological needs. I will defer to MOE in terms of the process, how best to do that, what certain aspects may already be done right now, but it is just ensuring that those are taken into consideration.
I am pleased and delighted to see how much you emphasized education in your presentation, but we need to be very careful that when we talk about education, we are not talking about education for education self. On a lake like this that needs such help, education should be linked very much to action and action should be very much linked to measurement.	Addressed in the proposed suggested stewardship policies
Recommendations of Recovery Committees, as identified in Recovery Strategies, are considered "advice to government" and are to be considered when the provincial government develops species specific habitat regulations pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, 2007. This proposal would circumvent this recently established decision-making process and eliminate the ability of elected officials to make and be held accountable for government decisions. To ensure accountability and transparency in the decision-making process and avoid unnecessary duplication, I recommend that this proposed policy be removed and that the Plan identify that species specifc habitat regulations, that may impact the Lake Simcoe watershed, will be developed pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, 2007.	Suggested policy removed
Include in public education what to do with invasive species once you have them. Not just a phone # to call. Ensure that every ice hut on the lake has posters identifying invasive species, as bait and as adults, and WHAT TO DO with them if they have them. This is crucial. Would also suggest basic consumer education/ outreach about Phosphorus tied to Sobeys or Home hardware or both, to reach people when they make purchasing decisions. Again, something specific to septic owners, a program to track pump outs and tests, and to keep them informed (not at ALL always done) on the timing of sewer installations or upgrades (times when they will get off septic). Educate aquarium managers about what they shouldn't carry.	- Agreed – please see invasive species section for more information - MNR, with several partners, have developed a poster (The Lake Simcoe Ice Fishing Pledge) that contains these messages which has been distributed to bait and tackle shops and ice hut operations around the lake - Agreed – incorporated in invasive species section and elsewhere in the plan
A question about why you separated the Socio-Economic Study, which could be interpreted as research from the rest of the research and how that relates also to issues of sustainability about the fisheries.	From a management perspective, the hope is to actually coordinate all of it and improve our management. The reason is it split out is it is a different delivery mechanism. The research end of it is from a public body standpoint; the socio-economic study may be led by one public body, however it is probably not going to be developed by a public body.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Policy Development Team Response at Meeting
The purpose of the Socio-Economic Study is to inform management. It is a phrase and I do not know the context and I am just trying to figure out where other things fit in, in terms of the fisheries, and in particular, how the sustainability of the fisheries is dealt with. It seems to me that we are coming through the process, and actually previous to this, that an economic focused review of the lake is important, but really the environmental perception of people in the watershed and whether it is an economic focus or not, is probably essential to the long-term resource management of the lake. There should be definitely be a component of social science research in this study, related to the future behaviour change of activities of all sectors, whether it is development, right through to fishing and others. In the research, and there certainly is in the literature, a number of these kinds of studies that have been done around the world, that kind of study, being broader than just social-economic, should really be an important foundation of this Plan. Because we have to modify and move forward in behaviour about how we are managing the landscape and land use in the watershed. I think it needs to be bigger than that. Ecological value and its relationship to the human social dynamic of the feature. Without us here, the aquatic and habitat would be fine. It is getting back to that human dimension.	It is greater than that. It is actually to determine the socio-economic value and ecological value of all of the aquatic resources. There are a few other policies in other areas of the Plan that may address that. If you are not satisfied by the end of today, I would suggest that we could revisit that. The intent of this is to add the ecological value, so it is not just socio-economic in the traditional sense. I am getting the sense that you mean even more than just the ecological value.
In terms of the monitoring policy, it sounds like a wonderful idea. What is the difference between community monitoring and biodiversity monitoring? You have 2 bullets, *(c) expanded littoral and offshore fish community monitoring* and *(d) increased fish biodiversity monitoring*. Just for simplicity, are those the same thing in effect?	In essence, they are, but they might be delivered in 2 different ways. What we were asked to do was to give examples of what program types or deliveries we would make. Fish community is the broader sense or broader monitoring program, whereas biodiversity monitoring is one specific program.
In terms of *Enhance Monitoring, Research and Assessment*, is the importance of an integration of these programs. This is really important. There is a lot of complexity here. I would like to see that kind of wording right in the statement, integration of these functions. And not only that, how they fit into the adaptive management process. These are only a part of that. I hope that that is well appreciated by the other task teams that are addressing the overall picture. I wanted to ask about where the impact and extent of bait harvest and use of	Completely agreed. The way the Plan is structured, invasive species and climate change, have all been dealt with in another section, although referred to in this section. You will hear those policies.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Policy Development Team Response at Meeting
bait comes into this perspective. I know that overlaps with invasive species policies, but again, it is really important to get the integration, not to get lost by fragmenting these different components. That is an essential part of the aquatic live and habitat considerations. As is another one, climate change. Integration is critically important. I would like to see that recognized explicitly. Invasive species is another example, which is really important to this aspect. The effect of invasive on food webs is really at the heart of the changes we are seeing in Lake Simcoe aquatic communities right now. It is hard to separate that from aquatic life and habitat. I have read those, but my point is that we are talking about monitoring, research and assessment here, having to do with aquatic life and habitat policies that need to be explicitly recognized that that is a part of that and that all of these activities need to be integrated in a way that they are not presently in our on the ground programs in Lake Simcoe. In terms of some of the comments that have been made around integration, which I know you have to pull it all apart and you have to put it all together again, but it is good to hear this emphasis and to make sure that that message gets through. Also, when it comes to the sections on outreach, education and stewardship, making those linkages. There was reference earlier about the need to look at some of the broader social sciences, looking at behavioural issues as well, so while you are doing this work, how are you going to link that into the information that is provided to the sectors and the public that are required to actually make the improvements and to be partners in this process.	

Climate Change

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Natural Heritage Strategies - I am aware of a number of natural heritage strategies integrated in the County, local and regional Official Plans, that were undertaken by Simcoe County, York Region, Durham Region, local municipalities and the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (many of which are in the process of being updated). This needs to be reflected in the chart. Also, I am unaware of a provincial natural heritage strategy for the Lake Simcoe watershed. Will this be provided to the SciAC and SAC?	GENERAL RESPONSE: These comments are mostly related to the tables in the draft paper which identify a "lead agency responsible" for items. At the last SAC meeting the committee had asked for more detailed information on existing and proposed policy actions, specifically "who, what, where, when, why" type of information. We attempted to capture this in charts in the working paper and presentation, but since we are working so closely with our partners, there is overlap with respect to "who" is leading different actions. We agree that additional lead agencies responsible for actions should be added, given the collaborative nature of many of these actions. We appreciate that these gaps have been identified. This is the type of information/advice we need from this committee. It is recognized that natural heritage strategies are being developed throughout the watershed on a number of fronts. The protection plan will also deal with natural heritage protection in Chapter 6: Natural Areas and Shorelines. The value of protecting natural heritage features and functions will increase the resilience of the watershed to adapt to impacts of climate change. It is included in this chart to recognize this linkage and co-benefit.
Source Protection Authorities (CAs) in conjunction with Source Protection Committees, (private sector and public sector stakeholders) with the support of the provincial government, are the lead agencies responsible for developing Source Protection Plans (not "Source protection climate change action plans"). This needs to be reflected in the chart.	Agreed. The phrase "source protection climate change action plans" was perhaps not the best choice of words. This area was meant to recognize the need for source protection plans to consider the impacts of climate change.
"Promote innovative technologies/design related to climate change adaptation" Why are CAs and the development industry (who possess significant expertise with respect to innovative technologies and design) not identified to take responsibility for this action? (For example - TRCA and BILD are in the midst of building the Archetype Sustainable House - a demonstration project that will be used to promote sustainable design and technologies to homebuilders and homebuyers). Further, why are ENGOs included in this chart but not private industry? Both the LSEMS Working Group and Steering Committee endorsed the participation of the business sector and the public in any future actions to continue the rehabilitation of the Lake Simcoe watershed. The government will establish the rules, but the development community and other private businesses, who possess significant expertise, will be responsible to implement a number of the components of the Plan. I recommend that a column identifying the business community be added to this chart, and appropriate actions	Agreed. Private industry and the business community are definitely a partner in the development and implementation of the Plan and should be included in this chart. This is an excellent point.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
assigned.	
Lastly, "Linkages to Source Protection Planning" is listed as a proposed new action for the provincial government. It is more logical for CAs to be responsible for this action as it is the CAs (and municipalities, with assistance from the provincial government) who have undertaken the technical work that will form the basis for the Source Protection Plan in the area.	This is included to recognize the ongoing work by the province in source protection planning. Under the Clean Water Act, communities will identify potential risks to local water sources and take action to reduce or eliminate these risks. Municipalities, conservation authorities, property owners, farmers, industry, community groups and the public will all work together to meet common goals. We will add the CA to the chart.
Can you expand on this? Can you provide an example of what would be an adaptation plan? What problem and what solution would be in it?	It would be looking at the risks to the Watershed, related to impacts of climate change impacts and developing strategies. It would be more fulsome exploration of climate change and how it is impacting the Watershed and developing a plan. Solutions would be storm-water management, water conservation, permeable pavement, preparedness for droughts and floods.
Can you provide some clarity around your understanding of the local and regional scientific data that actually exists to start being able to do some of this work that you are talking about.	The Conservation Authority has done a lot of work with natural heritage strategies. It is based on the best available information. It is acknowledged to have gaps in the base-level information. The idea would be to identify the science gaps and to build on the work that has already been done in the last 17 years. For example, fine-scale vegetation, the way endangered species habitat is identified right now is by recording and categorizing where they have been found in the past. There is a gap there in predicting where they should be. The way significant woodlands are identified is primarily a matter of geometry, how big are they, how proximate they are to other natural areas. We do not have good information on what species are in those woodlots and what habitats they represent. For example, if the projections for climate change are that climate changes are going to migrate northward at about 3 km/year, species ability to migrate is only about 1 km/year. Over time, there is going to be significant changes to the species content of woodlots and habitats that they represent. We do not have the base-level information to start projecting what those changes are going to be. There is one large science need there, the base -level, fine-scale vegetation inventory. We working all the time with the best available information and no one can be critical of that that is all we have. Here is one opportunity to increase the base-level knowledge in that area.
It is fully understandable that there is a lack of regional and local data on climate change because that has not been the focus. There are other sources for data and it may be a process of pulling that data together and looking at other baselines that were taken numbers of years ago and looking at the trends and changes and trying to determine whether climate has had an impact, if there are changes.	We have become good at the impact part of it; we have become good at saying we are going to be 2 degrees warmer, we are not so good at saying what is the impact of that going to be.
The Premier has a climate change adaptation experts panel for Ontario. Does any of the work that this panel is doing have implications for Lake Simcoe?	The expert panel has a mandate until the end of this year at which time they will be producing a report. Our policies in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan will have to be in line

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	with whatever recommendations they make. The panel is intending to focus more on adaptation, what humans have to do to adapt in terms of what infrastructure is required to minimize or to continue to protect the water, emergency management, etc. Sharon Bailey gave a presentation on some of the policies that are being worked on where climate change in being built in into things like regulations under safeguarding and sustaining Ontario's Clean Water Act, and about what is being done for Lake Simcoe. In terms of the municipal side and managing infrastructure, there are some good things that can go into this plan. In terms of getting advice of how to increase the resilience of the ecosystem, that is harder. The panel did not have a lot of advice at the time. At some in the process, the team will go back and indicate what ideas have been developed through this process and then get some more advice from them. That is tough. If you are going to spend any time on what should be put into this Plan about ensuring we protect the natural resilience of the ecosystem that is going to be very innovative.
What is the status of this? Some of the regional governments are developing climate adaptation plans and looking at various aspects. For example, Peel Region is looking at climate and health issues. York Region has a climate adaptation plan. What is the status of the capacity of the municipalities currently to do this, or are they doing it, this climate change risk assessment?	We did not do a scan to see where municipalities were at. We wanted to get the advice of this committee first before we explored the policies further.
There are a couple of people, Ian Burton and Thea Dickinson and their area of expertise is adaptive technologies for climate change. If this is a helpful resource, I would be glad to provide the coordinates.	There are probably some documents that can be included on Lakeapedia from the panel. If you have any references, just email Robb Ogilvie. Or any working papers that should be included.
They must be spatially relevant. It is has to be tied to the land use. One watershed may be more robust than other. It needs to be more specific and feasible. We are eluding ourselves if we think that any or all of these actions have anything really to do with climate change. For the $30 million federal clean up fund, climate change was never discussed. Nothing in that expenditure of money has to do with climate change. It sure should, everything should have climate change.	When the list was put together, the idea was to capitalize; it is an existing tool. You are right, the clean up fund as not be used yet, but we have three more years. All we need to do is ensure that we have good projects put in related to climate change.
There is a list of things that we are worried about happening, such as drought, but there is no recommendation that we create better reservoir systems. We are worried about flooding, but there is no recommendation that we create better dam systems and control systems for our rivers. There are obvious adaptation things that we ought to be doing right now. All of these things are recommendations to do something to produce some report. There are no suggestions about what we should actually be doing. There is no "Monday morning question". There is no Monday morning plan here.	Part of what the writing team put together was to put everything into developing an adaptation plan that was specific to Lake Simcoe, rather than trying at this stage, to come up with all of the answers because we do not have them. We recognize that we need to do exactly what you mentioned, the best that we could come up with in a short period of time was to say we need an adaptation plan for Lake Simcoe that addresses all of these specific stressors and some of the specific answers for Lake Simcoe. Our challenge is what we can do in 2 months for September 8, versus what will be in a

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	longer-term strategy as we implement the Plan. The climate change adaptation plan might be something that we create over the next year, year and a half, but it is a specific action that we commit the government to do for Lake Simcoe through the Protection Plan.
There are 2 ways to make a plan for climate change. There are plans for other things and at some point they integrate. Since climate change is an actual fact of life, should climate change not be an overarching plan, everything fits into the same plan, but a strong recognition of climate change. There are all kinds of plans on Lake Simcoe, there is a growth plan for population, etc. Maybe there should be a strongly integrated plan that says climate change is a fact of life and we need to do some of the things that have been talked about here. We need to have a precautionary principle in place. And it all becomes part of the same thing.	It is expected that the panel is going to be recommending something exactly like that. That in government programs, policy development, climate change be addressed right up front.
Climate change is bigger than Lake Simcoe; it cuts across everything. The government is going to have to set priorities for Lake Simcoe, priorities around what can be done in a certain amount of time, whether there is money to do it. Should we be focusing a lot of energy on climate change? We should not get too hung up on the actions that we should be taking. I think what is important, is more focused activities that are exclusive to Lake Simcoe. When it comes to deciding, the government will have to decide what priorities are more important. We should be giving them advice on where we think the best bets are. Climate change goes so far beyond Lake Simcoe.	
Climate change should be mainstream, which is the language that is used in the development world. The Existing Policies, Programs and Tools for climate change, while is a very useful list as an inventory, again points out the marginalization. These tools are for adaptation versus climate change. Climate change could be a filter for all government decision-making or climate change needs to be mainstream, which is the language of the development world. Whether these are policies, programs and tools for climate change or climate adaptation, they still represent a very small piece of what governments do. It is the way that environmental issues are marginalized because it speaks to mostly to environmental stuff. We are not seeing the budget, not seeing the inter-provincial trade policy. Not being marginalized into environmental silos. These things have implications for Lake Simcoe, they go beyond Lake Simcoe. Climate change should be a filter for government decision-making or it should be mainstream. These policies, programs and tools represent mostly environmental kinds of policy decisions that the government makes. There are things that are missing. That is the very broad envelope. Also, in the Act itself it says that the government will conduct research, taking a look at what are the kinds of impacts that affect the ecological integrity of Lake Simcoe watershed outside the watershed, so, therefore, climate change is impacted there more broadly, but also, within the watershed. There are 3 points: one is very broad, secondly the legislations says we can do this and third, we can take a look at what was put together	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
here around climate change and then drill down. We also need to talk about concrete things. We are not precluded, as a stakeholder committee from saying a very general statement like, climate change should be mainstream. We can make that statement. But we are also responsible for having a discussion about some of these other more concrete elements. If you have non-permeable surfaces, this exacerbates many of the problems that we are going to feel with regards to extreme weather events, which are going to increase because of climate change. Therefore, there are municipalities and other areas in Canada, and the world that are making bylaws and legislation to have an increase in permeable roads, driveways and surfaces. That might be a practical kind of thing that we say.	
Some of these actions will have climate change benefit. There is some splitting and grouping. What might be helpful is if they were broken out better.	
What about the frequency and history of those measures. It is no use measuring something starting today. The more practical measures go back 50 years or more and provide a basis for determining those changes. Changes do not happen over night, they happen over decades. I know a lot of that work is in place, as a prequel to LSEMS and through LSEMS. I would be happy to know what the frequency has been, history is and which of these measures are significant. We are not going to be able to make any informed opinions with respect to adaptability without measures.	
What is missing here, there needs to be a weighting of importance, a prioritization for a Plan. There should be some kind of idea of what is really important, what is most important, what is maybe not as important. And maybe there could be a timing component to that as well. What would be useful in these different categories is, what are the key things that are being done in each of those programs that really have an impact on the Plan, on the ground for Lake Simcoe, including a strategic weighting. It is giving some kind of real use to the chart. This is the most important thing in the Plan, what action is being done and who is actually going to do it. How would the Policy Development Team weight them? This is a start and there is a lot of stuff right here that would really inform the start.	
You have done a good job of laying things out because climate change is such an unknown. You have laid out what the parameters might be in both cases, if we have more floods or more droughts, if temperature goes up, or if temperature goes down. That is all part of the broader aspect of climate change. You could probably put under those proposed new actions some prioritization of those activities and some timelines. Some of them are very long term, some of	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
them are relatively short term and some require a mix of both depending on what they happen to be.	
I am not aware, but I do not think municipalities have made much progress on doing their adaptation plans on climate change because they have to figure out what are they going to have to plan for. Are they going to have to plan for one 200-year flood? That is the real challenge, at some point in time, someone at some local authority is going to have to say, as big as climate change is, we are going to have to plan for this part of it and then we will plan for this next part of it because budgets will come into play, prioritization, etc. That is all part of developing an adaptation plan, is what are you going to adapt for, you just do not know, but we have to start figuring out what we have to adapt for.	
	The chart that was shown for the program areas, the priority charts, that is attempting to prioritize. We really need your thoughts. For instance, we talked about acting locally, mainstream, how we think about climate change, do we have that captured here? Should we move the social marketing up into short-term high priority? You can think about that and provide comments through the website.
The Province needs to understand that there are a lot people out there doing a ton of things, all the way from municipalities through to volunteer organizations through to builders, developers, etc. The Plan should be in the context of building and strengthening those, not reinventing the wheel, duplicating, etc.	
There are a whole lot of different sources of information coming out on different things like climate change and we need to access that kind of information, make it accessible, but not duplicate it, and instead coordinate and make it available. At the upper tier municipal level that has resources to do some of this planning, some of the smaller municipalities may not have the resources to do it, so we have to find ways of sharing knowledge, information, best management practices, etc., so again not reinventing the wheel.	
Adaptation is good, taking steps to locally change things. We need to realize that we have a backdrop of natural processes that are already taking place. We are in a dynamic system that we cannot control, but we do have to integrate into a larger system. We need to very mindful of the priorities for Lake Simcoe.	
3 fundamental principles should be built into the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. 1st principle – to employ a precautionary approach to deal with the inherent variability and uncertainty of natural systems. 2nd principle – to recognize the limits of natural systems to deal with stressors imposed by human activities. 3rd principle – to employ at iterative, adaptive approach that employs social and science-based planning and monitoring of systems, to improve understanding and to use the new knowledge in a timely way to modify management.	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
These 3 principles should strongly govern what everyone does, what every aspect of the Plan should do.	
The Act as currently configured gives the SAC permission to make climate change a mainstream filter for all decision making. Climate change should not be marginalized into an environmental silo. We also need to be very mindful of practical things.	
On the climate change section overall policy direction, areas for climate change adaptation priority areas area based on what?	Assessment of what the potential impact is going to be from climate change. Part of this is to understand the range of issues that we need to be examining in more detail. There is climate change work that has been done but it was done at a high level. In terms of trying to see what that means for Lake Simcoe that is one of the first steps. Then from there figuring out what actions have to be taken.
Delighted to see the precautionary principle is in the principles. Where we don't have enough information that we follow the precautionary principle and follow some of the recommendations of SciAC which I am not seeing in the plan at this stage around no net loss of naturalized areas. We should aim high in order to acknowledge the fact that we don't know what the impact of climate change is going to be. I have some very serious concerns that we are going to get to 2012 when we develop a climate change adaptation plan for the Lake Simcoe protection plan and there won't be anymore for us to protect.	
These last stressors have received short focus – not enough attention and need stronger language. Supply in context of climate change and demand in context of population growth…municipalities need to look at it from this perspective – climate change, population growth and sectoral perspective. Big on linkages (slide deck pg 21 to 31 Invasive species have huge implications and have received little focus – not aggressive enough; linkages to climate change and water quality; emphasis on policy for understanding the interaction among species that have already invaded vs. just new invasions to know where to focus efforts; 32 climate change – integration is important here and research needs to be more specific – chemical and biological state and processes, and developing linkages between atm phenomena and lake processes to better predict what will likely happen (support in climate literature but LS has unique characteristic – location, morphometry, which impact the way climate interacts); interactions with so many other stressors; page 33 climate impacts on agricultural practices – water recycling, nutrient use, etc. Need to emphasize these important and priority areas. We will see more intense weather patterns and increasing difficulties keeping the water on the land. Recreation – develop incentive program for rec. destination…to do what? Need elaboration – how can they contribute in a positive statement.	Has been explained more thoroughly in the policy. We are looking at the various groups in the watershed to be doing what is the equivalent of a LEED program or a clean marina program or a autoban cooperative sanctuary program and seek certification it's those kind of incentive programs.

Invasive Species

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
While the goal is laudable, having read all the material preceding this section it seems pretty unachievable....sounds like we are standing in hurricane with a cheap umbrella when it comes to controlling what arrives in the watershed. Our chances of staying dry are slim to none. Even if we could perfectly control all the human pathways into the watershed (which we can't), there are still others the reach of this plan....so reduction of rate of invasion maybe all we are capable of. Increasing public awareness and changing behaviours would seem to be critical to getting there. Most of the items under "additional" indicators would be practical steps. Not sure what "increased capacity" means.	SciAC supports a no new invasive species objective for the plan and that prevention of new invasive species must be a plan priority. The legislative commitment is “to respond to adverse effects related to invasive species and, where possible, to prevent the invasive species from entering the Lake Simcoe watershed.” Despite that fact that we may not be able to reduce the rate of introduction to zero, taking our best effort to prioritize and target key pathways and species will provide the best level of protection. Even reducing the rate of introductions will buy more time for effective control and management techniques to be developed. Increased capacity generally refers to increased programs and policies of government and non- government organizations to respond to the threat of invasive species. It includes both operational dollars and staff positions.
By according equal space to the various affects of invasive species, it is easy to infer equal importance. The combined affect of Eurasian milfoil and Zebra mussels on the littoral areas of the lake is profound and has major implications for phosphorus recycling. Large areas of lake bottom that were formerly stony are now muddy and have become rich rooting beds. It is small wonder that there is less total P at depth - the plants and mussels are likely filtering the P before it "goes benthic". The danger is that unless P deposition is dramatically reduced, this rooting membrane will become a self-generating source of P.	It is difficult but essential to fully understand the impacts of invasive species and their role in disrupting biological/chemical ecosystem processes. Support for research into impacts and response measures is required on a priority basis. Often, the effects take many years to manifest, making long-term sources of funding for this type of research imperative. From a Lake Simcoe perspective, there is information available on impacts in other systems (Great Lakes, well studied inland lakes) that would help outline anticipated effects in the Lk. Simcoe watershed.
There is a history of invasive species problem from beginning of reporting data for the Lake, is the threat worse now? I am not familiar with what some of the invasive species were in the early days, smelt, compared to zebra mussels now. Was it more detrimental to the Lake?	Yes, if you take carp as an example, they were 19th century, history of early invasions. What you can see is fairly evident from the data that was collected, is that the frequency of invasions is increasing. Our knowledge and understanding of their impact on ecosystem functions has also increased. We need to understand that the threat is bigger.
In creating regulations, I hope that we do not start to make regulations for the sake of regulations. Because some of things that I was listening to in this presentation would cause me to leave Lake Simcoe all together. If I was not allowed to fish with live bait, I would leave Lake Simcoe. We have been fishing with live bait in Lake Simcoe for over 100 years. We caught the crayfish, leeches and earthworms ourselves as kids under rocks and that was part of the thrill of living in a rural environment. If we are forced to use lures and become anglers, instead of fishermen, I would have no interest in that. I would call that an urban experience and I would consider Lake Simcoe as a reservoir, rather than as a lake.	I should maybe clarify one of the slides that I moved through fairly quickly. There are some options on the bait and the use of bait, and live bait. Banning is one option; the other one is restricting its use so that you only use live bait that comes from the watershed. Those tools, while they are available, they take some time, they require Ontario Fisheries regulation amendments and the approval of the federal and provincial governments. You would be looking at a 2 to 3 year time frame to implement those kinds of things.
I know it is difficult but we need no new introductions of invasive species. They are just so	This is a large societal issue and a challenge federally, provincially and locally in the Lake

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
much of a threat to the Lake that we shouldn't just give up	Simcoe watershed. Plan priorities should focus on prevention but will also depend on broader government initiatives.
The anglers and hunters are very concerned about invasives…we have invested in the invasive species programs since 1992….the initial threat we got involved with was purple loosestrife…but this is a tough one to beat, if we can but we have to try	This is a broad societal issue that will require individuals, organizations and governments to be involved …it may also require a departure from many traditional practices. MNR and OFAH have worked in partnership on these issues since 1992 and currently more than 100 other partners are involved in the program as well. One of the many successes of the program is biological control of purple loosestrife. Since 1993, partners have introduced the weevil that feeds on purple loosestrife to all major watersheds in Ontario and are seeing significant impacts on the plant. The weevils will not eradicate purple loosestrife, but reduce its density so native vegetation grows back – and this is what we are seeing on the landscape now. We anticipate that within 5-10 years purple loosestrife will be under control in Ontario. The weevils underwent several years of intensive research to ensure they would not cause harm prior to being approved by Agriculture Canada for release.
We need to do something in the Plan that will improve the situation One thing we can do is re-invest in education and outreach…increase public and recreation users of the threats of these invasives and how people can help by washing their boats, not brining baitfish into the watershed, etc. We need to change the behaviour of some of the recreation boaters who are no paying attention to what they can do to reduce the threat of some invasives	Multi faceted education and outreach programming is an important first step in changing behaviour. Applying community based social marketing is important part of the process to determine the best messaging and delivery methods. Fortunately we have the benefit of the provincial invasive species awareness program (MNR/OFAH partnership) to access many products (brochures, watchcards, fact sheets, school curriculum programs, displays, public service announcements, signs, posters) that have been developed and are suitable for use in the Lk. Simcoe watershed.
There's no doubt in my mind that changing people's behaviours is one thing that would help…but how do we do it? How would you approach regulation and enforcement so that it would work without being too expensive?	Changing behaviour starts with public education. Applying community based social marketing has proven effective at ensuring the right messages are being used that actually work to change behaviour. This approach has been used widely in other programs aimed at changing behaviour to benefit the environment (eg. Recycling, installing low flush toilets, etc.) It is recognized that changing societal behaviour does take time – it doesn't happen overnight. Fortunately, due to initiatives through the MNR/OFAH partnership Invading Species Awareness Program in operation since 1992, some of these behavioural shifts are occurring.
I am still worried about the terrestrial invasives…purple loosestrife has been a problem for decades and I still don't see York Region having a program to combat it…doe anyone know if York Region has a program and if so, what is it?	Since 1993, a number of partners including MNR and OFAH have been involved in implementing a biological control program in Ontario for purple loosestrife. We have introduced the weevil that feeds on purple loosestrife to all major watersheds in Ontario and are seeing significant impacts on the plant. The weevils will not eradicate purple

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	loosestrife, but reduce its density so native vegetation grows back – and this is what we are seeing on the landscape now. We anticipate that within 5-10 years purple loosestrife will be under control in Ontario. The weevils underwent several years of intensive research to ensure they would not cause harm prior to being approved by Agriculture Canada for release.
On the other hand, if the invasives problem is so difficult to combat, is all this public education worth it? Cottagers and recreational users are not really going to pay any attention during their temporary visit to the Lake…so maybe we shouldn't spend our money here. Put the money where it will have some impact and make a difference in the health of the watershed	Programming should be targeted at watershed visitors and residents as they are all part of the problem and the solution. In numerous Great Lakes jurisdictions, including Ontario, it has been shown that public education does effectively alter behaviour to prevent the spread of invasive species.
Maybe we should prioritize the invasives that are the biggest threat and focus all our efforts on these ones. If boats coming up the Trent Severn and into Lake Simcoe are a threat because they may bring invasives attached to their hulls….then let's set up a "big boat bath" that they have to go through before they can enter the Lake Let's figure out where we can have an impact and do something that will have an impact	The risks associated with the Trent Severn Waterway need to be assessed before options can be considered. Invasive species threats and the pathways should be prioritized. The invasive species policy team has made these recommendations through this exercise.
Timing is important when we try to deal with invasives…there are certain windows of opportunity after which our efforts will have little effect on them	When prevention fails, early detection is very important so that a response, if warranted, can be implemented prior to establishment and spread of the species.
If we are going to use heavy regulation, then we first have to increase people's awareness of the problem, why it is important for them to change their behaviour…then you can use the heavy regulation but not before you prepare them for the issue/problem	Public awareness is an essential part of public policy. Public consultation is a required component of developing new regulations to ensure that key stakeholders affected by the change are aware of the issues and need for that regulation prior to the regulatory change being made.
On the forestry side, we need new and evolving regulations, not the traditional approach to forestry We have significant commercial forestry in the watershed and we need to pay more attention to this sector/activity Shouldn't we have forestry expertise/advice at these sessions?	Wood lot associations are good forums for education and outreach wrt BMPs to help control the spread invasive species. The policy team has forestry expertise available to address issues although not at the sessions.
I think most municipalities would be supportive of increased enforcement/compliance with existing regulations…. But you need the resources to do the enforcement and don't try to download this on municipalities	There are few Municipal regulations directed at controlling the spread of invasive species. The majority of regulations are under the authority of provincial and federal regulations and these respective governments enforce these regulations because Municipal governments do not have the authority…..it is important for municipalities to incorporate BMPs into there own programming e.g. property management and road maintenance to ensure that their activities do not contribute to the introduction and spread of invasive species.
Given the purpose of the Plan is to protect the health of the ecosystem, we need the ability to	Generally thought that healthy systems are less vulnerable to invasive species. Invasive

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
resist invasive species but how do we control invasives when they don't have any natural predators?	species often disrupt food web interactions. They out compete native species for resources and proliferate at a fast rate even though they often become part of the food chain and are eaten by native an non-native species. Presently controls are limited so prevention is critical.
I was thinking about invasive species generally, nothing specific. This is an area that you might want to go as hard as you can, in terms of legislation. I think education is great, but a lot of people that are causing harm to our watershed are not from our watershed, they are visitors from other places. It is very hard to educate them. In New Zealand, there is great legislation around protection of waterways from invasive species. You have to wash your feet if you walk into a wetland. If you do not wash your feet, you are fined. They are very serious about saying we do not want any more invasive species to be in here and the law is going to support that belief.	The approach in Ontario (and many other jurisdictions including New Zealand) is a combination of soft (education, voluntary best management practices) and hard (regulatory) initiatives to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive spe cies. Both federal and provincial governments are currently undertaking a regulatory review to identify regulatory gaps and develop a framework to address those gaps.
We have been fishing live bait for 1,000 years; it has not caused any disruption to the Lake.	True but the movement of bait into the watershed has increased and the number of invasive fish species, invertebrates and plants in the Great Lakes and other waters has increased risk that they will be moved inadvertently into the watershed by commercial bait harvest and holding or through anglers dumping bait buckets that may contain invasive species (fish, invertebrates and plants)
It is the huge number of fishermen in the winter who are there ice fishing commercially and they have their own bait.	Emerald shiners are the preferred winter baitfish and often available from locally harvested fish supplies. When there are local shortages, local shiners are often supplemented with shiners captured in Lake Erie. However, there is a current restriction on movement of commercial bait to help prevent the spread of VHS, baitfish from the Great Lakes to inland waters including Lake Simcoe.
You have to have very stringent regulations and live bait should be restricted to that bait that was taken from the watershed.	Consultation with anglers and the bait industry on the scope of the regulation will be required to determine the most effective approach.
I think you can take a look at priority based on ecological impact, but on the other side, if there is a species that has just been identified and it has almost nil ecological impact right now, if you can get rid of it, it would be a lot easier. If you have a matrix, some things that have a huge ecological impact would be a high priority, and things that have a low ecological impact would also be a high priority impact because it is easier to get rid of them right away.	It gets at that quick response protocol. The *Prioritize and Assess Policy and Program Options (Preliminary)* chart does prioritize.
One of the things that it does not mention at all is anything that is already an invasive species, such as the zebra mussels. Zebra mussels are seriously changing the character of the Lake. What can be done about them? It does not even mention restoration.	The legislation provides for it. It talks about responding to adverse effects. You are right, as we move forward we need to make sure plan to make sure that we retain the capacity to be able to do that. The ability to respond depends to some extent on the level of knowledge and science around those things.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
There should be more emphasis on remediation and research.	When the SciAC talked about this, they talked about the fact that probably the most cost effective thing is to prevent. Once invasive species are here, it is hard to shut the door, and yet there is not a lot of discussion here about restoration.
Let us get the low hanging fruit, even if it is not a priority.	In partnership with government, a stewardship alliance/network in the basin would provide opportunities to expand education awareness about BMPs and tackle some of the "lower hanging fruit".
Targeted awareness is for users, not to improve their bad behaviour, but if you have general awareness, then you can engage the wider population in monitoring the incursion of invasive species, which helps to educate people for their behaviour.	Educational material about invasive species is being built into the school curriculum. However more needs to be done and can be done through collaborative partnership approach. Multi faceted education and outreach programming is an important first step in changing behaviour. Applying community based social marketing is important part of the process to determine the best messaging and delivery methods. Fortunately we have the benefit of the provincial invasive species awareness program (MNR/OFAH partnership) to access many products (brochures, watchcards, fact sheets, school curriculum programs, displays, public service announcements, signs, posters) that have been developed and are suitable for use in the Lk. Simcoe watershed. Volunteer and professional monitoring is also an key component of the provincial program.
That has worked hugely in Lake Champlain. Interesting enough, if the Lake were mobilized, the whole carp thing would have been an interesting exercise in people learning to understand about living in the environment, how it happened, have them watch what they are doing and it would have been one specific thing for which interest was high. It could have had a multitudeness effect on awareness and general understanding, instead of them saying, why do those people not fix it, why does the MNR not do something, why does the Town not do something. The big thing is to bring the responsibly for the Lake back to the people who use the Lake.	Agree - there was more to be learned from the carp die off and what caused it that got lost in the other messages.
We are not really addressing terrestrial anywhere here, especially in this watershed. There is a gap there and certainly in this Plan is has to be important.	Yes there is a gap in knowledge, surveillance, monitor etc wrt to terrestrial invaders. We will re-assess the priorities.
Prevention really is the most important thing. You can see a real difference between the Rouge River and the Don River, in terms of what is happening in those terrestrial environments in the last decade or more. Those invasives rip right through those valley lands and they are moving north. In the Lake Simcoe watershed, we have an opportunity to be a little bit ahead of the game. But, every year that goes by, we are getting behind. More and more is coming in. First, you are trying to keep on top of it by picking it, and communicate to people out there, but it is coming. It is still behind what is happening in the Toronto area, but it is coming. The idea of prevention is an idea that we have to look at. The terrestrial ones are	The plan will take a balanced approach when dealing with threat of invasive species. What affects terrestrial natural heritage features and functions can affect hydrologic functions and aquatic life.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
where we have an opportunity to do that. The Biodiversity Strategy for Ontario, this gap with the terrestrial and prevention aspect, if you can keep the biodiversity in the watershed in the Lake Simcoe area, then we have an opportunity to try to stall off for climate change. We should not lose that in this invasive species battle. Once you get an invasive plant, like black swallow wort, and then you start losing the other native plants. And then to try to get them back, how do you get rid of them, and then how to you get the native plants back, like the turtlehead flowers? It is almost impossible. Some of the invasive species have toxins that they emit. It is better in Lake Simcoe to be front and center, we are going to stop it here. We are going to try to reduce it, have a plan on the ground, have a program and it has to be a priority to do that, to get at it. There is a bit feedback from the terrestrial to the aquatic; if you keep the invasives out of the terrestrial, you have biodiversity in the watershed, then even some of the aquatic things that are going to start to get into the environment are going to have a problem, in that the native things are still there, they can resist. It is like the goby situation, you get rid of everything trying to kill the goby, now when the goby comes up, there is nothing there to stop them, nothing there to compete with them. We know from natural heritage that if the natural things are there, there is a fighting chance to resist all these invasives, whether they are terrestrial or aquatic. It may easier to control the terrestrial; it is just that we have not got at it enough. For invasive species, is it realistic to think that we can keep them out of Lake Simcoe? You can slow them down, but eventually they seem to invade. Are there other jurisdictions where we can steal some best practices about how we try to keep them out from invading?	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	Yes … there are a number of countries and US states that have successful programming to help address the threat of invasive species. Ontario (MNR participates) on several national and international task teams where information regarding programs and policy is shared between jurisdictions. Numerous states have modeled programs after Ontario initiatives and vice versa. This type of beneficial exchange of information will benefit initiatives in the Lake Simcoe watershed.
Communication is a key. There are lots of avenues that are available, video displays, website, etc., that sort of information makes individuals informed and able to make a difference on their property. It is the collective action of individuals that is going to make a difference, not simply government regulation, sporadically enforced. We regularly organize groups that plant trees, there is more to maintaining a balanced ecosystem than planting trees. We have had people out for decades harvesting purple loosestrife. Those volunteer opportunities are still there, if not even more so because of the mandatory obligation for high school students.	A collaborative partnership between government and non-government stakeholders and a strong stewardship network/alliance will be helpful advancing good prevention programming. Multi faceted education and outreach programming is an important first step in changing behaviour. Applying community based social marketing is important part of the process to determine the best messaging and delivery methods. Fortunately we have the benefit of the provincial invasive species awareness program (MNR/OFAH partnership) to access many products (brochures, watchcards, fact sheets, school curriculum programs, displays, public service announcements, signs, posters) that have been developed and are suitable for use in the Lk. Simcoe watershed.
There is nothing about licencing passage through the Trent Severn or at marinas, could be a very good opportunity to inform people about the problems that they face. For example, when going through the Trent Severn, wash your boat; do not dump your bilge into the lake. There could be education planted a very significant places, such as marinas, boat launches and the entrance to the Trent Severn waterway system.	Yes more needs to be done … there are likely some very strategic and effective avenues associated with the Trent Severn waterway and the marina industry. Some work has been done already to post information pertaining to BMPs, watchcards, brochures etc. in the lock stations throughout the Trent Severn over the past 16 years. Earlier in 2000, electronic messaging along the Trent Severn promoted bmps for boaters.
I think this is better organized at a higher level, but municipalities should have info and resources for connecting concerned residents to the right resources. Parks and outdoor maintenance staff must be trained in identification of and disposal of invasives.	Agreed …. municipalities can play an important role in monitoring and preventing the spread of invasive species especially disseminating information to residents but also in incorporating policies to help control the spread of some invasive species in their own operational programs e.g. road maintenance.
The issue of emergent diseases as an invasive species and the very important need to monitor that.	The measures being proposed regarding monitoring and response include invasive diseases.
Need to highlight coordination of invasive species work by DFO	There are more policies pertaining to coordinating efforts with the federal government for aquatic invasive species. Trent Severn waterway is an example.
It is suggested that an annual report be produced and published regarding the enforcement compliance activities. Also presence /absence of invasive species should be included in the	Enforcement reporting has not received any attention though it is something worth considering do exploring. …presumably however this would be broader than invasive

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
indicators for future reporting.	species. Agree, the presence of invasive species is proposed as an indicator

Money/funding

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
What are the expected costs – over transition and then beyond?	The costs to implement the Plan are substantial**.** Total costs for implementing the plan are estimated at between $100M and $135M in operating (for the first 10 years, 2009-2019). Infrastructure costs, which could be staggered over a longer period, include an estimated $120M for stormwater management and up to $105M for sewage treatment plant upgrades (with requirements for higher treatment levels to accommodate expected growth). Infrastructure estimates are in orders of magnitude and will be refined by the province over the next year in consultation with local municipalities, and others, while developing the phosphorus reduction strategy.
Who is expected to pay - Will all partners have access to sufficient provincial funding?	The financing strategy considers a range of financing mechanisms that are not limited to traditional sources of financing, i.e. government funds, local/private contributions and grants, but also explores other innovative financing tools that include public and private partnerships, water quality trading and user fees. The Plan advocates for collaborative partnership both in financing and implementation of the Plan.
Set priorities for spending.	Implementation of the Plan will be based on funding those priority actions which are most critical to achieving the targets set out in the Plan and to meet the objectives of the Plan. For example, the province's $20M commitment will focus primarily on providing assistance to farmers to encourage agricultural best management practices that reduce environmental impacts, scientific research and monitoring, and supporting the coordination of Plan implementation. Other existing programs and potential sources of funding are being explored to help support other proposed actions in the Plan.
Need to ensure a longer term commitment to funding Make access to the funding easier i.e. sort out the Federal-Provincial funding "maze" so that people can access funds and make sure that applicants get related support (how to apply for funds) for work on the Lake; Make sure work is coordinated with municipal planning and work to avoid duplication and make the process simpler.	The financing strategy of the Plan endeavors to provide a long-term and sustainable funding for Plan implementation. The financing strategy for the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan recognizes the opportunities within existing programs, which already have committed funding that could support actions/policies under the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. We have prepared a list of these programs. Implementation partners may explore opportunities to tap funding from these programs and/or monitor them (including federal programs such as Lake Simcoe Clean-up Fund) to ensure that actions taken and funded through provincial funding will complement and avoid duplication wherever possible.
Provincial support (lead) in accessing Federal funds is important help third parties (e.g. municipalities, groups) to access funding efficiently	The province, through MEI, is working with the federal government to finalize details of funding programs under Building Canada Fund Communities Component (a competitive

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	application based program). There may be an opportunity to encourage capital investment projects focused on protecting Lake Simcoe.
There are some local municipal initiatives that can involve and get the support of local people and get them involved in financial support in a real way (not necessarily large $ but significant support) – we are all in this together so how are we going to generate the money that is necessary	The Plan supports and encourages collaborative partnership in financing and implementation of the Plan. It also encourages non-monetary types of funding such as contributions of volunteers, who have been dedicating their time and resources to protecting and restoring the ecological health of the Lake Simcoe watershed.
Federal funds often come after a project is finished ---could we get the funds more upfront so cash flow by small groups is eliminated as de facto prerequisite for involvement	The province, through MEI, is working with the federal government to finalize details of funding programs under Building Canada Fund Communities Component (a competitive application based program). There may be an opportunity to encourage capital investment projects focused on protecting Lake Simcoe.
There are huge opportunities to use the intellectual resources (science and social) with institutions to reduce costs i.e. York U; combine some of the Lake Simcoe funding with NSERC grant applications	The financing strategy for the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan recognizes the opportunities within existing programs, which already have committed funding that could support actions/policies under the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. Opportunities in collaborating with the academe/research community could be explored.
Plan will not happen if not implementable--funding proposed is probably not adequate---priorities of the Plan – need to define a concrete set of priorities in the plan, clear use of funds and timelines for financial plans – all currently are not given/unclear	We recognize that the costs of implementing the Plan are significant. In view thereof, implementation of the Plan will be based on funding those priority actions which are most critical to achieving the targets set out in the Plan and to meet the objectives of the Plan. For example, the province's $20M commitment will focus primarily on providing assistance to farmers to encourage agricultural best management practices that reduce environmental impacts, scientific research and monitoring, and supporting the coordination of Plan implementation.
The development community is tapped out but funding should be spread out and come from the users of the watershed (tax base, special levy, user fees?); a special development charge is sure to come up also but currently there are only two sources public or private sector	The financing strategy considers a range of financing mechanisms that are not limited to traditional sources of financing, i.e. government funds, local/private contributions and grants, but also explores other innovative financing tools that include public and private partnerships, water quality trading and user fees.
Stormwater retrofit and sewage treatment costs (1/3, 1/3, 1/3); the provincial dollars should go to these activities; and the local community needs to also pay for the 1/3.	The financing strategy recognizes the important role that municipalities will play, as they continue to be responsible for water and wastewater infrastructure upgrades and investments. The province will work with municipalities towards full cost recovery, and the

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	user pays principle. The application of these principles implies that the local community who are basically the users and beneficiaries of these infrastructure will also have to bear part of the costs.
Private developers are important – need to take bold steps --we need to challenge them to change how they approach development e.g. green technology is available but still have not been adopted (solar roof panels)	The Plan advocates collaborative partnership that includes the private sector, both in implementation and financing. A range of financing mechanisms will be considered including other innovative financing tools. Adoption of green technologies is an innovative tool that may be explored to achieve cost effective solutions and ensure that available funding goes to those priority actions which are most critical to achieving the targets set out in the Plan.
Industrial water use exemptions should be reduced for golf; put revenues for water back into water management; taxpayers in the watershed and business need to close the gap in the payment for of services; taxes on bottled water should go back to water management; pay a bit more for your motor boat gas	The financing strategy for Plan implementation explores other innovative financing tools. As for these suggested financing tools and other previously recommended ones, the province in collaboration with partners and stakeholders will have to conduct reviews or studies to determine their potential effectiveness and efficiency before moving forward.
Some don't cost anything (natural heritage); some costs not too much (sewage and storm water); other cost a lot	That is why timelines and prioritization are very important. Implementation of the Plan will be based on funding those priority actions which are most critical to achieving the targets set out in the Plan, provides cost-effective solutions and meet the objectives of the Plan.
People need to know the implication of their activities on the Lake/environment i.e. P---when they do they will be able to react in a proper and supportive way---public education is key here for buy in and ultimately results in reduced costs for treatment after the fact.	The Plan recognizes the importance of education and outreach programs in encouraging sustainable actions throughout the watershed. In this regard, the Ministry is proposing an in-year investment that support positive, on-the-ground actions will help to address specific threats facing Lake Simcoe watershed and encourage a strong land and water ethic.

Natural Areas and Shorelines

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
What is the current per cent of woodland cover in the watershed? How are woodland patches distributed within the watershed, i.e., the quantity and patch size?	The Conservation Authority has carried out a woodland patch analysis for the watershed excepting the upper Talbot River as it is outside of the current regulated area of the Conservation Authority. This information is provided in Section 7 and in particular Table 7.3 and Figure 7.2 of the Natural Heritage System for the Lake Simcoe Watershed, Phase 1 Components and Policy Templates LSRCA July 2007.
This section should identify the Endangered Species Act, 2007, which provides for the automatic protection of species identified as endangered and threatened (identified on the Species at Risk in Ontario list) and their habitats across Ontario. In addition, it should mention that, as required by the legislation, species will be automatically added to the Species at Risk in Ontario list on the recommendation of COSSARO, an independent publicly appointed body charged with assessing species that are potentially at risk using the best available science.	The comment is well taken and modifications will be made to ensure that the Endangered Species Act is recognized.
Much has changed since the release of this report in 2003, including a comprehensive revision of the Provincial Policy Statement and changes to the Planning Act, (not to mention the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan) in an effort (amongst other issues) to significantly strengthen the protection of natural heritage systems. I recommend that a section be added here that identifies that due to the time lag inherent in the planning and development application approvals process, it is impossible at this time to evaluate the effectiveness of the current PPS and recent amendments to the Planning Act, that were enacted to address the concerns expressed in the LSEMS report and by others.	The province undertook a review of current policy direction as well as a review of the relevant provincial plans across the watershed. A summary of the policies and plans as related to natural heritage and shorelines is found in the background report.
Although this background information assists in providing context, it does not identify the scope and scale of potential problems in the Lake Simcoe watershed. I am unable to evaluate the proposed policy recommendations without information relevant to the watershed, i.e., land use change overtime, loss of wetlands/woodlands overtime, population growth overtime, phosphorous loading overtime, relative ecological health of the watershed, present impervious cover, etc. This information is critical to inform the types of regulations, policies, and/or programs that may be needed.	It is agreed that an understanding of historical levels of natural cover and the impacts of land use changes over time can be important to develop a template that can assist in gaining inference on the ecological health of the watershed. As you noted, this measure can lead to the development of potential regulations and policies.
Watershed cover is an important component but it also the distribution of the cover within a subwatershed is important as well. If a subwatershed has 32% cover but it is almost all found in one location - is this adequate.	Agreed it is recognized that distribution of cover in the watershed and subwatershed is an important component to consider when developing targets.
1) This potential policy may not be feasible. There are is mentioned ~12,000 existing residences along the shoreline as well as many approved lots and planning approvals. There is a need for more clarity on this one.	With respect to the first item, additional clarity will be forthcoming through policy development related to development setbacks along the Lake Simcoe shoreline In response to the item below re: policy missing for septics, this item has been recognized

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
A missing policy or requirement is detailed requirements for septic inspection and compliance for residences within 100m of the shoreline and riverine locations.	within the Natural Heritage slide deck (slide 15) and is also being dealt with in other policy areas.
The Drainage Act has been mentioned in a couple of presentations now. Also the Tile Drainage Act . Just what do these acts do? Do they require or encourage municipalities or farmers or others to install "drainage", to do it in certain places and not others? Are there incentives or disincentives attached to drainage activities? Do these acts need to be reviewed to reflect more recent thinking about runoff?	Farmers improve the drainage of their land by installing tile drainage systems and achieve a variety of benefits, such as earlier planting dates and improved crop yields. The *Tile Drainage Act* authorizes OMAFRA's Tile Loan Program. Farmers who are planning to install a tile drainage system on their property may apply to their local municipality for a "tile loan". For the 2008/09 Tile Loan Program, a property owner on agricultural land can receive a loan for 75 per cent of the cost of his/her tile installation work, up to a maximum of $50,000 per owner per year. The *Tile Drainage Act* specifies that the term of the loan be 10 years and that a loan cannot exceed 75% of the total cost of the work.
#1 appears to be duplicating the efforts of upper and lower-tier municipalities and LSRCA. Is there evidence that the natural heritage system in the watershed is not being adequately protected by existing policies/is under threat? (The greenbelt plan was not intended to encompass entire watersheds, it was intended to work with the Growth Plan to more precisely define where forecasted population growth is to be accommodated in the future.) #4 Is there evidence that demonstrates the need for 100m buffers? This seems excessive given innovative low impact development design and technologies. It will also require municipalities to build at much higher net densities to meet the gross density targets established in the Growth Plan. Again, #5 seems to duplicate work that has already been undertaken by LSRCA and others. The intent of the Plan, as identified by the Premier, and recommended by the LSEMS Working Group and the LSEMS Steering Committee, is to build on the work of the LSEMS partners, not duplicate work that has already been undertaken or is currently being undertaken. #9, 10 and 11 would seem to duplicate the work being undertaken by the Source Protection Committee, that is charged with developing polices to protect significant recharge areas.	The NHS currently being used under other plans are important components to meet identified objectives. We are reviewing these plans to determine the applicability to the development of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. The 100m buffer is a recommendation of SciAC that is based on science. As with other recommendations from SciAC and from SAC, these will be considered as we develop the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan.
Areas of wetland are something in a state of flux. For example, a wetland can dry up from natural causes. A beaver can build one dam and create a substantial wetland. How do you deal with that in the process?	It would be the information that we have now and it is recognized that wetlands are dynamic systems for that very reason. That would be part of our monitoring component of that. The suggestion is protect what we have now that we are aware of now. MNR and the Conservation Authority do a great job on this too. We update our information quite often to reflect those things. Wetlands are either upgraded from an evaluation, or they are

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	expanded, or they are decreased because of those very things. That is part of the component, but we have to start with what we know now, recognizing that things can change over time and it is important to monitor that.
I would like some clarification on the 100 m buffer policy.	The 100 m was brought forward by SciAC. In addition, to that, we have had other people, internally, ministries, looking at what that achieves. It is relation to wildlife habitat, but it is also in relationship water quality. The important point that was raised is how we achieve those things, where does it make sense, and does that number make sense. That is part of our discussions today.
How does 100 m get you the water quality, as compared to 50 m? I would suggest that you come up with performance standards, for a particular water quality, and then let people figure out how that gets done. Because 100 m is a nice round number, but what is the rationale for the difference.	Those are fair comments and that is our responsibility to be able to defend information. Does it make sense? Can it be rationalized? What is the science behind it? That is part of what we are dealing with. We have done literature research; we have our own information and that is a number that has come up. How do we achieve that? Does it apply? How is it applied? That is all part of the process. These are just potential policies, actions and recommendations.
When we are talking about 100 m and 30 m. 100 m is along the lake shoreline only?	100 m came up twice. It was 100 m setback along the Lake Simcoe shoreline and then it was in areas that are more sensitive from a water quality perspective or you have significant wildlife attributes there. A 30 m buffer to 100 m in those locations, so it was actually in 2 separate locations where it was mentioned.
A 100 m along the lake shoreline, that is not such a problem, in regards to agriculture, but certainly if you start looking at intermittent tributaries, canals, etc., you start talking 100 m setbacks, that is a substantial part of someone's farm and that is simply not possible in many cases. Even the 30 m is somewhat of a challenge.	Just to be clear, we are not talking about decommissioning agricultural lands within any buffer areas. That would be done through that educational component, stewardship opportunities where we had the ability to naturalize those areas. It is not a decommissioning; existing agricultural uses would be allowed to continue in those areas. If they are under crop production now, they would continue to be under crop production.
I am not saying that the standards cannot be increased. For example, stormwater management ponds, a new one would have to increase the phosphorous (P) treatment. That is something that is acceptable, but not when you come to zero tolerance on intermittent streams and wetlands. I do not know what they mean by wetlands. There are hydrological features that someone could determine to be a wetland by definition, by it is not provincially significant, which becomes a significant problem in the opportunity for development. I am not saying that the standards cannot be different, I just cannot see them being applied equally in or outside an urban area.	The Plan acknowledges that settlement areas provide a unique context in which natural heritage and hydrological features exist and therefore policies specific and relevant to settlement areas have been developed to encourage the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features in that context.
A lot of the communities around the lake are rural/urban mix. Someone's urban here is really someone's rural somewhere else. There may some very strict definitions, but if municipalities are trying to study to how to apply	There is a very strict, clear definition that the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan use. It does bring up some questions about what is urban. There are settlement areas of all

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
those definitions, because I am hearing on one hand that it is very strict, and on another hand, that there is some question about that.	different shapes and sizes. Does that general comment also apply to rural settlement area? Does it equally apply to the existing built areas versus new green field development?
What I would like to see is that the existing regulations stay in put, but that they develop a set of guidelines with the goal of achieving what they are doing in the rural areas, but offering in lieu of methods of achieving the same net benefit to the community; understanding that we cannot have sheep grazing through the urban boundary, but developing a set of in lieu of guidelines. For example, if you want a setback from a wetland and you want it to be 40 m in certain circumstances, you would be able to go to a developer and say this is our goal, but if you can give us an in lieu of strategy, that will give us the same net benefit, giving consideration that this is an urban environment, we will permit that. And they should be developing a set of in lieu of guidelines. For example, from the wetland, you may allow 10 m, provided that you sink a wall down so that drainage system will stay basically the same. Keep it the way it is right now, within the urban boundaries, but develop a set of guidelines with the goal of achieving what you have done rurally, but if you go there, make sure you have a concomitant set of in lieu of guidelines. You do not put up something impossible; unless you have an in lieu of that you know is possible.	The Policy Development Team has a couple of weapons in our arsenal to try to deal with this issue of standards between urban and rural and how we apply it. One thing we can do, no matter what kind of target we come up, we can always provide exceptions to it and that is part of the discussion that we are hearing today. Another thing that the Act actually lets us do specifically is choose for any particular policy the level to which we apply that policy. We can designate policies to be a conform to standard, which is the highest; we can designate policies to have a regard to standard, just like we used to have for the Provincial Policy Statement, which allowed a certain amount of flexibility; or we cannot designate it as either conform to or have regard to, it can just be a policy that can promote or encourage. We have options on how we apply these policies. There is still the ability, either through exceptions explicit in the policy or the level to which we designate a policy to conform to or have regard to, or something else, to try and tailor how that applies in whatever scenario, urban versus rural or existing versus new. There is some flexibility and obviously, whatever feedback we can get to help us sort things into those options would be helpful. We are not totally boxed in; we have some ability in how we do policies to mix and match and find some compromise amongst whatever the topics might be.
Some of the definitions and standards, this whole issue of what is a wetland and what is not, and lines on maps, clearly there is a lack of accuracy provincially on wetland designation. The mapping is not consistent and not necessarily accurate across the province. Intermittent streams is another one, this is coming back a little to the agricultural context, but certainly within the urban areas too. To arbitrarily pick setbacks and make regulations around things that may or may not flow, even fencing livestock out of the watercourse. You have some intermittent streams on farms. Or when there is a flood condition, water flows down that valley area and then the rest of the time it is not a stream. You have to be careful about applying a standard with particular activities allowed, not allowed, and setback and those types of things. There are some definitions missing and there is some less than accurate mapping on some of these things. That will be something that will have to be clarified so that people do not get caught within or without. You can things like setbacks, there is new technology, there can be a lot more focus put on stormwater management because it obviously has been historically a weak area. You start looking at the 100 m and 30 m numbers, in some cases, there just is not that much area there to allow that and then allow activity beyond.	There was a bit of this discussion around at the SciAC meeting. SciAC was very clear that we should be having a target, 100 m everywhere around the lake. 30 m everywhere, up to 100 m, up and down the tributaries. We were asking questions about these different contexts. Some of that got reflected in some further recommendations, they did say where you are dealing with existing built-up shorelines, 15 m may be a more realistic target. One comment was that they were probably more concerned about permanent streams than intermittent streams. Another thing was that they did feel that it was better to have something rather than nothing. The idea of in different contexts saying, in this context nothing is possible, they did not like that. Their principle was you are better to have something than nothing, even if it is 5 m. It is fair to say that that was everywhere, whether it was urban or rural in various types of rural contexts.
I would be shocked if the SciAC did not consider the particular soil conditions around Lake Simcoe in coming up with a 100 m number. For example, we know how many m you have to	The 100 m buffer was developed by SciAC based on science to protect. It is a high goal. A lot of the goals are very high intentionally because it was felt that was needed to protect

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
be back from a lake for a septic tank to give the earth, which is alkaline around Lake Simcoe, a chance to filter out the phosphorous and other nutrients because the soil around Lake Simcoe does not do a very good job of filtering out phosphorous and nutrients. I do not think we can say we want this to be science-based, the SciAC comes up with a conclusion and we are going to tell them it should not be a 100 m. You may question them and ask them was this in fact a number, how did you come up with that number. That is a reasonable question. And was it Lake Simcoe based versus generic. But I would be shocked if they had not considered the particular soil conditions surrounding Lake Simcoe and particular goals that they have.	Lake Simcoe, restore the fisheries and protect the health of the streams. Yes, the 100 m buffer is ambitious, but that is what SciAC felt was necessary to protect the streams and the lake. The challenge will be in the implementation, recognizing that some areas may not be feasible or achievable for either physical reasons or economic reasons. That is going to happen with some of the other goals as well. If we do not set that as the ultimate goal, ultimately we will fail in trying to protect and restore Lake Simcoe. The goal is high and is based on science and then we have to figure out how to address the other concerns in the implementation, as well as allow development and business to continue in the Lake Simcoe watershed.
You can set the goal as high as you want and nothing is going to happen. I can see applying standards in urban areas and there are going to have to be some new urban areas, if you want to apply the higher standard to those new urban areas, so people know going in that there is an urban boundary expansion, if there ever was, here will be the new standards. They could be equal to the same standards that are in the non-urban areas. Then everyone knows going in. If I go out and buy a 100-acre farm and I have a significant woodland, I know I have to provide “x” amount of buffers around it. It makes my economic model. Unfortunately, for most of the farmers, it is not in their best interest, but I understand going in. If you come back and say that I have to provide 100 m buffers on lands we own in Aurora, you have decimated an entire property; I cannot build.	Understood and I do not think that is the intent. That is something we have to work with. We have those goals; those are the science-based goals to meet our objectives. They are based on science. Now the challenge is, how do we implement those without detrimentally affecting existing development, approved growth, that type of thing. That will be a challenge. An example related to the 100 m buffer, showing the flexibility, would be a good thing to consider.
In terms of the comment about the soils, did the SciAC take 100 m as just a nice high target or did they come to that, arrive at that number? Given that this is a fairly rushed process, it would be hard for some of these things to really be decided. Maybe they should have come to 120 m or 80 m? 100 m is a nice round number and it is a number we have seen elsewhere pulled out of the air as a nice high target. Did the SciAC actually look at the uniqueness of the Lake Simcoe watershed and say 100 m is the appropriate number or did they pull that 100 m as just a high target?	I cannot speak to the degree alkalinity of Lake Simcoe, but it is based on science and literature. Whether it has been adopted elsewhere, I am not sure if it specific to Lake Simcoe. It will set a range of buffers and targets to achieve what we need to achieve here; this one is the most protective. I cannot speak more specifically than that.
The policies might as well be prescriptive, mandatory. If you are going to put buffers in, make it mandatory. The point about negotiation, that is what you will end up with and that is what you do not want. This would be for outside the urban areas. Inside the urban areas, we should be exempt to the policies because we already have a regime. We already have currently in place in the urban areas, through subwatershed work, Places To Grow, the Provincial Policy Statement, standards that we have to achieve. We already have tools, mechanisms, regulatory, mandatory, negotiated, geotechnical, environmental standards that we already achieve inside urban areas. I do not think you need to apply a new standard inside the urban areas when you already have them. I would agree that maybe there are some criteria that could be applied for some things that may be deficient. Phosphorous for	The Plan acknowledges that settlement areas provide a unique context in which natural heritage and hydrological features exist and therefore policies specific and relevant to settlement areas have been developed to encourage the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features in that context.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
example, when it comes to stormwater, maybe there are some things there that we could do differently that achieves a higher phosphorous treatment in a current storm pond, rather than just building to current standards, level 1 standards. But to apply different buffers, different linkage requirements, I do not agree because I think we are doing a pretty good job. The next wave of development, if there is an urban boundary expansion, I do not think there ever will be in Simcoe County, it does really matter what standards you apply because nothing else is going to happen anyway. I am saying exempt inside urban areas and then deal with the non-urban and any future lands that come on stream.	
Does it apply to urban areas, existing urban areas or new feature areas, or non-urban areas? Once you answer that question, I will tell you how I think it should be, whether it should be mandatory, flexible or my opinion, a third option, non-application/exemption. Until you answer that first question, I cannot answer yours.	I think it all does relate. To a certain extent, if you decide that this is something where there should be some flexibility, then there also, to a certain extent, some onus on the policy makers to speak to what that flexibility is and how you deal with the flexibility and the guidelines.
If the intent is to protect the lake and give it the best fighting chance you have, that is why I asked the question about how much of the watershed is actually urbanized. I am going to guess it is a very small percentage. Why would you use the same application of policy across the entire watershed if 2 or 4% of the watershed, where growth is planned, there has never been this balance equation brought to the table, why apply the same standards. I think you will do better by being more mandatory or prescriptive on 95% of the watershed that has not been developed and may never be developed. Say it unilaterally applies across the entire board and then create flexibilities and loopholes. Philosophically, if you want the best plan, put it to the best places, i.e., the non-urban areas. You are going to get the best result. Therefore, _ can do what they are supposed to do, be urban, I not saying pave over everything, because you know that will not happen, but that is where people are supposed to live, work and play. You have to let that happen. Philosophically, I cannot understand why you are even looking at this flexibility beyond the urban areas because it has to be done and it has to be mandatory. That is what you are ultimately going to want.	The Plan acknowledges that settlement areas provide a unique context in which natural heritage and hydrological features exist and therefore policies specific and relevant to settlement areas have been developed to encourage the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features in that context. The policies intended for non-urban areas are indeed much less flexible.
There is a concern with applying the buffer to drainage ditches, intermittent streams and ephemeral ponds. Buffers should be flexible and not just one standard.	A starting point for buffer size is designated leaving flexibility for increasing the buffer size as appropriate
The policies between rural and urban areas need to be looked at, in order to know if the concerns are being addressed.	The Plan acknowledges that settlement areas provide a unique context in which natural heritage and hydrological features exist and therefore policies specific and relevant to settlement areas have been developed to encourage the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features in that context.
There needs to be some clarification of the standards that will be used in the Act and during implementation, both inside and outside current urban areas. Definitions of things like wetlands, shorelines, setback, intermittent streams. What does zero tolerance really mean?	The Plan acknowledges that settlement areas provide a unique context in which natural heritage and hydrological features exist and therefore policies specific and relevant to settlement areas have been developed to encourage the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features in that context.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	These definitions have been made in the Plan. The wording “zero tolerance” is no longer used.
What might mandatory mean within existing urban areas. What should be mandatory in the Act and what should be flexible?	The Plan acknowledges that settlement areas provide a unique context in which natural heritage and hydrological features exist and therefore policies specific and relevant to settlement areas have been developed to encourage the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features in that context.
30 m set backs is there going to be some kind of financial instrument to deal with this land being taken out of production in the stewardship plans?	Well if it allows for existing agricultural uses to continue I don’t see how we would be taking lands out of production. We are not seeking lands to be taken out of production and being restricted from being in production. It’s simply a matter of best management and stewardship for those voluntary arrangements we can make with the agricultural community to take lands out but that’s not a regulatory thing.
Need a vision of what needs protection in a spatial context, and the elements are detailed in the table. Mapping, identification and significance should occur all at once; create a vision for the watershed that takes in all these elements and sequenced before development/decisions are made. How is it different to what is done today…difficult to decipher. Put all the steps under one to use to make decisions about adverse impacts regarding proposed development. Don’t see the difference between what is proposed and what is done now…we need to do things differently. Need the sequence of the vision and how it will lead to protection.	Fair comment
The ORM and the Greenbelt plan had different provisions when you were dealing with approved settlement areas not necessarily an application outside the settlement areas but within the settlement areas. So when I read policy 16 the application for development or site alteration is not subject to the natural and hydrologic features policies 13, 14 and 15 of this Plan. Meaning something within a settlement area is exempt. Then when I go to the transition regulations it says to me if I am a major development I don’t know what that means or near a wetland, I don’t know what near means, or a shoreline of the lake or stream I am subject to the plan. My question about transition is that when we are applying new standards inside an urban area regardless of the status of the application if it has planning status meaning it is approved within an approved urban boundary the intent then of the subdivision gets captured by the new policies in my opinion creates a really big problem for us and the industry. So I don’t except that the transition captures subdivision applications and subsequent applications.	That all comes back to the actual wording of the shoreline provisions. As I understand it, it is draft wording and it probably has to get more clearly articulated. Page 20 section 13 I think that is the key provision and it is very similar to the Greenbelt and ORMCP. Number 13 is not meant to apply to settlement areas. Number 16 is within settlement areas. So if I understand the question clearly, I think that 16 is the only provision that applies to natural heritage features inside settlement areas. If you don’t have your draft plan of subdivision yet than you may be subject. If you have your OP and zoning and then the plan comes into effect and you don’t have your draft plan of subdivision yet. Then that is the question that government needs to ask. What do we do about that type of application. And if the decision is that if it is in a shoreline area and it is very important that that draft plan of subdivision application conformed to designated policies the legislation allows us to do that. With the growth plan and the ORMCP they did have a transition policy where they did capture certain things like that. Certain applications that were for the integrity of the plan.
Very serious concerns that we won’t be able to meet the objectives of this plan if we don’t take	Many of the actions related to making a watershed more resilient are the kinds of actions

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
some serious action on protecting the remaining wetlands and spaces. Make sure that we get as many of those strict targets that are set out in the SciAC report under this very vague climate change section because I don't really see anything happening here.	proposed under other parts of the plan. So there is this integration with the other components so for example on the natural heritage that is where we have the targets around forest cover or natural cover or wetland protection. So the targets have been identified there not in the climate change. The targets need to be set considering that climate change may make it worse.
Suggest lining up the targets and indicators more closely. Maybe present them in a chart format. It would also be nice to see a clearer relationship between the policies (most of which are actions) and the targets and indicators. In the shoreline regulations section (8.) - are you going to ban removal of invasive species vegetation? How does 8 e relate to natural areas? I need an example. re: section 9. I think this could likely be accomplished at least in a interim way in less than 2 years. Many municipalities already have such bylaws. Try out a couple of options and review after a year or two to see if they worked, then revise if needed.	The plan will be formatted to ensure clarity The shoreline regulation is still to be developed and will be subject to consultation. At this time, we have not determined all of the activities that would be considered as part of the regulation The plan recognizes that tree cutting and site alteration bylaws already exist. The intent is to review them for adequacy as related to the goals and objectives of the plan and then to develop a template which strengthens the bylaws

Other Human Pressures

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary

Re: #10 - The phrase "natural areas" needs to be clearly defined.
 	
In addition, "further loss" in #10 and #12 be changed to "no net loss" as a more reasonable and balanced approached. This approach would result in more land being conveyed to local governments for protection and public use.
	Point acknowledged regarding The phrase "natural areas" needs to be clearly defined. As part of their work, the natural heritage group will be looking at how natural areas are defined and protected.
	
	The second set of comments relate to specific objectives identified by the Science Advisory committee. Please submit them via the mobalizers website where SciAC will be able to respond.
	
	SciAC response 19-08-2008
	RE recommendation 10
	
	“Natural Areas” has been replaced with “naturalized areas”.
	
	– The term ‘natural areas’ was derived from the Provincial Policy Statement 2005 (PPS 2005) to be consistent with existing planning terms.
	– As per the PPS 2005 NATURAL AREAS include significant wetlands, woodlands, valleylands, coastal wetlands, wildlife habitat, threatened and endangered species habitat, and areas of natural and scientific interest.
	– SciAC expanded this list further to include:
	  · All wetlands
	  · Riparian areas
	  · SHORELINES
	  · Forested Uplands
	  · Linkages
	– By definition ‘natural area’ means places within nature that have not been changed by human settlement.
	– Most of the natural areas have been influenced or stressed by human activities in the Lake Simcoe watershed. The term “NATURALIZED AREAS” denotes human influence of naturally, vegetated areas and ecosystems whose functions or features may have been influenced by current or historical land use activities.
	Due to land use thresholds or watershed carrying capacities, all these naturalized areas should be protected for the long-term health of the watershed and its occupants.
	
	RE recommendation 12

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	This recommendation has been replaced with the following (pending review by Dr. J. Ray) as per recommendations at the SciAC August 6th meeting. – Increase the percent cover of high quality, intact habitat in the watershed and identify priority areas and targets at the sub-watershed level for re-naturalization. (See targets for indicator 2 from Aug 6th meeting). – No removal of wetland areas or features in order to protect their quality and extent of habitat. (See targets for indicator 2 from Aug 6th meeting). – Reduce fragmentation by increasing the size of adjacent fragments to maintain existing naturalized areas in intact and connected states to prevent removal of aquatic and terrestrial habitat in the watershed. (See targets for indicator 2 from Aug 6th meeting). – Increase the naturalized areas along all shorelines, all wetlands, and all other provincially and locally significant natural areas and provide appropriate buffers along shorelines, intact forest habitats and wetlands to protect aquatic and terrestrial values from edge influences. (See targets for indicator 3 from Aug 6th meeting).
There is no mention of non-point loading, urban runoff under the category of other human pressures. When a detailed study was done of the study done by LSEMS during the previous 5-year period. Farmers improved their phosphorous input, the sewage treatment plants were more efficient, septic tanks were more efficient. The only increase came from non-point loading. That is not even mentioned here. Why was that not mentioned?	In terms of stormwater management and non-point source and point source phosphorous, those are going to be addressed in Water Quality. On the *Areas to be Addressed in Other Human Pressures Section of Plan* slide, there is a discussion on what is going to be captured in this section of the Plan as it relates to other human pressures. There is other the identification of where other human pressure type stressors are going to be identified. Stormwater management would be captured under Water Quality. We had a lot of debate about this, where does it best make sense to address that. Water Quality is where we landed.
In trying to address airborne deposition of phosphorous, you addressed construction activities, aggregate resources and left agriculture out of that. Agriculture is addressed in Water Quality, as it should be, just like stormwater, that is very appropriate. What about with respect to bare fields that you see around the watershed and when you look at your map, you see how extensive that area is between late November and early May.	In terms of agricultural fields, yes, they will be addressed under Water Quality. If there other areas where we need to broaden this section, then we can certainly do that.
On the *Preliminary Assessment of Policy Options: Policies, Programs and Tools* chart, the issue of these fields really have to be emphasized and worked into this because you are talking about the biggest still land area that contributes to phosphorous. And also, the sediment transfer related to phosphorous, which is a major issue.	The stewardship policies proposed under water quality/agriculture will address fallow fields and associated issues.
I do not see sod operators. It is a large area in the watershed and it is increasing. You have either nutrient loading on these fields and runoff is a major issue. There is also wind potential there. They are also open many times of the year to earth. That is not really captured	The stewardship policies proposed under water quality/agriculture will address this issue.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
anywhere here.	
I would really like to know what sustainable recreation means, what is sustainable what is not sustainable.	I will get back to you on that one. It is language that is captured in the proposed legislation. I will get back to you on what was contemplated when they were drafting the legislation. It is really about environmentally friendly recreation and trying to make sure the recreational activities stay within the carrying capacity of the environment. For example, off-road vehicles and how they can destroy the ravines, that is really not considered sustainable.
Peter Dillon mentioned to us that septic tanks were really not designed to capture nutrients. Furthermore, the soil around Lake Simcoe was alkaline and therefore the soil does not capture nutrients very well. Is that correct about septic tanks that they do not really capture phosphorous and nitrogen?	Given the nature of septic systems and soil alkalinity, those are factors that we are going to have to consider as we develop policy. The Building Code Act regulates septic systems and that is not one of the criteria that was set out for abatement of the septic systems. We are looking at other types of pathogens, bacteria and viruses that may emit from septic system. But specifically the Building Code Act is not looking to regulate phosphorous limits. There are some studies, there are some companies that say their products do limit phosphorous, but we have not conducted those studies at the Ministry, so we really do not have much information in terms of how well septic systems actually hold back phosphorous.
• Whenever you focus on education and awareness as a solution, remember this is not as easy as it sounds. • We are extensively involved in training and educating the building trades and we have to deal with a lot of resistance to change……so don't underestimate the challenges of changing public awareness and their behaviours	Point acknowledged. Education and outreach Programs will be designed to ensure objectives are met. Performance measures will be included in those programs to evaluate program successes.
• We need to make sure we have an adequate description of the baseline conditions first, then given some targets, what are we proposing that will close the gap between the baseline conditions and what we want to achieve	Point acknowledged. Understanding the baseline conditions is critical in order to assess the performance of plan policies
• On the recreation slide, the emphasis seems to be on land…what about the lake-based recreation? The policy options identified tend to be primarily about land-based recreation activities. The Plan should deal with both in a comprehensive manner	Point acknowledged, the policies in the plan reflect the fact that recreation is both land and water based
• Aggregates are a problem for municipalities. They are a net drain on municipal coffers because the levy given to municipalities from aggregate charges does not come near covering the costs of wear and tear on municipal rods used by aggregate trucks, etc. • Municipalities need Provincial regulations requiring "progressive rehabilitation", not waiting until the end of the lifespan of these pits	Point acknowledged. Policies in the plan will address atmospheric deposition from sources such as aggregate sites. It will not address concerns related to other impacts associated with aggregate sites however.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
• They are major sources of dust and phosphorus deposition in the Lake in most municipalities. Someone said that 60% of the phosphorus deposited in the lake is due airborne and runoff	
• While we are on the subject of airborne deposition, what are you going to do about gravel roads? No one is paying any attention to the dust from these gravel roads.	Gravel roads were looked at as an issue to be addressed, and the SciAC recommended • Non-toxic dust suppression and soil stabilization are at all active construction sites, aggregate mining, and unpaved roads (recommendation 30). However, given the fact that the actual contribution of atmospheric deposition from gravel roads is unknown and we are still studying the actual sources of atmospheric deposition, policies related to unpaved gravel roads will need to be addressed in future iterations of the plan
• Private septics is another interesting topic. WE definitely need an inspection program. And this could be done by having the little companies that provide septic tank pump-outs, do the inspection, prepare/submit a report and have the Province enforce. • Put legislation in place that septic tanks are to be pumped-out every "x" years and make it universal/mandatory throughout the watershed	Point acknowledged. The policies in the draft plan reflect this comment.
• As for construction sites, put the environmental requirements in the contract with the contractor and enforce the contract….include penalties for non-compliance….specify it has to be done or they don't get paid	Point acknowledge, the current policies within the plan encourage municipalities to enter into agreements with developers to ensure the highest level of environmental protection as possible.
• Your presentation used the expression :sustainable recreation"…what is your definition of sustainable recreation? Is it fishing, boating, ATV trails…..what is sustainable?	The definition of sustainable recreation that will be used on the plan is: Recreation activities which meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their recreational needs
• We need to look at BMPs for what sustainable recreation is • If you are going to have an ATV trail or mountain bike trail, you should put it where it will do the least amount of damage to the ecosystem, if at all	Point acknowledged. What is considered sustainable depends on the site specific nature of a particular location. This plan will require municipalities within lake simcoe to work with the province together to determine what is sustainable and then develop policies accordingly.
• You said the right word "value". If people find/feel there is value in recreation on the lake /in the watershed, they will take ownership and work to protect the Lake/watershed	Point acknowledged. this is the sense that we are trying to foster through our stewardship policies
• I believe that is the environment is in good condition, people will recreate on the Lake and in the watershed and that this will produce benefits for all….provided the recreation does not damage the ecosystem	Point acknowledged. this is the sense that we are trying to foster through our stewardship policies
• This figure of 60% of the phosphorus is from airborne and runoff…is this a new number? Answer: No, it is an estimate from the SciAC	It is an estimate from the SciAC. Further study will be conducted by 2011 to determine the exact sources of atmospheric deposition
• I agree that septics are a big problem that we can address in the Plan and have some	Phosphorus is currently not a criteria for which standards are set for septic systems in the

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
benefit/do some good. I am concerned about subdivisions that are going to rely on private or communal septic systems but municipalities should be able to control this at the development application stage. • Why can't this be covered under the Building Code, have inspections done when the septic systems are built and then some regular municipal inspections	building code currently. However, phosphorus migration from septic systems is a problem in some areas and as a result, the policies in the draft simcoe plan reflect the need to take action.
• We need to pay attention to the full spectrum of problems caused by the aggregates industry on the Lake and the watershed – dust, noise, water table issues • MNR needs to be more assertive/effective in regulating the aggregates industry	The *Aggregate Resources Act* (ARA) provides for the management of the aggregate resources of Ontario, controls and regulates aggregate operations on Crown and private lands and minimizes adverse impact on the environment in respect of aggregate operations. Policies in the plan will require MNR to assess the findings of futute scientific studies on atmospheric deposition and if necessary, take further action to address atmospheric deposition from aggregate industries.
• Don't forget municipalities have invested a lot of time and resources in waterfront recreation, we have not be sitting on our hands • What are we going to do about the problems caused by geese in our waterfront parks and beaches?	Point acknowledged – the policies in the lake simcoe plan will build on the great work municipalities have done. Geese are not being addressed in the plan.
• The solution to private septic tanks isn't as simple as it seems. Some companies doing pump-outs can't get a sewage treatment plant (STP) to take the septage they remove from homeowner's tanks….some STPs don't have the capacity to handle this additional septage…so the operators are stuck putting untreated septage on agricultural lands where it is permitted	Land application of untreated septage (septic tank and port-a-potty waste) is being phased out by Ministry of Environment (MOE), as treatment options are developed. All current land application is under Certificates of Approval administered by MOE.
The problem is that our population growth has now caught up with our land use and resource availability. We have to have a comprehensive set of regulations. Those regulations do not just include septic tanks, which should be banned altogether because as you just heard, they do not treat nutrients and we have an alkaline soil around Lake Simcoe, which will just not filter out nutrients. Whenever these septic tanks are put in, if they are put in within 100 feet of the shoreline, you can be sure that all of the nutrients coming from the human waste in that house are going into the Lake. They just approved development on Moon Point with septic tanks at the very same time that we spend $20,000 a cottage converting from septic tanks on the other side of the Lake. There is nothing wrong with saying no more septic tanks, no more building on Lake Simcoe with septic tanks. There is nothing wrong with a comprehensive set of regulations governing the use of boats. Off the coast of Yugoslavia, the Dalmatian Coast, no personal watercraft are allowed, this is a second-world country, this is not Lake Simcoe, an inland water. This is the ocean they do not allow personal watercraft within 500 m of the shore. Why would we be more timid? We need a comprehensive set that affect noise and	Septic systems are a viable sewage treatment option within parts of Ontario. However – the point is acknowledged that phosphorus migration from septic systems is a problem in some areas and as a result, the policies in the proposed Simcoe plan reflect the need to take action.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
light pollution. It is impossible on a Saturday or Sunday to be in a canoe on Lake Simcoe unless you do not mind battling 2 foot waves and that is just wave action. And yet, we think nothing of letting a 1,000 boat marina to be built. We have to decide either that we are here because we want to save the Lake for our kids to enjoy in a rural way or we want to encourage the new urbanism. This is where the rubber hits the road. I do not see anything wrong with saying that there should be a comprehensive set of regulations involving toluene and benzene coming to the Lake from boats, noise and light pollution, hours of usage of boats. These are not draconian things.	
It is obviously not going to get any better on its own. With all the growth that is planning "x" more people coming to the watershed are going to bring "x" number more boats, if you do not put some controls on. There are obviously none at this point in time. Something is going to be necessary, voluntary is certainly not going to work, given the fact that a lot of the people using the Lake so not live there. Controls will be necessary.	The draft policies reflect the need to develop additional policies for sustainable recreation.
We are seeing pesticide bans coming through, but there are no fertilizer bans on lawns. There are many, many thousands on or near the water who are fertilizing their lawns. There is some federal legislation coming down about phosphorous in dishwasher soap.	Point acknowledged. policies within the plan do address the use of fertilizers
Across Canada, marinas are being purchased up to not to be solely marinas anymore, but basically, developments of people and marinas. I am sure that is something that is happening on Lake Simcoe. Every one of the marinas is kinds of vulnerable to that, which would bring a new crop of people all of whom would be adding impact onto the Lake probably with little understanding of the relationship between people and the environment.	The draft policies reflect the need to develop additional policies for sustainable recreation.
Is that something that should be addressed? It is amazing how the Ontario government considers the aggregate industry to be sacrosanct; it is almost as though it is a religion.	Aggregates are not exempt from the greenbelt or ORM. Those provincial plans have strict requirements for aggregate extractions and in some cases outline places where aggregates can not be extracted. The *Aggregate Resources Act* (ARA) provides for the management of the aggregate resources of Ontario, controls and regulates aggregate operations on Crown and private lands and minimizes adverse impact on the environment in respect of aggregate operations. Policies in the plan will require MNR to assess the findings of future scientific studies on atmospheric deposition and if necessary, take further action to address atmospheric deposition from aggregate industries.
The industry has specific statutes and regulations and that is more likely the reason than to make it sacrosanct. The Pits and Quarries Act has some rehabilitative measures in it. The MNR is the overseer of the Pits and Quarries Act.	The *Aggregate Resources Act* (ARA) provides for the management of the aggregate resources of Ontario, controls and regulates aggregate operations on Crown and private lands and minimizes adverse impact on the environment in respect of aggregate operations. Policies in the plan will require MNR to assess the findings of future scientific

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	studies on atmospheric deposition and if necessary, take further action to address atmospheric deposition from aggregate industries.
One of the things that we have received noticed about is to purchase green gravel, which is gravel that is not extracted from a gravel pit within a watershed. How significant is the aggregate industry was in relation to the watershed and if there should be some regulation there? We mentioned construction sites, but nothing to do with the aggregate industry.	The SciAC reports do say there is going to be increase pressure for aggregate extraction and there are a number of reasons for that, proximity to the GTA, and major highways. It is not specifically referenced in the Bill; SciAC make a recommendation to ensure that aggregation extraction is done in a sustainable way. SciAC is raising the same concern.
There has been a big increase in zero or minimum tillage in the watershed over time. That as been encouraged by all the programs. Other than the Holland Marsh, where farming the marsh is different than farming the rest of the land, you cannot put a cover crop on the marsh land in the winter, or you will have all kinds of problems in the spring. That is a problem. They need to work on some new technologies to get around that. But for the rest of the watershed, there would not be much farmland that is left bare. There may be crop stubble, but the land does not blow when it is under stubble. It does not matter if it is corn or soybeans, you do not get blowing there. Traditionally there has been lots of fall plowing, but that is getting to be less and less, although if there is some heavy soil, it is a requirement, but usually they do not blow. Whereas if you go to a construction site, you strip the top soil off and that subsoil will blow, it has no capacity, no organic matter to hold it in place. There is a big difference in the amount of phosphorous that might come off a bare field versus a stripped construction site, both be wind and water erosion.	The stewardship policies proposed under water quality/agriculture will address fallow fields and associated issues.
What is the extent of the sod farms? How big is the problem? As well as peat extraction. It is not captured under any of the regulations that is why it is a problem, it is not well documented. Can you quantify it more?	Quantifying the impacts of sod farms would require further study. None have been conducted to date
In this section, we are really dealing with competing uses of the same resource. When you have them all taken together, then that puts tremendous pressure on the ecosystem.	Point acknowledged – cumulative impacts, in terms of recreation will be further studied and appropriate policies developed accordingly
We should not be taking a reductionist approach, where you look at various activities; you do have to look at what is the collective impact.	Point acknowledged – cumulative impacts, in terms of recreation will be further studied and appropriate policies developed accordingly
Does anyone know what the percentage of the residents within the watershed are certified septic systems versus municipal systems?	There are 12,000 cottages, we have identified around 3,500 that are within 100 m range of the Lake. They are all around the entire Lake. They looked at seasonal residential and year round residential within 100 m of the Lake, based on assumptions, calculated how much phosphorous goes into the Lake.
If you went to a no septic tank policy, everyone had to be on municipal systems, do the municipalities have the capacity to handle that extra volume? There is a huge infrastructure issue about getting it to their systems. Is it feasible to go a no septic tank policy?	Point acknowledged. the policies in the plan recognize this reality but still attempt to move towards a framework that minimizes phosphorus inputs from septic systems

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
I am only talking about new development; I am not talking about existing development. I am telling people that they have to convert as soon as there is the capacity to handle it. If the city wants to build a new development on the Lake, surely, it should have to be on a sewer, otherwise do not build it.	Point acknowledged. the policies in the plan recognize this reality but still attempt to move towards a framework that minimizes phosphorus inputs from septic systems
If you look at the cumulative capacity study right now, how you are really calculating cumulative capacity of the entire Lake, you are talking about municipal controls on development and what you are putting in their systems. You have this sleeping giant of the existing septic systems. If you really want to get to the problem, you need to have services for the existing developments. Politicians do not want to do that. How then, can you allow, when you do not have those other things that are not on the municipal on, and you are not really saying that you are going to do it. Over the years, it will get worse and worse. In this Act, maybe you need control, that every 20 years you need to have an assessment of a new system, but you still do not know the cumulative impact. It is an issue in terms of the Act. If we are saying that septic systems are not a modern, controlled approach to municipal waste, then we should be saying all developments around the Lake, or in this watershed at some point should be going to a municipal system. You obviously will not be able to do it in a completely rural situation. We really do not know how much is going in from those other systems.	Point acknowledged. the policies in the plan recognize this reality but still attempt to move towards a framework that minimizes phosphorus inputs from septic systems
We need to know our baseline and the actual tonnes of phosphorous that are emitted from septic systems. We do need to check that baseline and get a better sense of how many septic systems have already, or up to this point, or are planned to be converted to municipal systems, so that we are guiding this in terms of what is the real issue out there. There is a need for an inspection program and one way that we might be able to do that is require the people who actually pump out the septic systems, if they could be required to actually inspect the septic systems at that time and that report could come in. That might be one way to ensure that septic systems are being properly maintained. If there is some kind of inspection program, it needs to be broadly based. It is going to be costly for municipalities, so that needs to be considered, but maybe we should be focusing on septic systems that are closer to the shoreline as opposed to throughout the whole watershed. Septic systems that are close to well heads are going to be captured under the Clean Water Act. When we are talking about septic systems, we need to consider where the septage is going and where it is being treated. In some cases, there is septage from the watershed that is being shipped down to one of the sewage treatment plants on Lake Ontario, so it is being treated out of the watershed. We need to take a look at that in a holistic manner.	We do know that septic systems within 100meters of lake Simcoe contribute to 6 percent of the annually phosphrous load. the policies in the plan recognize this reality attempt to move towards a framework that minimizes phosphorus inputs from septic systems. Point acknowledged – a septic re-inspection program is proposed. Point acknowledged – building septage treatment capacity is a province wide issue

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
What is the practicality of requiring septic systems to be hooked up to a municipal system? What approach should be taken? Do you say any new development must, or do you take a remedial approach? This point might preclude pumpers from inspecting because in some cases, they do not have septic tanks and there are just straight pipes into the Lake. That is something that certainly needs to be dealt with.	We do know that septic systems within 100meters of lake Simcoe contribute to 6 percent of the annually phosphrous load. So putting all of them on municipal servcing woulresult in a signifanct phosphorus reduction. However, doing so would cost millions of dollars. That being said the policies in the plan recognize this reality attempt to move towards a framework that minimizes phosphorus inputs from septic systems.
There are many people on the Lake that really have no appreciation for the impact that their activities have on the ecosystem. They really look upon it as an inert resource that is available for them, whether it is recreational activities or other activities. How do we increase the appreciation that it is a living resource and the human activities that have a negative impact on the ecosystem?	Point acknowledged – a key policy within the proposed protection plan will be developing education and outreach programs to promote sustainable recreation activities
We need to be more aggressive in our actions. There was concern that the Plan is not aggressive enough, that we are too timid that there are not enough specific actions to address and to really make a difference.	Point acknowledged – the plan will need to strike a balance of designated and non designated policies to ensure the ecological integrity of the lake is not further compromised but also ensure that this is done so in a cost effective and less onerous manner.
There was some discussion of agriculture and the impact of fallow fields. Over the last number of years, tillage practices have changed significantly, with zero and minimum tillage that is not as huge a problem as it has been in the past. With fuel prices increasing, it will probably be more and more movement to minimum or zero tillage. The one exception is the Holland Marsh where using minimum tillage or a cover crop is not possible with that type of production system. There were concerns about sod farming and peat extraction that really we are depleting the resource and certainly in the case of peat, we are reducing the ability for the ecosystem to provide that filtering effect.	Zero and minimum tillage are recommended as Best Management Practices and are generally used where appropriate for the type of crops being grown. Sod harvest does not remove as much topsoil as most people think, more than half of the thickness of the sod removed from the field is actually organic matter and thatch. Based on research by University of Guelph, the average a sod crop removes less than 10 milimeters of soil per crop, on a two year cycle. Sod leaves behind roots that contribute organic material to the soil. The largest risk of soil movement is during seeding-pre-growth. Soil movement is generally a low risk on the flat lands used for sod. When top soil is removed from the field it increases the growers' transportation costs and decreases the transplant ability of the sod. This means it's in their best interests to properly manage the soil resource.
When you are talking about population growth, and population pressures, there are more things to be considered than phosphorous, things like benzene and toluene that come out of all the boats, there is noise and light pollution. There is a whole range of things that other jurisdictions have managed to tackle without upsetting the citizens. If you refer to Lake Lucerne, where you cannot put a boat in the water if you do not have a dock and they do not allow you to build a dock. They think that lake is sacrosanct and they think their enjoyment of that lakes means peaceful enjoyment of the lake. You cannot put big floodlights on your	The draft policies on recreation reflect the need to examine intensity and cumulative impacts of recreational use and take appropriate action once the examination is complete.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
docks and you cannot have radios blaring from houseboats. And the people do not seem to mind, they love it that way. I think we would learn to love it that way as well. The population has exceeded the available resources that we have. Circumstances alter cases. You need to be more stringent as the society evolves if you care about the Lake.	
Concerned about the parceling out of recreation, i.e., big issue is golf courses is an enormous agent for impacting land use, water quality, and implication in other areas.	Because it is noted under here in recreational activities doesn't mean that it is not also subject to some of those other rules around natural heritage etc. So if there is a golf course wanting to do a development it is subject to the other requirements in the other parts of the plan. Encourage them to be a sustainable operation or a green operation so that is what we are trying to promote.

Recreational Activities

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Do not ignore the fact that some recreational development (timeshares) can have a bigger impact than urban development	This is a comment and does not require a response.
Farming should come ahead of other existing uses such as golf courses—existing courses should be actively encouraged to improve	The proposed plan will contain a policy that encourages owners and operators of golf courses to adopt best management practices to protect the ecological health of the lake. The ministry of environment will also be setting up a program to encourage eh adoption of eco certification for recreational activities such as golf courses
Support a plan for tourism—emphasis on sustainable recreation needs to be made	The objectives of the plan, as defined by Bill 99 are to improve conditions for environmentally sustain-able recreational activities related to Lake Simcoe and to promote those activities. The plan reflects this key objective
We are behind the rest of the world in how conservation issues are treated---cigarette boats, use of non local bait, noise pollution, etc. --we need to catch up over time	This is a comment and does not require a response.
"1. No development or site alteration within 100m of shoreline." Is this intended to prohibit resort development on the Lake, i.e., new and/or expansions of older marinas, that will presumably add to the economic benefits of the tourist and recreation industries that, according to the provincial government's fact sheet, are "among Lake Simcoe%u2019s most important industries. Tourism brings in millions of dollars, supporting local businesses and driving the economy. More than $200 million is generated annually through recreational activities alone; $112 million comes just from fishing?"	The economic benefits of maintaining a healthy tourism industry in the Lake Simcoe watershed is a primary consideration as the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan is developed. As such, fostering a healthy tourism base in the watershed will remain an important component through the various phases of plan development.

Protection Plan Principles

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Possible principle 1: “Incorporate a broad range of societal values”- the values that would be incorporated need to be explicitly stated	The proposed Plan includes a principle of Shared Responsibility, requiring collaboration and giving a voice to various partners and interests.
Possible principle 1 is too broad – “incorporate a broad & wide range of policies” – doesn’t tell us much	Principle is reflected in range of proposed policies in Plan. Partners involved in implementation will provide a range of perspectives.
“Environmental protection” should be added to possible principle 1	The proposed Plan includes a Precautionary Approach principle so that caution can be exercised in favour of the environment when there is an uncertainty about environmental risks.
Possible principle 3 : “Use adaptive management approaches” We need to add one more principle – “cost effective”	The proposed Plan includes a principle on Cost-effectiveness to ensure the Plan can be implemented in a cost-effective manner.
Possible principle 4 “Watershed approach”; A sub watershed approach should be added to the concept of a Watershed approach	The Ecosystem Approach principle includes recognition of both watershed and subwatershed approaches.
Possible principle 5 “Wide range of policies, programs and tools (regulatory and non-regulatory)”: Wide range of policies- don’t loose focus in the ultimate plan, danger that we loose focus	The proposed Plan focuses on priorities as identified in the Plan.
Possible principle 7: “Build on existing policies, legislation and provincial plans” should include the concept of not duplicating them	The proposed Plan builds on existing policies, legislation, and provincial plans.
Possible principle 7: “Build on existing” is confining to what policies, legislation and provincial plans have now, without adding anything to them – take out the word existing	The proposed Act and Plan do build on existing policies, legislation, and provincial plans.
Identify the ones that are non-negotiable	The proposed Plan contains policies with legal effect that must be conformed to, as well as other policies that identify strategic actions to be taken.
The SciAC report has 42 recommendations at this stage and that is OK, but we will need to bring some focus to this large number	The SciAC recommendations were examined to determine how they could be addressed in the proposed Plan. The proposed Plan focuses on priorities as identified in the Plan.
The candidate principles give a sense of supporting the status quo	Principles such as Ecosystem Approach, Precautionary Approach, Adaptive Management Approach go beyond the status quo.
Innovation should be a principle	Promoting innovation has been included in the Ecosystem Approach principle.
Principles are so vague; we need to be cautious about doing something loosey goosey like these	The principles are intended to be high level. However, additional detail has been added.
These are too vague to be meaningful	The principles are intended to be high level. However, additional detail has been added.
We should be able to evaluate our work and the Plan based on the principles	In part, yes. The Plan will also be evaluated in terms of the degree to which the Plan’s objectives are being achieved.
Principles should be transparent through the document, therefore may not need to be listed separately	By listing them we make explicit the principles that guided development of the proposed Plan.
The contents of the act have not indicated that principles would be included here – why do we	Principles are included in the up front chapters of the proposed Protection Plan and will be

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
need them now? If we are going to have principles in the plan – they need to respect what is in the Act	used as a foundation moving forward. All principles will respect what is in the Act.
The title of the Act includes " restore the ecological health of the lake Simcoe watershed" – we need to respect the Act and its integrity in any principles	All principles will respect what is in the Act. The purpose of the proposed Act and the objectives of the Plan as stated in the proposed Act identify the "endpoints" to which the policies of the Plan are aiming. The principles guide the way that the policies in the Plan are developed and what is taken into account in developing those policies.
We have an opportunity for a new model for the Lake – we don't have to do what is always done – we aren't always doing a better job – ecological values are mentioned in the Act	Policies of the proposed Plan are intended to help protect and restore the ecological health of the Lake Simcoe watershed. The proposed Plan builds upon policies, legislation and provincial plans that are already in place to avoid duplication, but policies are not limited to the provisions that already exist.
The objectives of the Act should stand alone and speak for themselves	The purpose of the proposed Act and the objectives of the Plan as stated in the proposed Act identify the "endpoints" to which the policies of the Plan are aiming. The principles guide the way that the policies in the Plan are developed and what is taken into account in developing those policies.
Ecological health of the Lake is the objective of this Act	All principles will respect what is in the Act. The purpose of the proposed Act and the objectives of the Plan as stated in the proposed Act identify the "endpoints" to which the policies of the Plan are aiming. The principles guide the way that the policies in the Plan are developed and what is taken into account in developing those policies.
We need to find innovative techniques to get there	The Plan attempts to take an innovative approach. Promoting innovation is included under the Ecosystem Approach principle.
We need to be very clear about who is using the principles and for what purpose. Is it only for this committee to help us evaluate?	The principles guide the way that the policies in the Plan are developed and what is taken into account in developing those policies.
Remember that the act currently is a Proposed Act – the plan and the Act are going to be built together – the Act could change	This is correct. The proposed Act (Bill 99) was introduced June 17, 2008 and received second reading on September 23, 2008. It still needs to visit third reading and standing committee where changes may be made. The proposed Protection Plan may also change as a result of changes to the proposed Act and in response to feedback received through the upcoming consultations.
Should SAC look at the objectives of the Act – the role of SAC in relation to the proposed act is a defining issue, this is a defining moment, for SAC	SAC was provided an additional opportunity to provide input on the proposed Act at a subsequent meeting. It is recognized that SAC comments on the proposed Act and Plan as it is being developed may necessitate revisions be made to the proposed Act. There remains opportunity for this to occur. The proposed Act (Bill 99) was introduced June 17, 2008 and received second reading on September 23, 2008. It still needs to visit third reading and standing committee where changes may be made. The proposed Protection Plan may also change as a result of changes to the proposed Act and in response to feedback received through the upcoming consultations. Interested parties will have the

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	opportunity to provide comments on the proposed Act through the Standing Committee process and comments on the draft Plan through the consultation process.
We need to consider the Human dimension – our perception of the Lake – the entire area of the Lake -and the province	The proposed Protection Plan includes a principle of Shared Responsibility, which includes collaboration with all partners to ensure that their perspectives are considered.
a separate principle – prosperous economy, community health and environmental protection	The proposed Plan includes principles regarding Cost-effectiveness and the Precautionary Approach. The Ecosystem Approach principle recognizes that a healthy environment provides the foundation for healthy communities and a healthy economy.
“Efficient and effective expenditures” should be in a principle	The proposed Protection Plan includes a principle on Cost-effectiveness to ensure the Plan can be implemented in a cost-effective manner.
Principle of implementability – comes down to commitment of people, who is responsible, resources to do it	The proposed Protection Plan includes a principle of Shared Responsibility, recognizing that various partners all have a stake in effectively implementing the Plan. The proposed Plan also includes a principle on Cost-effectiveness to ensure the Plan can be implemented in a cost-effective manner.
Economy, society and the environment – if just general principles – which one comes first?	The proposed Protection Plan is a balanced approach considering economics, society and the environment. A precautionary approach in favour of the environment has been added to the principles. The Ecosystem Approach principle recognizes that a healthy environment provides the foundation for healthy communities and a healthy economy.
We need a innovative plan so that it doesn’t need the blah (including principles) at the beginning to make it work	The principles are included in the up front chapters of the proposed Protection Plan to provide a foundation moving forward. The Plan does attempt to take an innovative approach and promoting innovation is included under the Ecosystem Approach principle. The principle on the Adaptive Management Approach suggests that policies and management will be continuously improved by adapting them to what is learned from ongoing science and monitoring.
The preamble to the legislation clearly says we can’t necessarily put something first although the Lake should be first but there will be a lot of development, increased population in the area and that will all have to be dealt with and that will deal a lot with implementability– can’t go anywhere without principles	The principles are included in the up front chapters of the proposed Protection Plan to provide a foundation moving forward.
"Accountability - Create clear lines of responsibility and consider cost-effective solutions." I recommend that the principle above be separated and amended to read "Accountability - Create clear lines of responsibility" "Cost effective - Identify and implement the most cost-effective solutions."	The proposed Plan has separate principles on Shared Responsibility and Cost-effectiveness.
The LSRCA supports a science-based foundation but believes that decisions must be informed by both the Science and Co-ordinating Committees.	The proposed Plan builds on existing policies, legislation, and provincial plans in order to avoid duplication and promote efficiency.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Again, the LSRCA strongly supports the need for a principle that addresses efficiency of delivery and lack of duplication. This requires definition.	

Transition Rules

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
The rules of transition (responsibilities, timing and expectations) must be clear, e.g., clarity re: policy application in settlement areas.	
What rules do apply—also needs definitions –e.g. **settlement areas** depending on definition can have a simple transition rule	We are trying as much as possible to be consistent with definitions that already exist. We weren't trying to create yet another way to define settlement areas. Conceptually we are trying to be consistent with Places to Grow and the ORMCP. We will go back and take a look at the definition.
Can you use Official Plan definition of transition or Simcoe County definition?—need clarification	tried to use definition already in place (Growth plan)—in this case used Simcoe County id areas
Proposal for PDT to consider: need a clarification, can we say "no new development outside settlement areas that affects Natural Heritage until the related study is completed" ?	MOE will clarify the settlement areas definition in the Plan
How can the policy apply to areas that have not yet been mapped?	New rules will apply to areas that have not had subdivision plan approval e.g. how will policy 13 have effect without full inventory Many of the factors are known (location of streams) and the Act will apply—need to consider what happens until the others are mapped
We have approved urban areas; some are built and some are approved but not built yet. Transition policies for stormwater do not exempt some that do not yet have subdivision approval---"new" intermittent streams may stop development on some of the developments --- have not heard that current settlements are exempt	If you are in a settlement area regardless if you are Greenfield or built up the PPS applies.
Concerned about interpretation---suggest policy should not be applied to settlement areas	maybe need to clarify the intent (big subdivisions? Minimum sedimentation and erosion controls?)
Is the regulation to go out right away or are you planning to consult on the development of the regulation?	the draft regulation will go out
we need to have a carrot for the Development community which is to challenge them to find a way to infill in the settlement areas within the spirit of the Act. A different approach is needed for settlement areas.	
Is there a way to ask a developer to try to comply without having to modify their development within the spirit of the plan?	
Retroactivity: how about a rule that when developments have been approved and not developed; establish a date for conformation if no activity has occurred by that date	
Is there a carrot that can be used to encourage long standing approved but undeveloped areas to be used for other uses (e.g. donate for a park)?	
There is a compensation issue here that would have to be part of the consideration	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
How will we get a response to this discussion today—will it be through the draft Plan when it gets released?	Yes.
On the Places to Grow plan, we spent many hours talking about what is appropriate for transition, what is already in the pipeline, what is already far advanced? If lands are zoned, someone has a legal right to do something with that property. Are you going to take away those legal rights? This means your setback issue is a primary example. If I have the right to build a cottage within 8 m of the shoreline, then you are going to have to amend the zoning bylaws or have your regulations and your policy supercede the local zoning. Politically, I would not want to be in the chair. That is a disaster. So really, think through the transitional provisions, looking at what is on the ground in reality. That could be an implementation nightmare for everyone.	The Plan acknowledges that settlement areas provide a unique context in which natural heritage and hydrological features exist and therefore policies specific and relevant to settlement areas have been developed to encourage the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features in that context.
We should wait until after the growth plan exercise to know what those settlement areas are.	There is the desire to allow the growth plan exercise to take place for the delineation of the settlement areas.
This Plan is going to be a lot about transition and unfortunately, the Plan will not be reviewed for 10 years, although there are opportunities to amend the Plan. When you are looking at the interplay between prescribed instruments as identified in the Plan with the non-prescribed, the Planning Act and the Condominium Act. These 2 acts do not have prescribed instruments. But if the policy is designated, then that trumps what might be in the Planning and Condominium Acts. It is the interplay between those. I am going to recommend that we have a chart that allows us to flow through because a lot of our discussion on something as important as natural heritage systems and something as practical as some of the things that have been the case examples are sort of moot, unless we can follow the path through the subsections in the Act around prescribed instruments and designated policies because there is reference to so many. It is important to have a good understanding of that to understand what the implications are in actual practice and what you want to achieve in terms of ecological principles.	Certainly in the Plan, we have to be very clear about what is designated versus what is not designated because it does speak to the level of flexibility. As far as, the discussions today, at this point in time, what is helpful is for you to turn your minds to how much flexibility should there be around some of these things, which is where a lot of this discussion is happening. If we put out the idea of 30 m buffer up and down the tributaries, a lot of this discussion is should that apply in urban areas, how does that relate to farms, what about in different soil contexts? Should it be absolute? Should there be flexibility to it? Right now, we need to hear, that should be absolute or you need a little bit of flexibility to deal with certain situations. We can convert that into the policies in the Plan or write that into the Plan that either allows for flexibility or does not allow for flexibility.
There are development applications at Bond Head, Lefroy, Bell Ewart, Innisfil, Big Bay Point, Oro-Medonte and Rama, you can go right around the lake and there are development applications that are now in place and yet a lot of the things that are in this Act are not going to be implementable until certain study periods have taken place such as forest cover and set backs. My worry is that by the time the Act and all its provisions come into effect it's too late. So where does that all come into play?	With each of those applications the first thing I would say to all of you is to look at those applications to see what stage they are at in the planning process and do those applications actually meet the standards that are being set out in this plan for natural heritage protection etc. When you talked about phosphorus coming from sewage from those developments etc. I think it's fair to say that on an on going basis that will be controlled because what you have is a prescribed instrument to control – a sewage works approval or a permit to take water or whatever they can be adjusted over time.
From the point of view of the people who are implementing the Act are we going to have before these plans have developed too far ahead are we going to be in a position to have the intent of this Act be effective?	During the growth plan transition regulation I know it was pointed out to me that it was important to catch certain things in process that would effect the integrity of the plan.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	Transition is complicated with this Act it is more complicated than Greenbelt because you are trying to influence a number of different instruments and so the transition around Planning Act approvals is one set of rules that we need to look at. The transition around certificates of approval or other permits is another and some of these visions that we have got in here like a new shoreline regulation can come into effect immediately when the plan is in effect. That is what we need to spell out in more detail which of these things are effective right away. Each and every policy has a transition related to it. But the general categories are where something is at with a planning approval, where it might be impacted by a regulation around shoreline so you kind of have to look at the whole thing and look at a proposal individually to know how it may or may not be effected.

Water Quality

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
The water quality targets, particularly phosphorus and dissolved oxygen, provide a key and essential foundation for the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. Clarification is required from the SciAC regarding how the targets of 7mg/l of DO and 44 T/yr of P were developed and how they can be achieved. A phased approach to reach TP targets is supported, but the timelines to reach the targets are not yet identified. For example, the P target was reduced from 100 T/yr to 67 T/yr over the period of 1990 to 2007 given a certain budget. The new timelines need to be set so that a program including funding can be established to meet the targets. It will be challenging if the sub lake and sub watershed targets do not align with the overall targets for P and DO. Preliminary estimates to reduce P from all sources indicate that it may be challenging to reach the target of 44 T/yr without significant investment. This information should be available before an informed decision on targets can be made. Monitoring of DO, P, pathogens, chlorides and other water quality parameters is supported as a priority.	The rationale for the DO and TP loading targets are described in the SciAC Report and in Winter and Young, 2008 (currently in draft). This can be provided and fully referenced once finalized. Under consideration for Protection Plan. Timelines are extremely important and future decisions will be based on adaptive management principle. Under consideration for the Protection Plan. If policy is developed that requires the establishment of sub lake and subwatershed targets they will be based on new overall targets.
Part 2 of the Water Quality Policy Options requires modification to reflect that the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority has been completing sub watershed plans since 1990. The slide deck may give the impression that none of this work has been done to date. The Oak Ridges Moraine sub watershed plans will be completed in 2008. In addition Lover's Creek, Uxbridge Brook and the Maskinonge River sub watershed plans have been completed in addition to the ORM sub watershed plans. The entire southern end of the basin has been addressed and the LSRCA has a timeline in its Business Plan to complete the remaining sub watershed plans for the Lake Simcoe watershed. This section should also be modified to reflect that Level 1 treatment for stormwater management for new development is currently a requirement and has been for many years. A stormwater retrofit strategy has also been completed by the LSRCA. The document states that "farmers lack access to professional advise and information to guide	MOE recognizes the work of the LSRCA. Modification will be made to any material developed in the future to clarify the status of subwatershed planning in the watershed. MOE will clarify that Level 1 is currently the standard for new development and that the Strategy has been completed by the LSRCA. The province recognizes the good work completed through the Water Quality Improvement Program. The improvements made as a result of the program were outlined as a key fact in the working document on this topic.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
the adoption of the most appropriate BMP's" It also states that P loading has been reduced by 26 T/year from 1990 to 2003. This was achieved in large part by over 800 projects with the agricultural community through the LSRCA's Lake Simcoe Water Quality Improvement Program. Farmers have done an excellent job in reducing P loads by completing projects on their lands. The LSRCA works with a Committee of agricultural representatives from the FOA for York, Durham and Simcoe County. Through this program farmers are provided with professional advise and information. Continued research monitoring and strategy development is supported, however, it would be beneficial if the document contained the existing programs compared to the enhanced programs that are being recommended as policy options so that the new Plan can build upon excellent foundations which already exist.	
The proposed target of 44 T/yr is 23 T less than the current loading of 67 T/yr. From 1990 to 2007 the loading was reduced from 100 T/ yr to the current load of 67 T/ yr. Achieving the target timelines will need to be addressed by developing the implementation program, applying appropriate funding and adjusting course to deal with variables such as climate change and invasive species. This will presumably require a phased approach, however, this can not be determined with certainty until the implementation program is defined.	Under consideration for the Protection Plan. The phased approach is meant to coincide with the principle of adaptive management. Promotes the strategic and efficient use of funds, resources and effort to protect Lake Simcoe and reduce phosphorus loads.
Consequences to achieving, or not achieving the targets are linked to the resources available. For example, if a target is enforced, but the resources are not available to achieve the target, then there should be a review. Adding additional resources, or adjusting the target would be two options.	A funding strategy to implement the proposed policy approaches is currently under consideration.
The LSRCA needs to work with municipalities and other funding partners to ensure that retrofits are completed, within specific timeframes, budget dependant. Monitoring by the CA of the retrofits needs to be completed to accurately indicate P reductions. This needs to be reported on an annual basis by the CA as part of an overall loading reduction report.	Stormwater retrofits are currently identified as a potential policy approach for the Plan.
Water quality improvements are best completed on a sub watershed basis. Stormwater management master plans are therefore best completed as a component of overall watershed/sub watershed planning.	Stormwater master planning is currently identified as a potential policy approach for the Plan.
The SAC needs to have a clear understanding as to why the DO target was selected by the SciAC and if the related P reduction can be achieved. The LSRCA believes that, dependant upon resources, the final DO and P targets as recommended, could take a considerable time to reach. As such interim targets and	The rationale for the DO and TP loading targets are described in the SciAC Report and in Winter and Young, 2008 (currently in draft). This can be provided and fully referenced once finalized.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
adaptive management would be required.	
How do we know what the target should be? Is this 44 tonnes (t) in a year list this year or in a year like last year? The year where we have abundant rainfall or a year when we have had none? Is the 44 t using the methods of measurement in the period ending 2001 or using the methods of measurement in the period ending 2006? Is it interpreting the data that we did in 2001 or 2006? Is it collecting the data the way we did it in 2001 and 2006? The statement that the reduction from 105 t to 70 t is knowingly misleading. It keeps get repeated over and over again. We know that the atmosphere did not suddenly get cleaner, and yet the reduction in phosphorous (P) from 40 to 20 t gets repeated over and over. We know why it from 40 to 20 t because Dr. Dillon told us why, it had nothing to do with the atmosphere getting cleaner, it had to do with the fact that they closed some of the catchment areas that were too close to highways, farms and gravel pits. We know that the non-point loading figures are not only incorrect, but they are misleadingly incorrect. In the first period, the non-point loading went from 10 t to 20 t over a period of 5 years, as urban development expanded and urban boundaries expanded. Did we reverse the flow of gravity, did all of sudden the urban boundaries get smaller, no. They took a snapshot in 2001, applied the precipitation numbers to that year, which was a very dry year and determined that non-point loading was probably 10 t in that year. 10 t of the reduction came from a misinterpretation of non-point loading, 20 t came from a misinterpretation of atmospheric deposition, there is 30 t. That is 105 to 75 t. We keep on repeating that it is getting better. The fact is we do not know that it is getting better. And we do not know if the dissolved oxygen (DO) in the middle of the lake is getting better because we change our methods of measurement, it was a drier year, so therefore we have less DO. We do not know whether the P is being trapped by the greater weeds in the littoral layers of the lake, or whether it is the zebra mussels filtering the P before it gets the hypolimnion. We do not know if the DO goes down because it was a dry year. We do not know these targets and yet we keep on talking as though we do. In all of the years, from 1995 to 2006, 2 measurement periods, the amount of P entering into the lake from farming, other than sod farms was down. The farmers have applied more stringent management practices and we applaud that. The amount coming from the tributaries, not counting non-point loading, was down because of all the hard work by the Conservation Authority. We know that the amount coming from sewers was down because of the more stringent rules for sewage treatment plants. The only area that could have caused the increase in that period was non-point loading from expansion of urban boundaries. If all of these other things are down, and we do not know if the total is down, then do you not look at non-point loading as being the only area of total concern, and yet no one has mentioned the expansion of urban boundaries. We so growth oriented. You want our feedback, you want us to influence the government and its	Our commitment is that we are moving forward to achieving our ultimate objectives. Collectively as a team, whether it be from the different levels of government, or the local citizens, or industry, or municipalities, we are all moving forward together. In terms of exact information, we have to acknowledge that at this point, trying to portray the amount of information in 20 minutes, may not have triggered off all of the caveats, and there are many. We will review and see where we can address your comments directly and acknowledge that the information that you have provided is really from passion and where you have that frustration, where you want to start getting to action and moving forward. All of us also want that.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
decisions, yet you ignore what we tell you about P, non-point loading, development, urban boundaries, forest cover, other pollutants, such as benzene and toluene, noise and wave pollution. We have not been totally ignored because there is the Act. We applaud the Act, that you are working towards 44 t and that 75 t is not going to do it. But do not tell us that the lake is getting better when you do not know. Do not tell us that have targets when you do not know, or you do not know what forest cover we need, or how far we should be back from creeks, river beds and wetlands. The lake is precious; we cannot develop outside of urban boundaries anymore until we really understand these targets. I wish you would address these facts and not continue telling us that the lake is getting better and it has gone from 105 t to 70 t until you can tell me that you know it has gone from 105 t to 70 t. Because no one knows.	
When we come to stormwater runoff, I would like more accurate information on P loading from rural agricultural, urban without level 1 stormwater management, urban with volume control only and urban with level 1 stormwater management. There should be enough data on that because we monitor enough of these ponds. I encourage not a broadband monitoring. We have been monitoring and have been requested to monitor stormwater management ponds forever. I find that you monitor 100 ponds and you do not come to any conclusion. All of these ponds for level 1 are designed the same. Why do we not monitor half a dozen of them effectively and thoroughly, rather than just a broad statement of let us monitor every one of them. If it is unique, by all means monitor it, but if it is level 1 and it is a standard level 1, let the Conservation Authority do an exhaustive analysis, the industry is happy to pay for it, because they would rather do 6 well than 100 poorly.	The proposal is not for “broadnad monitoring” but rather the proposal is to require monitoring of priority facilities only. Priorities facilities will be determined based on location in the watershed, size of the development, and findings of subwatershed plans. The purpose of the monitoring is to ensure that these priority facilities continue to function properly over time and to allow for corrective actions (e.g. enhanced maintenance to be taken, if necessary).
The dissolved oxygen target of 7 mg/L, it seems like we have taken this and adopted it without any discussion how achievable it is. It depends on you assumptions going into it, whether it is achievable. It is achievable in what time frame, and this goes back to the assumptions. It is achievable given what we know about climate change and the targeted population for the watershed. I do not know what targets you are using, I do not know if they are Places to Grow targets or, Growth Plan targets, or IGAP targets, I do not know what your modelling is based on. I would like to know, or for us to have a discussion because that seems to be the most fundamental objective of all this, is the DO target, everything else is designed to support that. The concern is that if it is not a doable target, or if we are saying we are going to do this in 10, 15 or 20 years, that we are setting ourselves up to fail because it is simply not achievable. I like the idea that there are interim targets mentioned here. I think we have to have some successes that we can point to. If you just say 44 t and it is not really achievable then we are not doing anyone any favours. One of things that we need to agree upon as a committee is, is this the right target and what is the time frame, and be knowledgeable about the assumptions that are backing it up.	Even beyond the 7 mg/L and the 44 t, we know those are numbers we are going to hear a lot and talk about. These are the main objectives. These are the ones we have to have critical thinking around. “Restore a self-sustaining cold water fish community Lake Simcoe” is a pointed question we asked our scientists. To achieve that, what do we need? They came up with caveats, etc., they peer reviewed papers and they helped us develop this linkage down to something that is manageable. We have controls that can reduce P. We have to make some sort of linkage, and restoring the cold water fish community is fundamental. If this committee, as we move forward, accepts that, then we have to move through this process. If we cannot accept 7 mg/L and 44 t, then we have to change the concept of restoring the cold water fish community.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
There have been lots of questions about the accuracy of the numbers, the 75, the 44, the 105. I do not think there is any question that to get somewhere, to get the lake cleaner, to do the things we want to do, we have to have a target of some kind. The accuracy of the target may be up for discussion. Trying to set loading reductions, some of the target reductions that you have picked, if the 75 is not accurate then those reductions will be very questionable and achieving them will be very difficult.	In 1995, an interim target of 5mg/L hypolimnetic dissolved oxygen was set in order to improve coldwater fish habitat (LSEMS 1995). At the time, it was recognized that 5mg/L is suboptimal for lake trout, but that the interim target set an achievable objective that should result in significant improvements in the deep water habitat of the coldwater fish community. Modeling based on empirical data for Lake Simcoe indicated that a reduction of phosphorus loading from 100 T/yr to 75 T/yr would be required to achieve this interim target (Winter 2005).
I agree with lots of the comments made. There is obviously a lot of concern about the accuracy of the measurement and the accuracy of the targets. If you are starting from one number and you want to get to another number and that first number is suspect, then how you are proposing to get there may be equally challenging. We are operating in a very tight timeframe, probably way too tight; this will have to a living document. I think we all recognize that. We will just have to do the best we can to get there. But you have to have a target and maybe there is another way. Maybe the DO level of 7 is maybe not the only canary to go by. If there is another one, I have not really seen in that SciAC has come up any others, that seems to be the one that they are very focused on. When diving down into the water, the health of the fish down there is probably the most important indicator of the health of the water, it does not matter what body of water you are in. If the fish are healthy then that is a good indicator of the quality of the water.	Agreed, that there a multitude of indictors of water quality. The coldwater fish community (with Lake Trout as one of the most sensitive species) is the proverbial “canary” and is a biological indicator of the health of the Lake ecosystem. Biological indicators typically more useful than chemical indicators because they are more representative of long-term conditions or acute impairment. Multiple biological indicators are currently used to assess the overall health of the Lake Simcoe watershed, but the coldwater fish community is a key indicator because they are more sensitive to changes in ecosystem conditions.
I am concerned about the data reliability because to reach a conclusion, you have to data reliability.	The annual loading numbers are estimates, incorporating measured, modeled and extrapolated components. For each period of record (from 1990-1998 and from 1998-2004) MOE scientists have made the best estimates of total phosphorus loading to Lake Simcoe with the data and methods available. Our methodologies are documented in our publications (Scott et al. 2001; 2006; Winter et al. 2002; 2007). MOE has also increased the sampling frequency and locations we sample in partnership with the LSRCA, and are continually improving our methods to make out loading estimates

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	more accurate. It is important to note that our methods for monitoring water chemistry in the lake and its inflowing rivers (including total phosphorus concentrations) and dissolved oxygen levels have been consistent and are comparable from 1980 to present.
When I locked in on LSEMS at 75 t and I see 44 t, I am asking if that is achievable. 75 t was the target that was selected just 2 years ago, now it is 44 t. It helps to have targets. There is nothing wrong with aiming high, I am just wondering what the implications are if you do not achieve it in the time span that you are suggesting.	In 1995, an interim target of 5mg/L hypolimnetic dissolved oxygen was set in order to improve coldwater fish habitat (LSEMS 1995). At the time, it was recognized that 5mg/L is suboptimal for lake trout, but that the interim target set an achievable objective that should result in significant improvements in the deep water habitat of the coldwater fish community. Modeling based on empirical data for Lake Simcoe indicated that a reduction of phosphorus loading from 100 T/yr to 75 T/yr would be required to achieve this interim target (Winter 2005). Under consideration as a proposed policy under the Plan – Water Quality Section is the development of a Phosphorus Reduction Strategy for the Lake Simcoe watershed (within one year of the Plan taking effect) for the purpose of reducing phosphorus loadings to achieve the target of dissolved oxygen of 7 mg/L in the Lake. This is proposed to result in a detailed an assessment of sources or sectors that contribute phosphorous loadings to the watershed and an identification of the actions that should be taken to address each source or sector.
It is important that as the SAC, we had a common understanding in terms of moving forward. On any comprehensive watershed basin plan, the pivotal foundation point in this particular plan is the DO target. Once you land on the DO target that is going to dictate the P loading. The P loading will then spur a plan for all the components where you have to do the loading reductions and that will then spur the timelines. That was the question earlier, how do we get to timelines and ultimately costs. I wanted to make sure that we have a common understanding to meet our September 8 objective. The common understanding is that the SciAC has given us the figure of 7 mg/L of DO. That is a given. We need to drive our process further at this point in time, with that target from the science committee. If that is not an appropriate understanding, we need clarity on it now. I am of the impression that that is the	The target of 7 mg/L is the best science that we have right now and it is a starting point for developing the Plan. As was indicated earlier, we have tried to translate that into a P loading, which is something we can actually try to align management actions against. There are a bunch of assumptions around translating and whether that 44 is the right number as well. The other key element in what was presented, was that this is an adaptive management approach. That is a starting point for moving in a certain direction. The Plan needs to evolve with new science. If we find at out 5-year or 10-year update of this Plan that 7 is not the right long-term target, then we adjust it. It really is the best science that we have right now, that is aspirational target, how are we going to get there, what do we think is manageable in the timeframe, keeping in mind that the legislation requires that the Plan

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
figure that SAC is being charged to use.	be updated at least every 10 years. There are opportunities to modify the Plan even before then. We have to have a starting point; you have to have something to aim for. That is what we know at this point in time.
If the government just wants to slow down the development around Lake Simcoe, they do not need to go through this much of an elaborate exercise to do it. They could just change the targets in the Growth Plan and extend the Greenbelt. They do not need to do any of this to do that. If the fundamental goal here is just to slow down or halt growth around Lake Simcoe, let us just get there. We want to save this lake, so there cannot be any growth, certainty for everyone. If we have to stop the growth to save the lake, then let us just say that. If we agree to do that, that solves the problem. We are talking about status quo and the future is unknown, we can manage the status quo down to a certain level, but when we you start talking about adding the growth on, and the cost of doing that in a sustainable way. From a municipal point of view, some of the costs I have seen in some of the Lake Simcoe things for stormwater management, or going to membrane sewage treatment plants, these are some very significant costs in some very small communities that do not have the tax base. And the property tax base is already stretched to the limit. When you start talking to municipalities and the developers do not want to see the development charges any higher, we are tapped out. If you start talking about, it will only cost you $17,000 a year to reduce the P by this much, and it will only cost you that much for the next 50 years, we add that directly onto the tax bill. If people are in favour and they are willing to accept that additional financial burden, fine, but that is where it will come down to the crunch.	Clearly, this Act and the Plan is not about growth management. It is about protecting the lake and looking at all the threats to the lake. We have talked in other meetings about some of the other threats and what we need to do about them, in terms of, for instance, aquatic invasives and what that is doing to the quality of the lake. It is as important to look at that as it is, this is one more indicator, I know we are tending for fixate on this indicator today, and P being a problem, but it is not the only thing that we are looking at. We really want this to be a comprehensive look at protecting the lake, the quality of the lake, which is helping to protect the quality of life in the Lake Simcoe watershed. And no one is denying that there are challenges here on all sides and challenges related to development in the basin as well. We are not ignoring it. This is all part of the discussion. We are trying to look at these things in piecemeal fashion, and I hope as we bring it back, on September 8, when you see how the pieces are fitting together, that we do have the kind of balance that is needed to try and address each of the issues. This one is challenging. We have given you some specific questions that we are looking at, just to deal with this one issue. Even though we are talking about a target for 44 t, we are looking for advice in terms of timelines, how much can we handle. The adaptive management approaches indicate that we do not have all the answers, but we need to put some action plan on the table to try and move us in the right direction on all fronts, including the P issue.
In terms of the phasing of the reduction strategy, some of the things that you are going to have to take into consideration are the time frames. If you want to do the retrofitting, you have municipal and provincial budget processes to go through, construction seasons, etc. When you start thinking about how fast can we get to this target of stormwater reduction, you are going to have to build in all of these really practical matters, which take time. It takes this much time to get the approval, run a RFP for the construction, and then 2 years later you actually get to build something. When you start looking at what it is a realistic time frame, these are very practical considerations that you need to look at. What is the timing if new development is expected as part of the plan, you have to look at when is the new developed scheduled to begin and this will affect how fast targets can be met and what you have to build into your assumptions about that.	Point acknowledged. We will work with our partners to develop an implementation strategy. Financial resources and timelines will be an important consideration to take into account when determining how to reach the goals/ targets of the Plan.
Item 10, you are talking about redirecting the effluent for other purposes. I do not know how you would achieve that because it would mean piping from the wastewater treatment plants in a separate piping system altogether that could never cross into potable water or even back into the sewage system, out to the golf courses, out to the farms that may want to reuse the	Under consideration as a proposed policy under the Plan – Water Quality Section. Assess effluent re-use opportunities in the Lake Simcoe watershed and report as part of the overall phosphorus strategy.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
water in that regard. I am not sure why that is even a recommendation, seeing as it is so problematic.	Identifying effluent re-use opportunities in the Lake Simcoe watershed will assist in moving towards this recommendation in communities or situations where it is feasible. This assessment would also address situations in which effluent re-use could not be used in the Lake Simcoe watershed (i.e. use as irrigation source for produce or as potable water). Some jurisdictions use treated effluent, delivered through a separate (3rd) pipe for water to flush toilets and to water lawns. Sewage is still treated to a high quality effluent for reuse.
In response to the plan for moving forward, there was discussion about how we get to the timelines. One of the things that is in the legislation that is required in the Plan is a financial strategy. I am quite curious to know how before September 8 the policy team is going to acquire, even in a very gross way, and maybe they do not do it yet because you would not want to do the work on a lot of the numbers until you had narrowed down which strategies you were going to use. Because it is very difficult to start estimating. You are you going to need a lot of input, in some cases from municipalities, to generate those numbers that relate to some of the strategies around stormwater, keeping in mind that some of the lower tier municipalities, in Durham at least, are responsible for stormwater. These are small communities, they do not have a lot of staff, they did not have a lot of resources to throw at this last minute project. What is your strategy in terms of developing those financial pieces that need to be attached to the Plan? This may be the biggest caution, in terms of releasing a plan that is not complete enough, because if you go to municipalities and say here is our Plan, and you have not got any of the financial information about how you would pay for the Plan, I have seen this happen before, they just will resent it and react badly.	We are working on trying to cost out as much as we can of the concepts that are coming forward. In terms of the time frame, it is unlikely that we are going to have everything costed, but we are trying to triage it. Those things that look like they are the most expensive, focusing on those items first. It is going to be evolving, but you are right, this first Plan has to have something in there about the potential cost of the Plan and the options around financing and that is why we put it in the legislation. We recognize that that is important. As with everything that we are doing, we will bring the best information forward that we have at this point in time and through this process and the further public process, we will continue to refine and evaluate the costs and the options in that manner. And we are using some of the existing work that has already been done by the Conservation Authority and the IGAP report to the extent that we can.
In terms of P trading, 2 years to feasibility, I am stunned. If it is going to take 2 years, and again we are going to have a Plan that we do not know how to implement because P trading is going to be critical for this, and yet we are going to take 2 years to do it. If you are being realistic in telling me that then do we have a plan? We have an incomplete Plan and we are still going to have an exercise lasting at least another 2 years before we get to a full picture. I want to be careful on what we are selling to the public this fall. It may be a road map, but it is an incomplete road map.	The Protection Plan recognizes the need to conduct a feasibility study for water quality trading/ offsetting. The results of this study will allows us to make decisions on whether it will be a useful tool to fund programs for the remediation of Lake Simcoe.
In terms of the beach closures, we study our beach because our children are out there; we are often taking the samples to make sure the beaches are okay for them to swim in. I notice that when they are closed it is where all the geese are. When it says 0 for beach closures, I just cannot see it happening when we have so many geese coming around.	Point acknowledged. SciAc recommended zero beach closures as a target for pathogens. We will take into consideration all the factors that affect the closure of beaches.
I would like to pick up on the point about net benefits from development and refer to the suite of tools that were referred to. I find some of the tools bogus and some of the tools are nothing more than slight of hand. Under the category of bogus ones, I would like to deal with intrinsic	I will try to put some context around it. I think this concept of trading is complex and the rules that you set around what can be traded and what cannot is what we have to look at. We have to work that through. There may be ways to accomplish the kinds of certainty

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
values. I would think that most of us find that forests have some intrinsic value. Wetlands, working farms, bike paths, walking paths, these are things that are considered to be of intrinsic value. If they do not, then maybe we can say it right out front, we do not care about these things. But if I were to tell you that I can achieve better P reduction by tearing down a bunch of trees and creating a state-of-the-art holding pond, I think you would call that bogus, as a net reduction in P. Or, if I were to tell you that I am going to pave over a working farm because that working farm is adding P to the lake, but my paved parking lot, because I am going to fence it in, is not going to provide any P to the lake, I think you would call that bogus. I think there are some things that should be inviolate. Those things that are inviolate should not be allowed to be used in the definition of reduction of P. If they are going to be used, then we should be upfront about it and say, we do not value working farms unless they have such and such a crop benefit to the nation, but as part of our heritage, they have no value whatsoever. Let us say that. We should not use it as a device to justify things that 95% of us value in our hearts. Then there is the area that is the slight of hand. This comes under the category of municipal responsibility. I do not believe it is a developer's responsibility to convert my septic tank to a sewer. Nor, it is the developer's responsibility to make sure that my septic tank is working properly. Those are municipal responsibilities. In Georgina, we spent between $10,000 and $30,000 a cottage converting from septic tanks to sewers. If some developer had come along and said there will be a net benefit to the lake of a half a tonne (t) if you will allow me to convert these people to septic tanks. I am going to put a quarter of a t into the lake, but I am going to take out half a t by converting these septic tanks. The net benefit to the lake is a quarter of t. If the municipality had done its job, and either supervised those septic tanks or converted them, the net benefit would have been half a t. That is half a t forever, whereas, the developer's quarter of t, is a quarter of a t forever because that quarter of a t is still going to come into the lake. Those are the slight of hand. I do not think those should be legitimate tradeoffs. You have the two different types. If we retract those two categories, and then a developer can say, my development is so sophisticated that in and of its own self, reduces P, I am all in favour. But I have never heard of such a thing. I do not know how that would be possible.	that people are looking for and not getting into areas that are problematic, we are really not trading off the right kinds of things, we are not getting the overall benefits that we are looking for. It really is important to set the rules around what is and what is not possible. But we have not gone there yet and it is complex. We understood this was going to be a heated kind of discussion around this, but we still think despite all that there is merit in looking at it and it is a good way to find the best alternatives to reducing P around the basin.
I do not know if it is different in Georgina, but in Durham Region, septic systems and wells on private property are the responsibility of the private property owner, to properly maintain, monitor and for their own safety. It is not a municipal responsibility, other than when if it becomes a health and safety issue or consistently bad tests in private wells.	In terms of septic systems, the human pressures group who is dealing with septic systems, looking at the maintenance and the re-inspection option. It is a complicated issue, but as one of the alternatives to help not just with nutrients, but also with pathogens.
So, municipalities do not inspect septic tank systems?	Municipalities are not required to inspect septic systems.
Maybe that is something that should be added to someone's list, that municipalities should be inspecting them.	Point acknowledged. The draft plan includes policies regarding septic system re-inspections.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Under the Clean Water Act, they have already brought forward a proposal for septic re-inspection program. The Clean Water people need to understand from a resourcing point of view and a start-up program point of view this is a different activity than what is currently done in many places. A septic re-inspection implies physical re-inspection of the property. We talked about looking at it while a pump out was happening, so you could actually look at the tank and the condition of the system. It is going to be mandatory if the regulatory proposals are passed for the septic systems and well head protection areas, you would have to do it, the municipality would have to do it for those. But if you want to extend it to the shoreline areas or tributary shoreline areas, then that is at the discretion of the municipality under the proposed regulations, to expand it beyond the well head. It is not currently a municipal responsibility, unless there are health and safety issues, then municipalities who have the responsibility, do step in and they look at what is the solution to the problem and if they have to extend municipal services.	Point acknowledged.
With regards to nutrient management plans, the recommendation is that all farms, small and large, in the watershed should implement a nutrient management plan. The Nutrient Management Act was dealing with expanding live stock operations and those over 300 nutrient units. The Act was to phase in different size of livestock operations and phase in cash crop operations, and horticultural operations. That was all put on hold except for the 300 and greater nutrient units and new and expanding operations because they discovered in a lot of cases because they plan is based on how much nutrient you apply and how much nutrient your crop needs. A lot of the OMAFRA recommendations were found to be inaccurate and outdated, so they really do not know. They are in the process of updating a lot of that stuff. You cannot do a nutrient management plan on a horticultural operation or a corn, soybean, wheat cash crop operation until you have some accurate nutrient requirements. A lot of that stuff has to come, so they put those phased in on hold until they could get accurate crop uptake information, both to fit today's varieties, and just to correct things that we not accurate before. And also to find funding to help people actually implement some of the changes they may have to make. That is #17. That is very problematic, you cannot do something until you actually have the right information to work from. That is not one that you can make assumptions on. We can make assumptions on DO levels and loading targets. #18 is already legislated, that you cannot apply manure; I am not sure how that would work to throwing fertilizer on frozen or snow covered ground. You could probably still do that in the case of fertilizer on frozen ground for wheat, it is still okay but you cannot apply manure. There are two different types of nutrients at work here. You might want some clarification on that one. It is necessary practice to get fertilizer onto wheat ground early in the spring when you cannot physically drive on it because then you get into compaction issues.	There is significant work to be done on the smaller acreage crops. There are issues with the OMAFRA recommendations and with specific crops, and with high value crops. We do have a lot of good information. A lot of good information was developed from a production standpoint. Part of it is going back and putting the environmental filter on as well. There is work to be done on that side as well. As far as application on frozen and snow covered ground, I am quite familiar with the nutrient management part of that; it defines frozen as more than 2 inches of frozen soil. It is a bad idea when the ground is frozen really solid to out and spread fertilizer or manure. But to go out on a frosty morning and apply fertilizer just before the season is going to change and the crop is going to start growing, would still fit under existing nutrient management. But we do not want to be putting fertilizer on as it is going to run off at the first heavy rain. We have to manage that part of it.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
When we talk about stormwater, we seem to be focusing on the systems themselves, and improving the systems. I would like us to take a step beyond the system itself and say what is going into the system, the quality of the stormwater. If we could do some things, there may be some simple things that we can do to improve the quality of the stormwater itself, such as reducing the amount of fertilizer people put on their lawn, etc. Some of these things are very tiny, but they are the kinds of things that homeowners can buy into and take control, and say, this is what I am doing to help improve the lake. The Ladies of the Lake are already doing some of this. Maybe you are putting it off as something that is already happening, so it is not in here. It is part of that human behaviour change. Maybe one of the targets is maybe to have no one doing that kind of fertilizing by a certain date.	Point acknowledged. Proposed policies in the draft protection plan will encourage an integrated approach to addressing stormwater runoff.
In terms of the master plans, what you are really talking about is asking municipalities to integrate this into their capital plan. They already probably do master plans for environmental services. Stormwater is done at the lower tier. It is something that you are going to have to integrate where there is upper and lower tier municipalities both doing, you are going to have to look at it. If you are asking them to do new things, I will refer back to the infrastructure deficit, we have projects that are continuously deferred because there is never enough money to get to them all. Unless you are going to provide some assistance to go do the planning and then to make sure it gets implemented, you are going to run into barriers in terms of getting things done in a timely way.	Point acknowledged. We will work with our partners to develop an implementation strategy. Financial resources and timelines will be an important consideration to take into account when determining how to reach the goals/ targets of the Plan.
I wanted to get an idea about relative importance of some of these gaps. The one I would like to talk about is the sediment bound versus dissolved P. In the 1980s, there was a fair bit of work done on that by Wilson. His work indicated that this really needed to be done and more. Naturalization and restoration of natural areas along waterways and generally environmental farms, all of those things could really help this particular problem and gap. I wanted to highlight that one; I really think that is important. For example, in the last week, in the Zephyr watershed, in the last decade or so, a lot of sod operations coming into the area, it was a great year with the rain for growing turf. They are ready to get the stuff off earlier in the year. One really big field, the sod came off and then we had a big storm 2 days after. There was a big open field, all the sediment goes down into those drainage tiles and out to the river. The river is now brown, totally brown. All that sediment, with all that P attached to it, going down the river. This one here is really important and that is just one concrete example of it. That kind of turbidity in the river has to be really bad for the fishery. This relationship of sediment to P is critical in terms of reducing that impact, that stressor right across the watershed. The policy team should look at in more detail at the literature on sediment and P, the relationship between the two.	Point acknowledged. We have included policies in the draft Protection Plan that aim to reduce sedimentation and P loadings with respect to stomrwater management and construction sites. We have also included policies for the development and implementation a broad-based agri-environmental stewardship program, to promote the adoption of Best Management Practices with the greatest potential to improve the health of Lake Simcoe and its tributaries.
There was a discussion about the subwatershed management plan looking at cumulative	That is an appropriate distinction between the two. This is taking a focus on stormwater

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
impacts, and I am wondering if cumulative includes synergistic, in other words, not just cumulative impacts of a particular kind of stressor, but the synergistic impact of other stressors as well. I know that you have specified it with regards to development issues.	per se. If you break down the components of stormwater, there is a quality issue and a quantity issue, so potentially there, in a conveyance type of issue, there would be merit there. Additionally, if there is, we move forward with overall subwatershed management plans and look beyond stormwater, then definitely that fits. Looking at them, instead of in silos, but looking at how they interact together and even separately.
I would like to discuss the importance of subwatershed planning. I know it is showing up here under stormwater, but it is a particularly important tool, not just for stormwater, but all other components of dealing with protection and restoration. It allows us to identify all the natural features that require protection at a much smaller scale, woodlands, wetlands, etc. It allows us to development on our subwatershed-based area, the remediation that is required for both urban and rural areas. Very supportive of that policy recommendation. I would like to note, however, about the number of subwatersheds. Just to give a picture of where we are today, there are 7 subwatersheds within the entire basin that have subwatershed plans. There are 4 that are underway in this fiscal year and there are 5 yet to be done. Those are targeted with the Conservation Authority's business plan for 2008 to 2011. Those can be driven faster depending on resources available. The other adjustments that would have to be made to existing subwatershed plans would be in the following areas, including the source water work that is being done right now. There are 7 subwatersheds within the total basin that require a tier 2 water budget analysis because they are showing some signs of stress in terms of water budgeting and water quantity. Those need more detailed assessments. In terms of the targets themselves, if we increase dissolved oxygen (DO) and lower P, then we would have to redo the whole assimilative capacity on a subwatershed basis. From a timeline perspective, it is purely driven by the resources available. It can be done relatively quickly depending on the resources available.	Point acknowledged about the value/ importance of subwatershed planning. MOE is aware of the work of the LSRCA and the status of subwatershed plans in the Lake Simcoe watershed. MOE is considering policy options around how subwatersehd planning can be incorporated into the Protection Plan.
In this policy toolkit, I did think we do already require level 1 treatment as a minimum standard for stormwater. We may want to change the wording in that box to say, "Continue to prepare and amend subwatershed plans within the policy context of the provincial guidelines." We may want to say, "Continue to enforce level 1 treatment." Level 1 treatment has been a standard within this watershed since 1995. Rather than "require" which implies that we are not doing it, we should use the terminology that says, "continue to require that level".	Point acknowledged. This change has been made in the draft protection plan policies.
If we are looking at stormwater retrofits and the costing and the cost per kg or per t, I was not sure if they costs were annual costs or if there costs that broke down the capital costs over a period of time. There is maintenance costs related to this and interest costs if it is a capital program. You have the one-time cost to do something, but then you have ongoing operating costs related to cleaning out catchment basins and things kinds of things. There are 2	In terms of stormwater, we want to highlight a number of opportunities because a stormwater retrofit pond is truly an end-of-pipe type solution and you need the other source control and innovation. That is where, in terms of a municipality, they can assess, what is the most efficient way of achieving a target, a number, a goal for a subwatershed, an area and then really pick the most efficient options in achieving those goals. Whether they be

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
components to the cost, when comparing street sweeping to stormwater retrofit; you have to be conscious. Street sweeping is strictly going to be an operational cost with some capital costs to buy the equipment. It is an annual cost forever. If you are looking at retrofits, then you have costs that are one time and ongoing forever. There are 2 elements. When we are looking at just the bare economic cost and benefit, we have to be conscious of those things, in addition to the non-monetary costs and benefits that you are going to want to consider. The stormwater ponds, particularly, we are seeing now cases where they have to be dredged, the sediment has to be taken out of them. In some cases, the sediment is contaminated and the issue of what to do with the sediment is a burden on the municipality. If it has to be treated as a contaminated substance, then the costs are quite a bit different than just disposing them in electrical resistance tomography (ERT) sediment. Depending on where the pond is, again this comes back to trying to reduce what is in the stormwater that is going to go into the pond. Because if you have a lot of heavy metals and oils going into the pond, then the chances of having contaminated sediment becomes a burden for the municipality to dispose of later. There are long-term impacts that will need to be dealt with as well. If we are talking about a 50-year plan to get to 44 t, well within the 50 years we are going to be looking at the issue of retention points and cleaning them out and how we deal with that.	cost effective, whether they be the most efficient at reducing P or any other contaminants. It is opening up the possibilities for some of this innovation to go ahead.
One of the things that strikes me is that this all seems so inert that people just about their daily activities in the watershed are impacting the lake all the time. Many of them say, who cares, it is not my problem. Other people are trying to do things. One of the fascinating things, and I think it is an information gap, it would be a very valuable tool as we go forward and try to explain all of this to the public, if there could be some data assembled; a profile, about the impact of an ordinary person doing their ordinary things in their ordinary daily life, doing it one way, doing it a better way, and doing it a better way still. Because when it comes right down to it, the problems that we are having with this lake area caused by people. The municipalities are going to have to get buy-in from the people who are going to approve the measures that they are going to have to take. People do not understand all of this stuff at all, or so few do. As we are thinking about assembling data, it is very valuable to be thinking out through the end to how the data is presented.	MOE recognizes that everyone has to do their part to addressing the issues in the Lake Simcoe watershed. The draft protection plan has many policies that encourage individuals actions towards solving environmental problems.
Given the massive contribution of agriculture to P loading in the lake, your timeframe, high/low priority areas should have some action items in the high priority area. It is a lot of modelling and I am sure these things need to be done, but I think you really need to prioritize something that is more concrete that just some more research in these areas. For example, one piece of research that may be a shorter, faster line to getting reductions could be trying to determine what barriers there are for farmers to complete their EFPs beyond lack of access to advice. Even if you make sure there is this advice office and make the phone calls to all the farmers to	I think some of it is bringing some of the ongoing activity more explicitly into that. There are things that are going on already and things that will be continuing. We need to include the targeted funding in the short-term because it is already in the works, as well as having it in the long-term so that there will be actions. I think it is important that we have in the table the things that are already planned and there will be actions. It is a bit of an error on the slide, where it says “Develop a cost-share program to target

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
make sure that they start developing their EFPs, that would be much more reassuring to see some of that in that high priority area.	adoption of specific BMPs" that is really a continuum so it should actually be inside that red box at the top. We are looking at providing significant resources to farmers to actually do work, to go through the EFPs, if they have not already done so, and to actually cost share doing action on the ground.
The LSEMS indicated that there was a huge reduction in tributary input in P and it attributed a significant piece through agricultural BMPs. Do we actually know what that number is? Do we have an estimate?	Yes, we do. The LSEMS figures for projects over 1990 to 2007/08 were 950 projects, there were not all agricultural, in the early areas of LSEMS, a significant number were agricultural. Those can be specifically divided up, the number of projects in both the P loading reductions can be specifically addressed and that would be a great piece to add into here, as well as your provincial projects. Yes, it can be substantiated.
Farmers are always a little slow at the uptake on some of these programs; they have to wait for the neighbour or something else. Partly a lot of it is from the financial constraint, the fact that agriculture has not been getting good dollars for what they have been producing lately. Even though environment is a nice thing to do, they do not always have extra money to spend on the environment. That is why we have pushed very hard to get these costs share things up to 90% of better. It was originally only 50%.	Farmers are quick to adopt new practices that they can see will benefit their operations and the broader community; the shortage is in demonstrations that will allow them to assess the practicality of environmental practices on their own farms, and in cost-share programs that will help to offset investments that will not increase the productivity or profitability of their farms. The Environmental Farm Plan has a proven track record in helping farmers to plan, prioritize, and access cost-share funding to implement Best Management Practices that make sense for their individual situations.
The other thing that strikes me is that there seems to be 83 things that farmers are trying in order to be green or sustainable. The EFP sounds like it is the one place to look. Could not a lot of these things be brought under one umbrella, so that they do not have a nutrient management plan, a farm plan and a pesticide plan, maybe that is the way they do it. But I have the impression that there are many kinds of hoops they are jumping in order to prove that they are doing the right thing whether it is applying for a grant or a cost share program. If it could be simplified into a single system, it might save them some time and money and garner some more participation.	The Canada-Ontario Environmental Farm Plan program is just such an umbrella. Best Management Practices for nutrient management, water supply management, and integrated pest management, to mention a few, are all made available under this one stewardship program. Several federal, provincial and other funding programs have all been linked to the Environmental Farm Plan, significantly reducing the paperwork and "hoops" that individual growers go through to access funding. Were are committed to coordinating stewardship programming in the watershed
When we see source water protection coming out, there are people in well head areas who are going to have to do another kind of risk management plan, based on activities. Farmers are undoubtedly going to be caught in that. That is just another one. It would be really nice to see some kind of rationalization of all of these requirements into something that is less onerous.	We are working with MOE on the drinking water stuff to try and make sure we are not recreating the wheel.
Just with regard to land use considerations, it goes back to the crux of the issue, especially with this non-point source contribution of P and other things to the lake. A lot of the traditional farmers have real concerns with sod farms and operations. We talked last session about it being basically mining of the soil. Any agricultural process is like that, but there are some processes that we need to look at hard in this process. If you are talking 10 years in many	Soil health is very important in all agricultural production. Top soil, in particular, contains the nutrients necessary for crop growth as well as the organic matter necessary for good water holding ability. It is in the growers best interest to keep the topsoil on the field. Sod harvest does not remove as much topsoil as most people think, more than half of the thickness of the sod removed from the field is actually organic matter and thatch. When

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
cases, the depleting of soil and sediment to rivers because of current practices, this process has to look at those contributions really hard to try and come up with solutions for those operators. From what I have seen in my local area, we do not see a lot of change in these practices. That is just one example, but that is one that we really have to take a serious look at. I would like the ministry to do that in this process.	top soil is removed from the field it increases the growers transportation costs and decreases the transplant ability of the sod. Best management practices to reduce the loss of soil include: proper preparation of the seedbed (flat to allow even cutting and reduce soil loss), the encouragement of rapid root production with phosphorus fertilizers and rolling the turf prior to cutting. Sod in the landscape has many positive impacts on water quality. It stabilizes soil, it efficiently recycles nutrients, it encourages water infiltration and it filters stormwater.
I prefer option 1. I think there are numerous advantages to establishing sub-watershed targets and strategies that differ by subwatershed: 1. Recognizes vastly different nature and relative impact of stressors in different sub-watersheds 2. Allows for further and more detailed work on reduction strategy - removes the time constraints that are currently affecting the depth of work and consultation 3. Allows for closer alignment of strategies with current and planned municipal strategies and capital plans 4. Allows for Growth Plan conformity exercises to be completed, which will establish population and employment targets for watershed municipalities, and will tighten land use controls in several ways within the watershed Problems - must not replace the potential for cap-and-trade, which I think is an excellent idea to expedite achieving the goals. Also, may extend uncertainty.	Acknowledged It has been proposed that Water Quality trading feasibility study will be completed within a specified timeframe after the release of the Protection Plan.
My understanding is that the reason for selecting the DO target of 7mg/L is that this is the ideal condition for the cold water fish. SciAC is recommending this, and thus we are now seeing the TP target of 44 tonnes/yr. Restoring the cold water fishery is a proposed key objective, apparently because it is a proxy for the improved health of the Lake. The question we do not seem to address is whether this target is realistic or achievable, given other pressures (climate change) and objectives for the lake (for example the objectives around recreation and additional population). It may be realistic depending on the timeframe allowed. If SAC agrees that 7.0 is the right ultimate target, should the first plan simply say that is the ultimate goal (kind of a soft target, future ideal) but set a much firmer shorter term goal...one	Under consideration for the Protection Plan. Reductions in phosphorus are anticipated to occur if the Protection Plan is implemented but the timeframe for achieving the proposed target may be longer than 10 years. Development of subwatershed targets is under consideration for the Protection Plan.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
that we are more likely to meet or approach in the life of this plan given the kinds of results we could expect to see in a 10 year time frame? It will be important to set some realistic interim targets that relate directly to the actions proposed, being very aware of the timeframes needed to implement those actions. At the subwatershed level, if certain actions are proposed such as planting of 30 m buffers along the stream or a stormwater retrofit, we need to look at the reduction that kind of activity will yield, and how long it takes us to get there as part of the target setting. So we would build the subwatershed target from the bottom up instead of from the top down.	
It is important to note that septic tanks are not designed to filter out nutrients. The inspections are not a substitute for prescribing them for prohibiting. Around Lake Simcoe, it is commonplace for small seasonal cottages to be purchased, torn down and new full time residential buildings up. So, a new septic system was required for that building. Does that fall within that 100 m rule that we are talking about? Is that a replacement or is that new?	That is new. It is existing approved zoning so it would not apply. You would be exempt.
Stormwater management, you have said this is the big thing; we can gain a lot by stormwater management. You dig the thing and you have to maintain it, what are you going to do with the dirt out of it? Where is it going? Who is going to take it? Do you have a place for it?	There are some maintenance costs. When I said that stormwater management is something that we could do, it is at least one area where we have a fairly good understanding of what savings in terms of phosphorous we can get because it is more easily quantified than some of the other areas, which is why we have a cost estimate of about $120 million, which does not include land acquisition costs, as compared to agricultural or rural sources per se where we are still trying to get an understanding about what we actually achieve in terms of phosphorous reduction from doing any particular type of best management practices. It is just that it is more easily quantified and we probably understand the technology better in terms of what we could do about it. It is not necessarily the most cost effective and that is why we need to continue to look at all of the sources and do some more research before we land exactly who should be doing what, by when. When we look at, we would have to look at the costs of doing the digging out and whatnot as part of that analysis.
I am very happy to see the 44 tonne target and the 7 mg/L dissolved oxygen target. On slide 14, the *proposed settlement areas required expanded sewage services, complete and Environmental Assessment of the expansion prior to amending the boundaries of the settlement*. Are you talking about an assessment of the expansion of the boundaries or an assessment of the expansion of the sewage treatment plant?	In this case, because what we are focused on is water quality, it is the assessment of the sewage services so that we understand what the impacts might be on the lake. Particularly because our sewage treatment plants are going to have some kind of limit on them, we need to know what the impacts might be of any proposed boundary expansions. Unless someone was going to a higher level of treatment.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Would that not just relate to an increase in the total load from the sewer? A question about the reference to the *Sewage Treatment Plant Effluent Characterization – identify other pollutants or emerging pollutants*. I would like to see that expanded to septic systems. There is some good science now, which shows that, depending on the location of septic systems and their proximity to a waterway and soils, that we can have very rapid flux of pollutants from the septic system to a water body. There have been some interesting studies, especially with reference to pharmaceuticals, this is an emerging issue, it is an emerging issue globally. I would just like to suggest maybe some attention to that.	
I am a bit concerned about the last point, *develop watershed indicators and targets related to urban development and stormwater (e.g. extent of impervious surfaces)* and that that would be done in the future. Are we talking at this stage about a target for impervious surfaces, or if we are going to say that is still up in the air now, and develop that 5 or 6 years from now? Are you making a differentiation between impervious surfaces as they relate to stormwater specifically and a target for the entire lake? Is this setting a target for the extent of the impervious surfaces, is that related just to stormwater management in this case or is that related to a whole lake target?	The proposal is that it be done as part the stormwater management studies so that we would have more information about setting the target. At this point, we do have some higher level targets for the overall Plan, we have not proposed one for this yet, thinking that this would be more of a watershed target, that that is where it would make sense. It is the ability to also to take some time to look at from subwatersheds perspective too, which will be a longer timeline. Additionally, our understanding of stormwater is also advancing in terms of technologies and we also want to implement that too, in terms of whether we would be promoting low impact development and other tools, not just the traditional level tools. It is really an area that is expanding and we want to have the appropriate time to address those in terms of stormwater. In this case, it would be related to stormwater, specifically, any targets related to stormwater development
New on-site sewage services are not allowed within 100 m of a shoreline or a tributary of the watershed with the exception of… except where it would be shown that it would not harm the lake. I have some concern that there have been septic systems put in, certainly within a 100 m of the shoreline in the last 2 years that were approved theoretically because they were not going to harm the lake. What is the difference?	We have been refining this one. The one addition we did add was around environmental and health risks. Essentially, if there is an area that already has approved zoning, it would be exempt. If you are replacing the septic because it is failed, those are the only 2 exemptions. Proving that you could protect the ecological health of the lake is not an exemption.
Under *Atmospheric Deposition*, we have (a) and (b), which deal with construction sites and aggregate operations. What is missing is (c), or we should put it as (a), is agriculture. A quick, preliminary model that we did, 80 to 90% of dust comes from agricultural sources. If	No, we could have repeated (c), that agricultural will be one source we are looking at for atmospheric. We tried to capture it under just the general non-point source slide related to agriculture that some of the best management practices that are being proposed would

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
you look at the footprint of construction sites, total number of acres of construction sites as opposed to farmlands where there is machinery working. Not having any item there on Slide 18, for atmospheric deposition, that means we are not going to do anything about that key source. It is different. The way we do erosion control for runoff is different from the way we do erosion control for wind. I have a feeling it is best to be more explicit and have that item (c) under atmospheric deposition just to clarify that it is an important source. We are not going to achieve the 44 tonne target, that 11 or 12 tonne reduction from 23 to 11 tonnes on Slide 64, we are not going to achieve 50% reduction in atmospheric load if we only deal with construction sites with aggregate industry alone. Agriculture is a big one. We have to do proper wind erosion control practices, which is different from water erosion best management practices. That 11 or 12 tonne reduction in atmospheric load is not going to happen by itself. Simply because we do not have the monitoring data or we have not done our modelling yet, does not mean we should not start putting it into policies and start promoting these best management practices and continue to monitor their effectiveness until we achieve that target. It is just delaying the process by a number of years and not having those mechanisms or incentives the farmers need before we can achieve those targets. I think some people are being extremely naïve and really do not understand what agriculture is all about. It is not like we are out there running around making dust 365 days a year. The reality is in agriculture, if you are not no till, you have to work the land to grow crops, that is what you have to do. You do it for a very limited number of days of the year, it is not an ongoing activity, whereas construction sites and aggregates and so on, they operate, generally, all year round, so they are creating dust all the time. Agriculture is not making dust all the time; unfortunately, there is a reality when you have to do it. There are lots of practices that can be modified, but for some crops and in some places they cannot. You can go to no till in some things and in other things you cannot. Shelterbelts are always a good idea, windbreaks, that is ongoing practice that has been going on for a long time. I simply got the impression that the speaker talking agriculture was talking about something that goes on all the time and that is not how it is occurs.	help to deal with phosphorous, either through runoff or atmospheric deposition. But the kinds of activities that would be funded under the best management practices could address the multiple sources. What we are proposing, many of these actions do not have to wait for the study over the next year, some can start right away, including the agricultural program. It is not that we forgot it, and I apologize for not making the link more obvious. The issue is, it is not on the slide, and we have dealt with agriculture in the water quality section, certainly we are going to support the implementation of shelterbelts, cover crops, no till, everything that keeps a little more residue on the land, all these things will have an impact on test admissions. Point acknowledged, the draft plan includes a specific policy to ensure practices take into consideration the atmospheric deposition studies.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Our monitoring data shows that the bulk of the atmospheric load to Lake Simcoe is just a very short period of time, it is just May, June, July contributes 80 to 90% of the atmospheric load to the lake. Yes, it is a very short period of time, but it is a critical period. Again, I think we can do better and US studies show that we can reduce atmospheric load by 50%, which is our target here. Again, emphasizing, it is not the only source, of course, there is construction sites and aggregates, but agriculture is one of them that was missing on Slide 18 and I think we should have explicit policies that also covers agriculture as an important source.	
This is probably the most important section of the Plan in a lot of ways. The emphasis is heavy on point sources and on stormwater, and understandably. We understand the problems there the best, they are probably the most linear to solve. I was very interested to hear the points earlier about the atmospheric side, because I really that was lacking. Here is a bigger number that you are assuming as meeting the target and then I got to the recommended policies, it is in there, but they are basically study, study, review and review. Those are the four things that are in the Plan. When I look at the list of mandatory new policies that are going to come into effect, that are going to affect the way we do business as a municipality and as an operator of a sewage treatment plant, it is hugely imbalanced. That is the strategic concern I would express. I know some of that is inevitable because of the state of the science, but it is a real concern to me. The corollary of that, and this will come up again, I think you said in the implementation framework that you plan to spend most of the $20 million on reducing impacts from agricultural and rural sectors, science and monitoring and coordination. Okay, but only if you augment that section of the policies. I do not think that you can have the lightest section on the policies getting all the provincial money. If we are going to focus on stormwater and we are going to do that right away, the province needs to put its money towards it. And frankly, the federal government has already. There is an imbalance in the implementation section that mirrors the imbalance in the policy section. So, if you fix it in one, then they are in balance. I was interested to hear the comments from the SciAC member saying there was a very significant piece missing here on agricultural sources for atmospheric deposition. If the science is not there yet, that is one thing but I thought I heard that the science is there, so then the big question is, why is it not in the Plan? I would just reiterate that the through the policies I see a huge number of directions that are going to have either direct or indirect impact on the cost of municipalities doing business. Whether it is a piece of stewardship program that we are running or whether it is the official plan review or whether it is doing something new with sewage or stormwater, even things like	That is one of the reasons why we thought it was really important to commit in the Plan that we do the detailed work within a reasonable timeframe, which is the year. When we first presented it, we talked about doing water quality trading and our phosphorous reduction strategy in 2 years, we are saying fast track it for a year so that we can get the answers and have better targets related to the non-point source. But you are right, it is easier to control the point source, we know it the best and so on that, the strategy is to at least hold the line, particularly with the sewage treatment plants, while we do this work. And then hopefully things like the water quality trading will help us get more done on the non-point source. The science that is missing is understanding how much reduction we will get from a certain change in practice. That is where we are having the difficulty, so translating it into if we do "x" amount on agricultural practices it is going to mean 10 tonnes reductions. That is why it says *to be determined.* There is science to say an estimate of how much atmospheric deposition is being caused within the watershed and the likely sources. It is translating it into what is the effect of our management action, which is where we are stumbling.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
developing the stormwater management plan, that is an exercise that costs money at the municipal level. Maybe someone is already doing it, but if you say we have to do a new one, and we just finished one, and it is not up to your standard, we are looking at additional costs, in addition to all of the other kinds of reviews that are being undertaken for the Growth Plan and these many layers of exercises that are impacting us. You have to put it in a context of all of the constantly increasing costs that are being asked of municipalities to deliver.	
Where it says *no new municipal sewage treatment plants*, I understand that you are allowing for replacement. When you intensify inside an urban boundary, you may need to expand an existing sewage treatment plant, is that allowed for? What if it is cheaper to build new than to expand? Sometimes you have an existing life left in a facility. Sometimes expansion and refurbishment is an option, but sometimes building new is actually better. It depends what you are trying to do and what all the things that are attached to it in terms of twin sewers and things like that. I would just urge you to look at the result instead of the how do you get there. Maybe that is the key. In the column that says implementation, some places it says *MOE and municipalities*, I am a little concerned about who is doing what and who is paying for what. When something says there is going to be annual inspection and maintenance, I am thinking MOE is going to inspect and then we are going to have to be told to do maintenance. It is the practicalities of municipal budgeting and when we can afford to do things and the timing of those sorts of things. I would hope that it would be a cooperative process rather than a confrontational one.	Yes. We can look at refining how the policy is phrased. The concept was around not increasing the number of urban settlement areas that need a sewage treatment plant. That should not be an issue with the Growth Plan. Essentially, we want to hold the line on the phosphorous coming from sewage treatment plants in the watershed. Yes, it will be collaborative.
At a higher level, the targets that are being set for the treatment plants, can or can we not achieve the planned populations of the communities that have already has this approved development? I mean approved within the urban boundary.	Our understanding is that we think there is a lot of flexibility in terms of the sewage treatment plants and the options that they have in terms of the types of technology that could be in place to manage the increase in the growth. One of the difficulties that we have right now is we do not have the numbers of what is approved and everything that may be coming on stream, which is why again we are suggesting that we need the year to work with the individual municipalities to set the long-term targets related to that. The planned growth and the growth related to the Growth Plan can be accommodated. No, but I am not familiar with the Sutton situation.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
I will give you a real life example. Sutton was going through an Environmental Assessment to improve its sewage treatment plant. It stopped all of its planning work, part of its environmental assessment work, the Region stopped its environmental assessment on doing its upgrades to its sewage treatment plant. Effectively, what you are saying is, we are going to wait another year before we can commence both planning work and environmental assessment work. In my world that means another 3 to 4 years, potentially 5 years before I can start developing on land that sits within an urban are approved for development. Is that what we are suggesting, freezes for upwards of 3, 4, 5 years?	In general, no. Again, it really does relate to the individual plants because some have more capacity than others to manage the already approved growth. It does actually come down to an individual assessment of the plant and whether something that is currently approved right now could be accommodated.
It does not need to be specific to Sutton. It could be anywhere. If you put targets that are lower than the targets today, you have Certificates of Approvals that allow so much effluent to go through that plant. The Lake Simcoe Act reduced them. We are reducing them further. That means we have to upgrade each of those plants to accommodate the planned growth, not the new growth, just the planned growth. We have to do effectively Environmental Assessments for the 19 sewage treatment plants to treat to a higher standard. That Environmental Assessment process, generally, in my experience takes anywhere between 12 and 18 months, then you have to actually construct it, which can take anywhere between 18 to 24 months. From my world, I have not even put a shovel in the ground and I am 3 years waiting for the treatment plant to be prepared. Is that what the intent is behind these objectives?	The only decision in what is up here right now and in the proposals that impacts is the proposal to extend the current limit, the 7.3 tonnes for 1 year. That is the only thing that is changed at this point. The rest of it has to wait until we do all of the work that is needed to be done with the municipalities. It is maybe identifying that one or more facility that cannot handle what is already planned to come on in the next 12 months.
Would it not be prudent to have the information before us before you make a decision on whether you are going to use these objectives? If you are going to shut our industry down for 3 years, 1 for study, then several others for other review, would it not be prudent to understand how much growth the current plans can accommodate before you make a decision to set the targets?	
I will accept the answer; I am not accepting the proposition. I think we are on a slippery,	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
slippery slope would be my read.	
One of the other policies says *prepare stormwater management master plans for areas of existing and proposed new development*. I do not know how many people are familiar with watershed planning and subwatershed planning. Again, 2 to 3 years worth of study. Are you suggesting that we actually do these plans in current built urban areas? If you did the same thing in the City of Toronto, where all the streams have been piped, put under buildings, all in hard surfaces, if you did that study there, how would expect to treat the stormwater that has already been conveyed through an established system? I cannot see Barrie being any different. Naturalization is the short answer. You have to dig them up and bring them back to the surface, stop putting them in pipes. And that is on the taxpayer's ticket, which is not new growth. Yes. And it is not cheap. It is all out of the operating budget. This all comes out of the taxpayer, this is not growth related cost, so you are not going to go the development industry and expect to get a big paycheque from development charges. This all comes out of every single one of your residents. That is the suggestion that the Ontario taxpayer once again is going to take the burden on this. Again, while these subwatershed studies are going on, what is the rest of the world doing? What is a municipality doing? What is the proponent of an infill application doing? What are we supposed to do? Are we supposed to wait until these studies are complete, because I know that is what the answer is going to be. Your application is premature, your proposal is premature until have completed these works. Again, not only are the infill urban developments being held up, but new developments as well. I do not understanding, unless you tell me there is a transition period or it is business as usual and you will retrofit as you go along. I need to know what the rules are. I have a paved asphalt parking downtown Barrie, for example. They are required to do a	Yes, because part of the issue is trying to figure out what is the best way to control the stormwater from the existing areas. In fact, that is probably the major concern. It is part of the Plan to try to reduce phosphorous. We have not indicated how quickly we are going to do that, but if we want to be serious about achieving some reductions, we have to find the best ways to do that. It may be that part of it is stormwater management, part of it is other opportunities and we are still working on how much to do by when. The rules for new developments are as they are in the interim regulation around stormwater management, just meeting the level 1 requirements. That stays.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
subwatershed study to update this. I do not know what the targets are going to be. I have no idea what the new requirements are going to be, nor do they, the study is ongoing. They will say to me, thank you for your application, please wait until we have done our study, then you can meet our objectives. Again, is this a freeze on development inside urban areas? I am not saying it was explicitly intended, but I am telling you, practically speaking, that is what will happen in my world. Most of the subwatershed planning has been done, and yes, there is a little bit more to be done. The next step that has been taken is there has been a strategic look at all of the stormwater retrofit opportunities that are available for the past. We really do have to go back and fix all of those areas where development occurred in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, without any water quality or quantity controls. We have to do that. We have a fix on that. That is going to be an $117,000 million bill. We have done that. We have been doing stormwater retrofits with the municipalities for a number of years now. That is not influencing development going forward within proposed settlement areas. When you are going forward with new developments, you do it now to the specifications of the day, which is level 1 stormwater treatment. I would like that very clearly articulated in any document that this committee produces. If it is level 1 until such new standards are in place and those are the standards of the day, then we understand what that means. If it is anything different, and I hope you are right, I have never experienced that in my 20 years of doing what I do. It is always the new standards that get imposed. As long as it is in writing. I think the elephant is in the room about the limits to growth of this Plan. There have to be drastic changes in this watershed to achieve what we are trying to achieve for our goals.	It is on Slide 15 and in the detailed policies, hopefully, it is even clearer. In the detailed policies, it is 15(a) under *Stormwater*, page 11. I would suggest that if it is not clear, let us check on the wording to make sure that is clear so it addresses your concern.
What I do not see here, in terms of subwatershed and evaluations, etc., I still do not see a spatial approach to the Plan and the policies do not seem to reflect that, maybe the Plan will more. There are parts of this watershed that are quite different from others. The discussion, which I full agree with, bringing up the issue again about non-point source, and the very important contributor to that of agriculture. This is just one example of the uniqueness of different parts of the watershed, for example the Uxbridge area and places like that. We have maybe high elevation up on the moraine; you have completely different circumstances and situations in the Lake Simcoe lowlands. I have brought up a number of times in these meetings issues of water and wind blown sediment, for example, and the example of sod	Policies related to subwatershed evaluations have now been clarified and are intended to recognize the spatial variation within portions of the watershed and even subwatersheds. Stewardship policies are also intended to be based on adaptive management to ensure that measures are effective and allow for area specific or targeted approaches if necessary.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
farms. They do not just clear those farm fields at certain times of the year, when the sod is ready it comes off, it can be any time. The routing of water and sediment to the rivers directly, the wind blown, it is all local knowledge. You just have to go around the watershed and you will see that in those areas. There has to be a spatial component to this Plan and to the policies, to say we are going to look, not just as this kind of thing, but where we really have to look at it. That is specificity that was mentioned earlier. There has to be some specificity into this Plan and to those policies and that is where you get the integration as well. I do not see any of that here yet and I think there is still that other level that staff have to look at from the ministries and Conservation Authority to have that in place when we come forth with this thing. Reinforcing the non-point source emphasis.	
It is going back to the dust issue. The reality is that the watershed is very different. There is a lot of agriculture going on that creates no dust ever, pastoral agriculture, hay, those types of crops, the dust component is zero. I would question any model that comes up with a number and a percentage. We have been told all along that the whole the atmospheric deposition is really unknown. And yet, today we hear about a model that magically says 80 or 90% is coming from agriculture. I do not buy it. The model is probably created in a room by people who really do not understand agriculture and how it works, especially in this watershed. To take a model and then apply it to the watershed and as was mentioned, this watershed is very, very different, in different parts of it. I will have to agree with the sod farming, that is certainly one that definitely has some grey areas. I certainly do not buy agriculture contributing 80 or 90% of the dust at any point in time. That is not realistic. This is not reality. I have not seen the model; this is the first we have heard of it. Certainly, I do not think the model bears any relationship to this watershed. Since we have been told all along that there really is not a clear understanding of where the atmospheric phosphorous comes from and yet, now there is a model that clearly points a finger. I am not buying it at all. We have about 10 years of atmospheric bulk/atmospheric deposition data around Lake Simcoe, so that is where we started this research about 2 years ago, looking into how much phosphorous goes into Lake Simcoe. From that load, the next question came, where is this coming from and what can we do about that. That is new research that we have started about 4 or 5 months ago. We have equipment that measures the amount of dust that can emit from different sources within Lake Simcoe. We have been to different farmland around Lake Simcoe, measuring the amount of emission of dust from different sources. We are working closely with OMAFRA on effective different land uses and agriculture. We have senior OMAFRA people and the University of Guelph, who are knowledgeable about agricultural practices. This model, though it is in preliminary stages at this point, the goal of this model is	The plan contains a policy that requires the MOE to complete studies on the sources of atmospheric deposition. Once that study is complete, policies of the plan will be refined to better reflect the findings of the study.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
to identify what are controllable sources of atmospheric deposition. When I told you that it is 80 or 90%, it is simple mathematics. If you look at what are the potential sources, just looking at the GIS map at the map of what are potential sources, though we have not done our measurements completely and the model is not calibrated yet, but just ballpark, when you look at how much land can potentially produce just by land use and soil type. OMAFRA has a map, which identifies the risk of emission of wind erosion areas. Based on that simple calculation, we look at how many hectares can potentially emit dust. That data we have, in terms of how much dust goes into Lake Simcoe, based on the 10 years of monitoring that the MOE has done, tells us how much is that. That number is double the amount that you would experience from natural areas, such as Dorset, or areas that are not disturbed. We say that is 50% that is controllable, where is it coming from? Just simple math, if we identify 3 main sources: construction sites, the aggregate industry and agriculture. When you look at how many hectares of active construction sites you have, how many hectares of unpaved roads you may have or aggregate industry, the contribution of those other sources. Those construction sites can be 10 times or 100 times more per unit area, compared to agriculture. But there are not enough of them. In total, when I throw a number like 80%, it is based on that simple model without calibration, without any accurate numbers. It is just, where is it coming from. When your background load in Lake Simcoe is double the number it should be, compared to other areas, you ask yourself, that 50% local sources that you cannot control, where is it coming from. If it is not agriculture, than where? When I say 80%, it is 80% of what you can control. It is not 80% of the load because half of the load is background dust; you cannot do anything about that. 50% of atmospheric load right now is not controllable; it is just the background dust. The other 50% are controllable and are coming from local sources. Out of 23 tonnes, maybe there are 12 tonnes that you cannot do anything about. 11 tonnes is what you can control. Out of that 11 tonnes, some is coming from construction sites or sources close to the lake, unpaved roads for the aggregate industry. I am just throwing numbers, maybe 2 or 3 or 4 tonnes are from those sources. And maybe 8 tonnes is from agriculture sources. The ones that are closer to the lake would have a higher contribution, compared to ones that are further away. We look at the air shed and that is our goal, to produce these models. But we are visiting all of these landowner's sites right now and measuring the emission rates that are going to go into this USEPA model. MOE, the policy group are interested to find out these numbers before we can have some hard numbers for you. Just based on simply looking at the map and potential sources, I throw that number out and I can defend it. I heard the words preliminary, potential, and guess. The reality is, it is something that is very	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
difficult to put a number to. You cannot just take the number of acres unless you know the activity going on on those acres. It is one thing to look at a map and say most of the land is in agriculture, but the reality is, the type of agriculture and the activities going on, and whether it is till or no till, whether it is pastoral or whatever, and again, the distance that the activity is from the lake itself. Certainly, the muck soils are ones that because of how they have to be worked, very finely, they are going to blow more than anything else in all likelihood and that is historical. But there are also further away from maybe pastoral agriculture going on very close to the lake. But preliminary was the key word that I was hearing. I want to make sure that everyone else understands there is a long ways to go to get accuracy on that.	
You invited a response with regard to whether some of the policies are aggressive enough. It is my view that we have a lot of science around atmospheric deposition; it is a significant contributor to phosphorous loading in Lake Simcoe. I think we know enough to move forward. With any of these things, we never have perfect information, but I think we have enough information here to move forward with a more aggressive program to address this issue. What I would suggest is that this is a perfect candidate for an adaptive management program or experiment, where you might take some selected part of the watershed, a subwatershed, for example, and implement some of the recommendations that we have put forward about reducing the amount of atmospheric deposition.	Comment / suggestion acknowledged.
The aggregate operators should be required to adopt best management practices, including timely progressive restoration. Licence conditions should require restoration milestones to be met or there would be penalties or licence suspension until restoration requirement for that phase was met.	The plan contains a policy that requires the MOE to complete studies on the sources of atmospheric deposition. Once that study is complete, policies of the plan will be refined to better reflect the findings of the study, which could include additional mandatory measures for aggregate activities. Dust control from construction sites has already been identified as one of the key sources of airborne deposition contributing to the annual phosphorus load entering Lake Simcoe and thus has mandatory policies applied to it.
The water quality targets the province have proposed are very ambitious given the current annual phosphorus load results and uncertainty regarding; climate change, the effectiveness of best management practices and control options to reduce phosphorus and ability to address atmospheric sources. With this in mind, it is important that the province provide a schedule or time-line in which the phosphorus and dissolved oxygen targets will be achieved along with interim targets so that progress can be evaluated and resource agencies can adapt programs and policies as necessary. A twenty-five to thirty year time frame for phosphorus reduction is not unreasonable given the reduction in the annual phosphorus load needed to achieve the target and the subsequent cost to undertake the remedial work necessary.	We purposely did not put a timeline. We do not know how long it is going to take us to get there. It is a long-term goal. We want to get there, we believe it is important but we need to figure out how.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
The Phosphorus Reduction Strategy needs a bit or reworking to ensure that the plan can achieve the phosphorus target of 44 T/y. The atmospheric reduction that has been estimated appears to be to high based on comments made at the last meeting. More information on how the reduction from agriculture and septic systems will be achieved and the cost associated with the remedial work is needed. In relation to the urban stormwater reduction the current estimate of 7.5 T/y is based on using present day conventional stormwater management techniques. As a result only 60% of the contributing urban area is being addressed. This means that an additional reduction in phosphorus is achievable by implementing new and innovative site controls within the remaining 40% urban area. This needs to be estimated and included in the plan. The water quality targets currently only focus on phosphorus and dissolved oxygen. While this is the key parameter of concern, E coli bacteria which is the pathogen resulting in beach postings and problems with drinking water has been mentioned as another water quality issue which needs to be addressed. Including a target for bacteria would be prudent given comments at the SAC and SciAC committees.	The proposed Phosphorus Reduction Strategy will be a systematic assessment of sources / sectors contributing phosphorus to the watershed. It will also include an identification of actions that should be taken to address each source. Acknowledged. Water quality section now includes targets for pathogen and contaminant reduction.
If the plan is proposing a phased approach to reducing phosphorus it should as previously mentioned identify the schedule for implementation including; the proposed reduction by source, an estimate of the cost, and identification of the implementation partners and the expectation for the funding partnership.	The Phosphorus Reduction Strategy is intended to address the majority of these issues. Additionally adaptive management is a key implementation principle of the draft Plan
Page 14 (slide deck) recommends that there be no new sewage treatment plants in the Lake Simcoe basin. This recommendation served a purpose in 1985 but seems to be outdated for the current situation. The MOE does have legislative control of wastewater treatment therefore the need for a recommendation of this nature seems redundant. Furthermore, what if the creation of a new treatment plant to service new development could reduce the phosphorus load entering the lake by recycling waste water to a nearby industry of development. If it could be demonstrated to be cost effective and reduce the total annual	Proposed policies now provide exceptions for establishment of new municipal STPs when replacing failing subsurface systems (i.e. septic systems)

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
phosphorus load why would we want to limit this opportunity.	
The plan contains recommendations which deal with septic systems and the requirement for mandatory re-inspection programs. Is the province going to assist municipalities with the funding? Has the costing for this activity been evaluated and could it be included in the summary of costs as part of the plan. It would also be advised that new on-site waste treatment best management practices be evaluated and be licenced for use when found to be superior to conventional septic systems.	The costing of this activity has been calculated. Roughly 350k would be spent per year by all municipalities should this policy be implemented. The plan does contain a policy that requires the ministry of municipal affairs to evaluate and potentially adopt the standards for tertiary treatment units that is currently underway through the BNQ standard setting process.
Page 18 under atmospheric deposition the Authority would request being added to the list of partners as we are currently involved in studies with the MOE and University of Guelph to quantify and qualify sources of phosphorus from atmospheric deposition. In addition the Authority has also stewardship programs already in place to deal with wind erosion from agriculture (windbreaks, cover cropping,..). Dust control from construction sites has already been identified as one of the key sources of airborne deposition contributing to the annual phosphorus load entering Lake Simcoe. While the contribution to the total atmospheric loading is not known there are examples of existing dust control criteria and guidelines in the USA, Europe and Australia. It would seem prudent to recommend at least interim dust control guidelines and controls for construction activities in the short-term based on examples of these similar guidelines that already exist. This interim control could be changed once the results of the atmospheric investigations are completed. Dust control plans could be included as part of the sediment and erosion control plans required by the Authority for all new development. Similarly dust control from aggregate operations also could be addressed.	The plan contains minimum erosion and sediment control to mitigate dust/atmospheric deposition from construction sites.
The regulation should be amended to allow for planned growth to occur.	Comment acknowledged.
I strongly support the establishment of a water quality trading program as an effective and efficient means to reduce nutrient loading to the Lake.	Comment acknowledged.
Adding a requirement for an EA for expanded sewage services for proposed settlement area expansions confuses an already complex decision-making process to the point where it will be unworkable. Section 2.2.8 Settlement Area Boundary Expansions, of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Places to Grow, Subsection 2 states that: "A settlement area boundary	This policy is consistent with the Greenbelt Plan (Policy 4.2.2) and is complimentary to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Section 2.2.8) with respect to sediment area boundary expansions. An EA is required before a municipal sewage treatment plant can expand. This typically occurs during a period before the plant reaches rated capacity, which may be

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
expansion may only occur as part of a municipal comprehensive review where it has been demonstrated that - e) the existing or planned infrastructure required to accommodate the proposed expansion can be provided in a financially and environmentally sustainable manner." An EA process would undoubtedly duplicate this process for no foreseeable benefit. I recommend that this policy be amended to strengthen the requirements of the municipal comprehensive review for municipalities within the Lake Simcoe watershed to address concerns with respect to expanding sewage treatment plants (as opposed to "sewage services" which meaning is unclear) that might potentially result from proposed settlement area expansions.	This policy supports the need to fully assess sewage servicing capacity, in a comprehensive manner, before a municipality approves a settlement expansion especially in light of future phosphorus discharge caps for STPs. Terminology has been clarified.
It is my understanding (from SciAC) that 80-90% of atmospheric deposition of phosphorous that is related to human activities (i.e., not related to background levels) is attributable to agriculture, yet construction activity and aggregate extraction are targeted for further regulatory controls. I am not necessarily supportive of further regulatory requirements being imposed on farmers, but am disappointed with the implication of this policy, when in fact, construction activity is the source of a minor amount of atmospheric deposition of phosphorous. In addition, An Urban and Sediment Control Guideline (Guideline) was prepared in December 2006 by the 9 Greater Golden Horseshoe Area Conservation Authorities (including Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority), and was reviewed by Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Environment Canada, and MNR. I recommend that this document be reviewed and updated, if necessary, to address atmospheric deposition, to avoid general confusion and potential conflict between the Plan and Guideline.	Dust control from agricultural sites will be addressed through this plan's policies on agricultural stewardship. Many municipalities already require erosion and sediment controls as conditions as site plan approval; the policies in the plan ensure that there are minimum erosion and sediment controls in place across all watershed municipalities.

Water Quantity

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Water budgets- do we know yet whether water quantity we are in a deficit position? LSRCA Clarification after the session: The LSRCA has completed the Tier 1 water budget, which has also been peer reviewed, and it will be approved in the coming weeks. There are 8 subwatersheds that are being recommended for Tier 2 assessment. • East Holland River, • West Holland River, • Maskinonge River, • Black River, • Lovers Creek, • Barrie Creeks. • Hewitts Creek, • Uxbridge Brook There are also a number of subwatersheds where consumption exceeds the prescribed proportion of supply that are not recommended for Tier 2 assessment because there are no municipal water supplies within them.	South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region is currently undertaking a Tier 1 water quantity stress assessment. They are evaluating a similar equation to what Leo presented here to determine the stress in all the sub watersheds through the area. From the preliminary results I don't think we are in any kind of deficit situation where supply is less than the total demand. Those numbers are preliminary. There are a few sub watersheds that are going on to Tier 2.
If it is not in a deficit situation can I assume that we are trying to head off a future problem? Or is it much to simplistic interpretation of this?	We are looking toward the future but you don't want to use 100% of the available water within a sub watershed. The Ministry has set certain thresholds that trigger stresses or surface water use. You are looking at 20% of the water used within a sub watershed. Groundwater side you are looking at 10% annually or 25% on a monthly basis. Those are the thresholds that we developed provincially under the Clean Water Act
Water budgets are being developed for certain watersheds for Tier 2 evaluations – if those are found stressed then they go on to a Tier 3 evaluation. In terms of climate change and predicting how that might add to the stress how is that taken into consideration in the water budgeting? LSRCA Clarification after the session: The province has asked that a chapter be included in the SWP Assessment Report that summarizes the availability of information and data gaps relevant to the assessment of climate	We would ask the Conservation Authorities and Regions to give us the information. Try to use the global models and try to identify how to incorporate climate change. We are asking them to provide the province with that information.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
change impacts. While there is a requirement to consider a drought scenario in advanced water budget efforts, there has been provincial direction not to explicitly consider climate change scenarios in this round of water budget projects.	
If you know what the base flow the natural level of water over the year in the area and then you subtract all the PTTW then wouldn't you know that there is a huge hole in the bottom of the river somewhere or there is a whole lot of illegal water takings?	We are not up to that level of analysis yet. In terms of that. It is a difficult question getting. What is the actual base flow for a particular area. A lot of these are information gaps. We know there are particular sub watersheds where there are issues. Chronic low water problems during that low flow period. That same approach could be used in this area to really focus our efforts
We will never have 100% agreement about what is climate change and what the impact of climate change is going to be but there is a large degree of agreement that it affects areas. Even if that is not the case why would we not assume the worst and establish a conservative approach here?	Do we use a fundamental precautionary approach as one of our principles. That type of approach should we be moving that toward a lot of other decisions where we don't have direct cause and effect relationship type issues. That is where our hesitation is. On the MNR web site there are models for precipitation and temperature for the entire province based on 5 scenarios. A link to those can be provided on the SAC web site under the climate change chapter.
To try to improve ecological health of the Lake are we concerned that a reduction in water quantity will reduce the ecological health of the Lake? But we are not clear that that is happening yet. Is that fair assumption? LSRCA Clarification after the session: The water budget activities required under the Source Protection Program do not consider inputs to and outputs from Lake Simcoe. The assessments are specific to the subwatersheds themselves (precipitation, evapotranspiration, recharge, streamflow, groundwater discharge…). There has been provincial direction that the Great Lakes, Lake Simcoe and Lake St. Clair are not to be assessed in SWP water budgets.	Yes that is fair. There are certain sub watersheds that have been identified or flagged as stressed but from all indications the groundwater from which they are taking the aquifer is much larger and extends out beyond the surface water mapping. That is something that will be looked at in much more detail in a Tier 2 type assessment. Water quantity stresses are identified – the tiered process will be used to refine the demand - supply relationship
On targets and indicators we recommend that we add one more - continuing to monitor a key indicator which is change in land use and change in impervious surface development	Land use indicators include: ▪ Change in proportion of land in wetland, forested valleyland, natural riparian and upland forest taking into account habitat quality ▪ The degree of fragmentation of wetland, forested valleyland, riparian and upland forest ▪ The amount of shoreline that is either undeveloped or maintained in a naturalized state • Changes in land uses associated with significant recharge areas
You would like us to comment on the existing policies; we need to know specifically what in the ORM should be applied in the protection plan. There is also the Growth Plan to consider.	In terms of the provincial plans Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine if you go to slide 6 we have highlighted the sections to refer to. We are going to make every attempt in future

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Is there something useful in those policies that cover the watershed? Which specific ones are you currently thinking of applying?	iterations to really highlight focus. Highlighting sections 24-27 and 38 in the Oak Ridges Moraine and section 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 in the Greenbelt Plan. We have highlighted the sections of where we are doing further policy analysis on. We have not determined if any of these will be applied to the rest of the watershed it is too early in our policy analysis.
There are issues around timeline – legislation - some weakness around timelines on reporting	Regarding timelines we are definitely moving forward with SciAC on their recommendations. Part of that is priority and timeframes. What needs to be done at what point and potentially how long and where they have that expertise to provide that information. Up for discussion is in terms of reporting and there is a provision actually SciAC identified a 10 year plan review. Is that appropriate for some measures and recommendations
Trent-Severn governs/controls the level of the Lake – why there is an issue on the quantity part if we can control the top level?	Focus on this particular issue may not revolve around the lake itself. But the idea is the tributaries in the watershed as well as the aquifers again identifying a lot of municipal wells so there could be a lot of usage in that area. Along the sustainability line providing more natural proper water coming from the watershed to support the Lake level in the Lake rather than taking /stealing it from somewhere else to contribute for that. Working with Trent Severn will help to control the water level.
Large extractions are a key issue but we should not just look at 50,000L/d; it's an issue of accumulation of a number of smaller extractions	The Plan includes policies on establishing instream flow targets for water quantity stressed watersheds and the completion of Tier 2 water budgets with a goal to inform future water taking strategies in stressed subwatersheds. These strategies could include policies that would be included in future amendments to the Plan, including: setting out how much water can be allocated among users in a subwatershed, including the natural environment; and placing requirements on s. 34 Directors when issuing Permits To Take Water in that subwatershed as well as conservation measures. The Plan also includes water conservation policies for municipalities, agriculture and other sectors (e.g., recreation).
Water taking issue – accumulative impact, smaller water takers, sod operators – taking more than 50,000L/d	The Plan includes policies on establishing instream flow targets for water quantity stressed watersheds and the completion of Tier 2 water budgets with a goal to inform future water taking strategies in stressed subwatersheds. These strategies could include policies that would be included in future amendments to the Plan, including: setting out how much water can be allocated among users in a subwatershed, including the natural environment; and placing requirements on s. 34 Directors when issuing Permits To Take Water in that subwatershed as well as conservation measures.
Need to know more on the cumulative impact – what is the real state of the water	The Plan includes policies on establishing instream flow targets for water quantity stressed watersheds and the completion of Tier 2 water budgets with a goal to inform future water

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	taking strategies in stressed subwatersheds. These strategies could include policies that would be included in future amendments to the Plan, including: setting out how much water can be allocated among users in a subwatershed, including the natural environment; and placing requirements on s. 34 Directors when issuing Permits To Take Water in that subwatershed as well as conservation measures.
We need to validate the water taking information and we need to factor in climate change	Plan includes policy of developing an integrated climate change monitoring program, to better inform decision making.
Some of the links to other topics and policy areas in the plan will affect quantity and vice versa. I didn't see anything in the actions that addressed some of those linkages	One area that we identified as core linkage is in storm water where there is a quality and quantity problem. It's a decision of where in the plan you tackle it. We are going to recognize that it is a quantity issue but some of the policies may be very similar so in terms of storm water because there is that linkage and overlap we will deal with storm water as a whole in water quality and human pressures and linking it back to quantity.
Overtop of aquifers there shouldn't be a lot of permeable surfaces but I am not sure if that appears here. In an aquifer recharge area. I would like some assurance that that is being included in the planning? Who has the authority that that doesn't happen?	That is being acknowledged as one of those areas. There are certain recharge areas so fundamentally in some other plans and regulations protections for those areas. We have identified it in our natural heritage type of grouping area. May be that is one of our criteria in terms of a natural heritage feature. A recharge area that you protect.
Regulate the amount of water taken in an aquifer- everybody has to have a well – one well per house – if we are looking at policies – we need to look at those artesian well policies	The Plan includes water conservation policies for municipalities, agriculture and other sectors (e.g., recreation).
We need a water budget, some sense of fundamentals and magnitude, the human influence element, well records – areas of wet basements may indicate there is not a lack of base flow	Plan proposes completion of Tier 2 water budgets in stressed subwatersheds. This option as recommended furthers the protection of water quantity in the Simcoe watershed beyond that provided by the *Clean Water Act* and specific to municipal drinking water systems, and is supportive of climate change adaptation strategies, municipal water conservation and a host of other initiatives through the better understanding of the flows and volumes of water contributing to the Lake.
More data on PTTW and base flows	Plan proposes completion of Tier 2 water budgets in stressed subwatersheds. This option as recommended furthers the protection of water quantity in the Simcoe watershed beyond that provided by the *Clean Water Act* and specific to municipal drinking water systems, and is supportive of climate change adaptation strategies, municipal water conservation and a host of other initiatives through the better understanding of the flows and volumes of water contributing to the Lake.
There is a real lack of stream flow data (the clean water act is finding this as well) There needs to be funding for stream flow gauges and better well data	The plan proposes development of an integrated climate change monitoring program, to better inform decision making. Stream flow gauges and groundwater monitoring would form part of that program.
There should be more public awareness and more respect for water	The Plan includes water conservation policies for municipalities, agriculture and other sectors (e.g., recreation).

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Concentrate on what we can do – proactive, focus on decreasing water taking ideas like mandatory metering in the watershed	The Plan includes water conservation policies for municipalities, agriculture and other sectors (e.g., recreation).
Prioritizing actions – don't wait for all the research to come in before action is taken	The plan contains actions that will take place immediately (e.g., water conservation plans).
The Source Protection Planning process includes rigorous, scientific data collection and analysis. The water budget for the Lake Simcoe watershed, undertaken as a component of the Source Protection Planning exercise, should not be expedited, (and potentially undermined) to meet the artificial deadline that has been imposed for the development of this Plan.	It is not MOE's intent to duplicate or fast-track the work being undertaken through the source protection planning process. It is important that we consider this work in the context of assessing our current information gaps and identifying appropriate policies in light of this ongoing effort.

Implementation

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
The Province has always had a leadership role through their ministries, legislation and relationship with the Conservation Authority. In the mid -90s the province backed away from this role by reducing funding to Conservation Authorities and cutting the budgets of Ministries engaged in the kind of research and enforcement that protected the watershed. It's nice that they have decided to get back in the business - very noble - but I suspect $20 million over 5 years will not be enough to make a dent in "saving the lake". The list of things the Province plans to do is big on front end planning and monitoring, very little emphasis or investment on the actions needed to make change happen. Passing legislation and approving a plan won't help unless substantive resources are identified and allocated for implementation. Maybe they will have to start a lottery to support restoration of Lake Simcoe. I guess if it's a good enough approach to support our hospitals, maybe it's good enough for a unhealthy lake.	The costs of implementing the Plan are significant, this is recognized. No one organization should have to bear the burden of all costs. The Plan will include a financing strategy.
Municipalities and the Conservation Authority are more than just stakeholders in this process. They have mandated and regulatory responsibilities to do a variety of things in the watershed under many different Acts. They will have to comply with the various policies. create bylaws of their own and deliver programs and find the resources to do so. Other "stakeholder" groups are affected but not to the same degree. They do not have regulatory or taxing responsibilities. So while the inclusion of the CA and municipal representatives on the coordinating committee is essential, they really are more of a partner with the Province, than simply a stakeholder. Somehow this need to be reflected.	Agreed we are all partners.
The LSRCA is concerned that SAC members may not understand the rationale for the selection of targets by the SciAc, such as the Dissolved Oxygen target which leads to the establishment of the phosphorus target. This, in turn, will provide some challenges when designing an implementation plan when there may not be a clear understanding and consensus on the targets. The LSRCA is further concerned that the SciAC and SAC has not had time to liaise and compare objectives and work targets. We are also concerned that SciAC may not be aware of the work completed by the LSRCA. For example, at one SAC meeting, a SciAC member advised that they were not made aware of the Authority's Ecological Land Classification Mapping and Strategy. This type of comment could lead to a lack of confidence in the advice being provided.	Noted. The Province intends to provide 2 more joint meeting dates for SAC and SciAC – September 8 and September 15. These should help facilitate further dialogue. In terms of phosphorus reduction, the Ministry provided another presentation on phosphorus reduction at the August 29th meeting.
The LSRCA is not aware of the role of the SciAC once the proposed Plan has been forwarded for consultation. The SciAC could provide a basis for the future committee, however, all spheres - government,	SciAc may be asked to provide further advice as the Plan moves through approvals and is finalized.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
business and community should be represented on this committee. They must have scientific creditials to be on the committee. Practitioners in the field have an important role to play in the future committee.	
The SAC is an important group who has been challenged with providing advice to the province primarily on the development of a draft Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. Further opportunity to interact with the SciAC would have been beneficial. Significant topics pertinent to the Act and Plan have been reviewed quickly. It is unclear at this time regarding how individual SAC comments are being weighed in the drafting of the Plan.	Noted. The Province intends to provide 2 more joint meeting dates for SAC and SciAC – September 8 and September 15. These should help facilitate further dialogue. SAC may be asked to provide further advice as the Plan moves through approvals and is finalized.
The Working Group spent considerable time in reviewing differing governance models and providing recommendations for consideration by the LSEMS Steering Committee.	SciAc may asked to provide further advice as the Plan moves through approvals and is finalized.
The LSRCA continues to observe that the mandate of the CA under The Conservation Authorities Act and the objectives of the proposed Lake Simcoe Protection Act are similar. This was addressed in the LSRCA comments on the recent EBR posting. Duplication must be avoided. The LSRCA is anticipating that its traditional roles and responsibilities of sub watershed planning, watershed research, monitoring, environmental planning, regulations stewardship, land securement and environmental education will continue.	The intention is for the LSRCA to play a strong role in implementation, similar to the role it has played to date. The only difference here is that the Province is taking a stronger leadership role, with respect to both the development of the Protection Plan and coordination of implementation of the policies within it.
The LSRCA supports Cabinet approval of a Protection Plan and its amendments. Traditionally, the LSRCA has been responsible for annual reporting and monitoring. Under The Conservation Authorities Act, the Authority will need to continue with its own annual reporting and monitoring. Concern is expressed regarding duplication and misunderstanding of roles and responsibilities. Further details are required regarding the temporary Project Team and the province's recommendation for a joint provincial/LSRCA partnership in the future. Preliminary estimates from the LSRCA indicate that substantial financial resources will be required to meet the targets for Lake Simcoe.	This is the intention. Noted. Duplication will be avoided wherever possible. Noted. More details will be provided as they become available.
As I was a member of LSEMS Working Group, I probably have more than the usual share of questions for the Policy Team. Generally I think their work re Implementation is solid but I	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
do see some modifications to the recommendations of the Working Group. Most recommendations seem reasonable but I think we need to ensure ourselves that none of the high level objectives is lost My questions follow. Would you please see that the appropriate people get them asap? Thanks, Annabel 1. The Working Group articulated a number of principles that guided its thinking about what the lake needs in terms of governance. I wonder if it might be a helpful for the Policy Group at the meeting on Friday to speak to how the proposed implementation model might address each of these principles? this might show up some gaps ...The list described in the report is as below: "Lake Champions A common vision shared by all Unity of purpose Strategic Leadership One Centralized Point of Contact Sustainable Funding Efficient and Effective Resource Allocation Efficient and Effective Public-Private Partnerships Integrated and Coordinated Plans of Action A Meaningfully Engaged Public Who Feel a Sense of Ownership and Pride In the Lake An Ecosystem-Based Management Approach A Collaborative Web of Constituents and Stakeholders An Enhanced Monitoring and Analysis System That Is Connected To Indicators of Watershed Health Continued Emphasis on Science, Data Collection and Information Sharing" 2. A most positive step is that the Province is taking the leadership role. This is key as it is the Province that holds the ultimate responsibility for the well being of Lake Simcoe and the people who live and work in the watershed. However, there seems to be envisioned a transition to download leadership to the Conservation Authority. Under what circumstances would this download occur? What are the risks, benefits? And how would this decision is made?	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
3. Both the LSEMS Working Group and the LSEMS Steering Committee envisioned a high level council of ambassadors for the lake" who could set priorities and be on-the-ground catalysts for change. This group was to be equally comprised of well- connected people from 3 spheres: government, business and civil society (the public). It would appear that this idea has been replaced with a committee of highly regarded scientists to ensure the best steps towards the well being of the Lake. Was it the intention simply to replace the "ambassadors" with the scientists? Might there still be any role for such ambassadors—trusted members of the communities who would not represent interests but rather be there to champion the best for the Lake? Or are these *connectors* to be the SAC Committee? 4. Is it still the intention, as recommended by the W/ G, to keep the 1/3 1/3 1/3 composition for the Stakeholders Advisory Committee? How should the this composition be detailed; so as to avoid people being there simply to represent their interests rather than to contribute to the whole; to avoid too heavy loading from one sector or another. For example, no major business is on the temporary SAC other than for members of the housing/development industry Should the size of this committee be limited to improve efficiency? 5. Promoting recreational opportunities while protecting the health of the Lake was a vital piece of the WG's governance discussion as this was the quid pro quo for engaging the public—if not their Lake, it is difficult to get them to care and act accordingly. Is a strategy for this still on the table? 6. Lake Simcoe has a communications obstacle to overcome… the various areas in the watershed have little to do with each other and do not have much in common. The Policy Team's excellent proposal for a sub watershed approach (with different targets and outcomes for each) is one way to address this. Might the implementation plan embrace this subwatershed approach? Could subcommittees sub watershed by sub watershed help? What other ways could this challenge be addressed in the implementation strategy? 7. And what about fitting the federal government effectively into all this?	5. yes promoting sustainable recreational activities is still an important part of this plan and there is a policy in the plan that commits several ministries to do so.
Although the SAC consists of stakeholders with a "wide range of interest", SAC is also comprised of members with a wide range of expertise, specifically with respect to legislation and policy, and how it is interpreted and implemented on the ground. I recommend that this	Agreed

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
be reflected in this section.	
The LSRCA concurs that the province should take a leadership role in policy development. Implementation should be done at the local level. For 17 years the LSRCA lead the Lake Simcoe partnership. This implementation co-ordination role should be continued and this was embrached by many agencies throughout the consultation process.	
We are going to a have Plan. What exactly is this Committee going to be doing?	In terms of the 3rd bullet, *Providing advice to the Minister on the types of measures that could be taken to deal with the threats, including: policies that could be included in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan; or regulations that could be made under the Act,* the Plan will have some planned actions to take. Some of it could be develop policies. Water quality trading is an example where we are going to be doing a feasibility study and then we need to take that feasibility study and make a decision on whether we are going to implement water quality trading. This will be a role of the committee is to provide advice as we go forward on some of those planned actions. This bullet, in its expanded form, from what the LSEMS partnership is, which was government/agency representation. Now it will have more transparency because it will have the stakeholders in the watershed that are also interested in the health of Lake Simcoe, they will be sitting at the table. They will be the forum for a more broad discussion on how we move forward. It is like the role that the SAC has been providing for us to-date, and it continues on through the Plan implementation.
My question relates to the authority or power that the Coordinating Committee has and the accountability. If you want to get something done, it has to be very clear what kind of authority do they have and how much power they have to be directive. Or do they operate by persuasion or do they have some authority to direct. The Coordinating Committee is not going to be implementing, they have to rely on other organizations to do that. That is where I see the potential for things to break down. Who has ultimate accountability?	Ultimate accountability for the Plan is the province. The role of the Coordinating Committee is a collaborative model; it is not an authority-based model that is being proposed here. Accountability, as far as members showing up to meeting and having a Terms of Reference that says how we will conduct our business, that sort of thing; that is the accountability that I would see built into the process. It is not a decision making body.
That worries me. Ultimately I would like to be able to pinpoint who is losing sleep over this.	For the implementation of the Plan, it will be the province, for any actions identified in the Plan as provincial actions.
The Coordinating Committee will be operating from a persuasion standpoint?	Yes. Influence. And mobilization. The Coordinating Committee is an ability for us to mobilize action out on the watershed. By working together, we make further progress. It is a really important component of our going forward position.
It is not clear what the value-add is of the Coordinating Committee. When we talking about consultation and when we look at proposed membership of it, how does that differ from what	The LSEMS partnership was not just the Conservation Authority; it was the provincial government, as well as the Conservation Authority. It was identified by the stakeholders in

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
the Conservation Authorities do today, other than the Conservation Authorities are also an authority and the implementers. It seems like this is another layer to provide Conservation Authorities with help, which I would suggest, they probably do not need, on the premise that committees tend to be places where minutes are kept and hours are lost.	the community that it should be more inclusive and it should be involving the business community, as well as the not for profit public interest side of things. This model really tries to move towards that more inclusive model.
When I look at the board of the Conservation Authority, for example, they are there, the business community is there, the municipalities are there. I am just not seeing what the role of this is, other than it is another committee. In this case, less is more. I just do not see that we are going to get more inclusion through this.	The Conservation Authority board cannot give advice to the minister on the implementation of the Plan. The Coordinating Committee has very specific roles and responsibilities that have been identified; that is a little unique. I hear your comments.
If advising the minister is one of the roles, are you suggesting that he does not listen to the Conservation Authority?	No. But there is no forum to provide advice directly to the minister.
If we really want to work towards the health of the lake, it is nice to see the province back in with an interest and back in with some money and hopefully the federal government with some money and interest. The municipalities and the Conservation Authorities were carrying the ball through some pretty lonely times with respect to trying to do what was right here. I think it is great that everyone comes to the table and everyone has their say, but I think if we really want to do what is right for the lake, we have to make it easier, we have to make it cleaner, we have to make it more accountable. I do not think creating new secretariats and committees and everything else is necessary the right thing. I think we need that very strong provincial back-up, very strong direction, but it is and should be locally implemented. The directions to those that implement should be clear. I do not mind taking criticism as a municipality, because we get criticism because we are accountable and we are responsible. It is easy to throw tomatoes when you have no accountability or responsibility. That said, I think there has been a shift in municipal government and the province and the government in general. The importance of listening to the stakeholders when we make decisions is good because you need to make decisions from all perspectives. I am glad the way society has changed, I am glad we have all the wonderful things that we have in Canada in terms of free speech and everyone's opinion matters. But at some point, someone is accountable and the province has always been accountable and through no fault of the province, through various changes, they have been in and out with respect to some interests, but I think what we need to do is really make it strong. I think of creating more agencies and more layers, we change and strengthen the ones that exist. All I think about when I go to through theses processes is how is it going to affect people. Obviously, we want to make the lake better, but what if someone who lives in the watershed wants to be build a deck on the back of his house. Does he have to go to the local township, to the County or Region, to the Conservation Authority, to the new stakeholder committee? Are they going to spend $9,000 in permits to build a $2,000 deck? We cannot lose sight of that. As we move forward, if the province really wants to work on	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
committees and coordination, it has to be clear for the people that are out there, for all groups and even the industry and development group. If we work together we are going to make changes. The developers in the industry will make changes that will improve the lake through drainage, through better point source solutions and that is where the money is going to come from, and then the changes are going to come from. We all have to work together and we have to make it easier, not harder. I hopeful that rather than creating new layers and new groups, we modify what exists. Some of the comments that I have heard about accountability and transparency, I think those things exist, but if there are concerns about who makes up these boards and who makes up municipalities, let us make some changes there, let us not recreate.	
Form follows function; function follows form, substance, these things are really important to be well integrated. If you want to encourage collaboration, if you want to encourage participation from other stakeholder groups, the governance structure should reflect that. People should felt that they are not merely giving advice and merely giving advice is a lot to do, especially if you have the ear of the minister. But over time, people tire of that and some may get frustrated. There are other things than providing advice that this Coordinating Committee could do, which would then again, reflect and reinforce the need to work amongst different sectors. One of the things was what I had suggested last week, when we were looking at the comments on the legislation. My recommendation was 2 parts: not only do you specify that there is a specific time period after which you report on whether the objectives of the Plan have been met, as opposed to from time to time. And that the Coordinating Committee is the committee responsible for coordinating that evaluation, that review of whether those objectives have been met. They are the ones that could establish the Terms of Reference; it is not that they would actually do it because these are extremely busy people, but they are the body that whoever does this evaluation would report to. Ad then they would table the evaluation with the minister or in the legislature or to a parliamentary committee that would have an opportunity to examine it. You are providing an objective evaluation, separate from the minister, you are opening up accountability because the very people who are on this Coordinating Committee themselves, in some respects, will have some level of evaluation, even though it is directed to the government. They have to really participate and understand what their role is. There is transparency in that it is very public. And it is democratic because you have the people of Ontario that are participating in this and it goes back into an open legislative process, which represents the people of Ontario as well. There is a very strong role and it gives purpose. If you take a look at some of the other successful roundtables that have been established across this country, you have to find a way to give purpose. Fraser River Basin has given purpose to their activities. There are lots of examples across the country and elsewhere.	One of the questions under *Accountability and Transparency* was the suggestion that you had raised last week. We talked about for example, the annual report of each of the committees. You have gone into more detail about how that would be accomplished. We took your point and tabled it here.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
If the precautionary principle is going to be the foundation or the test to which amendments will be measured, it needs to be reflected in the Plan principles and it is not.	The Plan principles have been updated.
If we go back 2 or 3 years, one of the reasons that people started to get very engaged in the health of the lake is that the structure that was in place, which was government only, LSEMS, led by the Conservation Authority, was not resonating at all with people. The list of the working groups, principles of good governance, inclusiveness, accountability, transparency, simplicity, easily understood, among others, were there because it was felt that the current model was not working. People around Lake Simcoe did not understand that anything was being done to fix the lake. They did not understand what LSEMS meant. They did not understand what the Conservation Authority did. People were suspicious of the Conservation Authority because in fact, its board was entirely municipalities. The reason that we are here in this room today is because it was not working. We need to have something that is very strong and seen to be very new. And very inclusive and very transparent. To have the province leading this, in other words, the highest authority on Lake Simcoe is the best thing that we could have. The problem before is that the buck never stopped anywhere. This lake is the province's responsibility and to have the buck stop there and the province take an interest in the leadership and be advised by a committee that embodies transparency and accountability and who can stimulate action and who have connections into various parts of the community to help things happen, is so far better than having the Conservation Authority controlled by the municipalities head it. One of the things that I was worried about is the fact that it was envisioned going back to the Conservation Authority. That would be going way back from something new and exciting that we could see for this lake. I appreciate that this is an act and it is a plan of the province. That the Coordinating Committee, which I like that name, is advising the province, has the province's ear, is working closely with the team within the province to get this project on the go, I think is absolutely the right way to go. I congratulate all your thinking about that. It is very important that the composition on that Coordinating Committee does reflect across the sectors. For example, on this committee, I do not see any business, other than the tourism business, yet there is a lot of representation from the housing industry. There are other industries in the watershed and if we are going make the Lake Simcoe watershed a kind of poster girl for a way that a community of communities have come together to help a lake and also help the people who live there have some high quality of life, it is not just a committee that is going to meet and take minutes. Action should be its middle word.	
Lake Simcoe is like a little, but still very big, Lake Ontario. This watershed is not like some of the other Conservation Authority's jurisdictions in the rest of the province. It takes in an entire watershed and a big lake, a really big lake, a 6th Great Lake. That involves all of the	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
important and really great work that the Conservation Authority is responsible for and has done. A number of years ago I was on the board of the Authority, as the provincial representative, I remember thinking this is a much bigger thing than some of the other authorities. It is much bigger. The province is really important in getting this thing going. We have been waiting since the 1970s to really start to move where we want to go with the cold-water fishery and everything else. We have to really step it up.	
I like the idea of the secretariat being slightly off to the side in a supporting role of these two committees. Having a staff and a secretariat to really make things happen, to be able to get agendas ready is really important and that is how you get more than just a committee, some people talking about things, you need that secretariat, so I think that is really important that this process has come to that.	
I agree that it is very important that it is a distinct organization. In the public eye's it was very difficult to distinguish LSEMS from the Conservation Authority. The Conservation Authority does a great job of what they do, but they are not LSEMS. It would be difficult to separate the two if the secretariat was completely run by the Conservation Authority. I do not see why a structure with a secretariat, being separate, would not work. I do not see why it has to be, in the long run, under the Conservation Authority, although of course they are going to have a very large role to play.	
Where would the secretariat be?	Currently it is going to be located at 135 St. Clair in Toronto. We have heard your comments with regard to location in the watershed.
I would certainly echo those comments. I do not think you can have a Lake Simcoe secretariat that is located in Toronto. No one in the watershed is going to accept that.	
It needs to still reflect, other than the different kinds of people, because we are always human focused on what we are doing, it has to reflect the uniqueness of the watershed. We need to consider the geographical representation of the watershed. We really have heard about how important that is to people's commitment to the lake and eventually to this kind of plan and process. We need to give that inclusiveness spatially to people on the lake. That relates to these different partners because that is why I think as well, the provincial level of this body is very important because it can then inform and hopefully bring on to stream some of these other people that have wanted to be involved in the lake. For example, private business and not just the development business, but development business is really important in this future puzzle, but other kinds of private businesses. Certainly NGOs, but also the federal government, for example, the Trent Severn waterway, this is all part of a big system. The province can do that and should be able to do that really well. I am thinking university and academic institutions as well, engagement into this. There has been no greater opportunity for the lake in the long term, than that kind of an engagement. There has always been a lack of	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
where do I really go. This, and the secretariat, I see it as a tremendous advantage and much more than we have now.	
I am also very happy that the MOE is going to be taking a lead on this. That is a good move. Of course, as the Plan develops, I would hope that we would get better clarification about how that policy team, how the Lake Simcoe provincial team would work with the Coordinating Committee. That speaks to the roles and responsibilities, and what the Coordinating Committee can do. In the simplest of terms, the way I see it, the Coordinating Committee has a plan, they are not debating the Plan initially and then they recommend how the Plan could be carried out. This group could do that, farmers can do this. It seems there may be some decision-making opportunity that is not going to change the Plan or the Act, but that that committee will in fact will have not just influence, but actually make decisions that are going to be making projects happen on the ground. Is that fair to say?	Because of the representation that is currently proposed, it has the Conservation Authority and the province, the key delivery and also the NGOs that are part of the delivery, they could make decisions on how their programs get directed. From a program direction perspective, for sure.
That is an important thing to point out in terms of understanding what the role of that committee is. That is pretty big, it is how we are actually going to do this.	The stewardship alliance that was identified, some of that could also be in that kind of roles and responsibilities as well, or the actions on the ground.
There is a list in the chapter about implementation/governance, I am not sure if there is a plan for how that committee is going to be constituted in terms of numbers. Environmental and other interests of the general public are 1 of 6 bullets and I think there needs to be better representation.	Actually, that should be its own bullet. It should say, and other interests of the general public.
It is better. The recommendation that I would support, and that we have been supporting for quite a long time is 1/3 industry, 1/3 public and 1/3 government. There are lots of great examples of industry stepping up, providing excellent solutions and becoming part of the solution when they are at the table, when they are able to see the need and see what the challenges of the municipalities are. I think we are clearly going to need that synergy and the money to implement this Plan. We really need to get industry, more broadly than the residential development industry, involved. On the list of the members of the committee, LSRCA, that is fine, I want to ask the question if it is staff or political representation. I think that is important. I would support having staff as part of that committee, but not a political representative or board member.	
I agree with the timing of the review of the plan, every 3 years after the first 5 years would be appropriate.	
I would like to clarify some things that have been said. The LSEMS program was originally a technical committee, it was never meant to be a consultation model. Although they went out and consulted frequently when they heard those concerns. When they heard that stakeholders wanted to participate, they opened up that process. They have had incredible success over 16 years. In terms of the model that is being proposed, the working group spent 18 months thrashing out these issues. Some of the things that we discussed, that we all agreed on was	With this model, with your point about access for the public to the Coordinating Committee or the minister, as the Plan gets implemented, there may be regulations, there may be further amendments and there will be a public process associated with that. How do you see creating access to the Coordinating Committee from that perspective?

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
that this group should be enabled by memorandum of understanding, the members should be self-selected, who wanted to participate and there was a lot of discussion about the corporate memory not being lost. There was definitely a lot of discussion about this not being over designed. The two key issues that were identified were more opportunities for stakeholders to participate and money. This, to me, does not speak to those two key issues. Because if you have a committee that people cannot join, they have to apply and go through a very rigorous process and they do not get on that committee, how do they interact with that committee? Are the meetings open? Can you make deputations to those committees? Can you appeal to the minister? Certainly there is a forum for the Conservation Authority to speak to the minister. They write him letters all the time. It is vetted by their board of directors, which is elected by the people in that watershed. I do not see accountability to elected officials beyond the ministry or cabinet, which is very difficult for people to get access to those people. They can, any group, any citizen of the watershed can go to the board of directors' meetings, can go to council meetings and committee meetings, unless it is a legal issue or if there are rules around that. Let us be clear: the LSEMS program was successful. The LSEMS group and its partners did respond to stakeholder concerns very quickly. As soon as we phoned and said we would like to be a part of it, they said sure, come to the meeting.	
I do not see how this can work in a reasonable. It does not speak to the 2 issues. The reasons that the working wanted it make into a MOU is because the LSEMS program, which was not able to have a MOU, they did not have to run around complying with all these different regulations, they could be more strategic and could more quite quickly. This just slows everything down. Just the fact that getting this committee appointed got delayed and delayed because of procedural issues that is the best evidence I can tell you. I want it on the record that the LSEMS partners were transparent, accountable, accommodating to all stakeholders. That was clearly in the report that Ladies of the Lake and Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition signed off on.	Hopefully the comments that you have raised about changing what is actually in Bill 99 have been raised in that forum and that as we get second reading and finalization that if there are any changes to the Act that impact what we have put in the Plan, we cannot finalize the Plan until we finalize the legislation.
I appreciate. But being on this committee, I did not feel I would be the person to respond to the Act, I did not feel that I could respond to the EBR postings because I thought it was a conflict. I thought once this process was done, assuming the Act will go to Standing Committee, we will be responding at that time.	
Clearly I anticipated that the Conservation Authority and our role in the past and viewpoint would be a point of discussion and indeed it has been. The Conservation Authority wholeheartedly endorses the province's leadership in the legislation and in the Plan. The Conservation Authority has long called for provincial policy because it is very hard to defend a position in front of the OMB, based on no solid provincial policy when it comes to the environment. We are very pleased about this. I have made no hidden agenda in terms of	I hope I did not give any impression that we are negating your role here. We recognize that the Conservation Authority will be a strong partner in the implementation model. You sitting at the Coordinating Committee table, it is the growth of LSEMS. The Coordinating Committee was supposed to be the LSEMS partnership plus more. We are hoping it is plus more. I hope I did not give that impression at all because we certainly are looking forward to an ongoing partnership.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
believing that implementation is best done at the local level. It is a model we have followed at the Conservation Authority for years, strong provincial policy, strong local implementation. It is difficult to comment on the legislation and the Plan because it is very different than the recommendations of the working group, the recommendations of the steering committee, and those were endorsed by the board of directors at the Conservation Authority. We are now dealing with something very different than the position that the Conservation Authority has taken. While I say that, I do want to reiterate our support for the province. What I do want to focus on is a couple of comments. I have been concerned for many years with regard to the continued comments about the Conservation Authority. The comments about lack of transparency and accountability, to me are unacceptable. I have been in this business for 25 years and the fact that I have been suggested to be not transparent throughout this process and my board has not been accountable to me is distasteful. I can tell you that we can sit around this boardroom table for the next 5 years and unless we start working in partnership together and get rid of these attitudes, no plan will succeed. I feel very strongly about this. The Conservation Authority, just for everyone's opinion, was there when there was no money for LSEMS. The province backed out of LSEMS during 1995 and the municipalities stepped forward and provided a little bit of funding to go forward. We were there to write the plan and the progress report with 1 person on staff, not 100. I do not want to hear any more bashing about the Conservation Authority; it is unacceptable to me. If the province chooses to negate the work of the Conservation Authority for the past 55 years, and the work that we have done in the watershed, so be it, you are the province, we take your lead. If the province does not want the Conservation Authority to be the secretariat or play a solid role in this organization to be, so be it. But I ask all of you to stop bashing the Conservation Authority. We have been a solid partner, we have been transparent, we have been accountable and we are prepared to be a part of this process. But I do not want to hear anything more about the Conservation Authority's lack of accountability and transparency through this process.	
I too am a little disappointed to hear some of the strong opinions and accusations flying around the table relative to the Conservation Authority's activities. I found in my experience, at least, particularly, in the period reference by my colleagues, in the early 1990s when everyone else was bailing from responsibility around Lake Simcoe that the Conservation Authority was the only constant. I know that at the time, despite the difficulties and challenges we faced with also picking up social housing, social programs and some of the public health responsibilities that we did not have previously, we came to the table for the Conservation Authorities and crafted a deal to keep things going. I applaud their efforts to date. I applaud everyone's efforts to date, Ladies of the Lake, others have all had an impact on raising the profile and probably are largely responsible for why we are here. The work that the	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
LSEMS working group, the LSEMS steering committee did, really has figured prominently in getting us to this stage where we are now on the list with a number of other good provincial initiatives in the form of legislation and plans. Having, said that, want to make sure that we achieve that coordination, do not throw the baby out with the bath water. The Conservation Authorities have not only a legacy here, but a wealth of experience and in particular LSRCA. I also have 2 Conservation Authorities. We certainly appreciate having the two of them because we do benefit from the experiences in both basins. I do not want to discount the fact that the Conservation Authorities are playing a formative role already with source protection committees under another act and keep that in close perspective here as well because there is value, there is coordination and necessary collaboration between those two activities. That is under the Clean Water Act or Safe Drinking Water Act as well, which affects the health of the lake.	
I just wanted to clarify when I drew some of the concerns that the public had about accountability, transparency, simplicity, easily understood, all of those sorts of things, I was not actually criticizing the Conservation Authority or LSEMS. What I was saying is there is a tremendous amount of confusion about it. People do not understand it, it is not simple, and people do not know where the Conservation Authority starts and LSEMS stops. The opportunity to take something fresh and new and to put together a group of connectors that have a pipeline right to the top guy is going to help the Conservation Authority, is going to help the citizens, it is going to help the businesses, while they all help the idea of saving the lake.	
I think when it comes to the broader principles and objectives I think a lot of us are really saying the same thing. Yes, of course, it is the elected officials who must be held accountable for the implementation of the Plan. If cabinet signs off on it, they are responsible for the implementation of the Plan. They have to work through others. They have municipal partners, the have the Conservation Authority; they have other kinds of partners, people from the private sector, from various other environmental/conservation groups, from the average public. They have to work through others, but ultimately they are accountable. I do not think anyone is disagreeing with that. I think we all agree that we want a process that is open and transparent, relatively simple. There may be, as I am listening to this, in terms of how you move forward in ensuring that it is accountable, that it is open, that it is transparent, that there is public engagement, etc., that there are differences about how you move forward on that and different perspectives on what people feel might be the most appropriate way to have people become members of this Coordinating Committee. On one hand, it has been put forward that people are self-selected. On another hand, the legislation tells us, and others have support the fact that people are appointed through a formal process, which the province has established. One of the reasons why it took a long time to establish our committee because there was this	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
public appointments process. People's resumes are vetted; it is an open and transparent process in and of itself. It takes a long time sometimes to do that. On the other hand, and I do not know if there is a different way of looking at, you have self-appointed, you have appointment by the province through a formal process and I do not know if there is another method that people get appointed that does not have the same sort of formal process. This speaks to a broader issue about building in the notion of actually serving your community. Some people think being an elected official has all kinds of perks, and is full of patronage. It is hard work. I do not think we are disagreeing on the fact that there needs to be accountability, transparency, etc., in the process. I do not think we disagree on the fact that because the Coordinating Committee provides advice to the minister as one of its functions, and therefore needs to have a broad base. There may be, as I have suggested, other roles for the Coordinating Committee that it actually has some specific roles in undertaking an evaluation of the achievement of the Plan objectives, which is different than a review of the Plan itself. There are different kinds of roles that the Coordinating Committee can undertake. How that is best served in terms of how people become members of this, I do not know. I think some important points have been made, we do not have members of the public here because we are working on confidential material, but that process should be open to anyone who wants to be involved, whether they have the time or the ability to participate on the committee, even if it is self-selected. There are points that are open for debate. By talking about openness and transparency and accountability, I hope that anyone around the table does not feel that we are not saying that it has not already existed in the system. Because we are building on what has already existed in the system. When I look at what is suggested by the Plan document, by the legislation, my concern from what I see in this is there are some issues around accountability and transparency and openness. I think if we are going to have success around the lake, those things have to be reinforced. We have to learn from what has worked in the past and we have to go forward from that.	
The business about the provincial role, as municipalities we are fairly happy to see the province come back, and hopefully with their wallet. It is a double-edged sword, the province can make a strong policy and it cuts into municipal authority, and we are not always happy about that. If they come along with strong policy and also bring the resources to help us implement, because we will be helping implement. The municipalities and the Conservation Authority are more than just stakeholders in this process; we are part of the delivery mechanism. Other groups will be part of the delivery mechanism too, but we have to tax, we have report to taxpayers and be accountable to taxpayers for the way we spend their money. And we are spending a significant amount of money supporting Conservation Authorities, not just Lake Simcoe, in Durham, we support 5 Conservation Authorities. We are more than just a	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
stakeholder. I know that committees can get very large and unwieldy and that is to be avoided, but I think that the role that the Conservation Authority and municipalities will play need to be reflected in their representation on the committee.	
When you look at these models, and certainly we all came to this table with the same goal and that is obviously protection of Lake Simcoe. I was hoping for a little bit more balance somewhere through the process. Because obviously when we make decisions from one perspective, regardless of how noble and important that perspective might be, we make wrong decisions. We certainly have to be balanced.	What would require it to be more balanced? What are some suggestions?
Everyone talks about sustainability in our communities now. To be sustainable as municipalities and as an upper tier municipality, we are responsible for social infrastructure, economic development, environment; there are all these pillars to what makes a reasonable society. Any time one of those pillars is considered above other pillars, you have a decision or an influence that is tainting an overall decision. I do not think that is necessarily a good thing. And that goes for all pillars. I am not saying make economic and development decisions that are going to impact the lake, because you do not do that. What I am saying is, you can make economic and development and social decisions. One thing that always gets missed is the social infrastructure. We are not a huge upper tier government, we are a large county, we spend over $200 million in social infrastructure and it is not enough. Every year. We have to start thinking about these things and balancing these things.	
My major comment is just to acknowledge that everyone representing a particular industry or government position has something at stake. They have a position that they are trying to maintain and represent. At the core of this accountability, who is on the committee question, is a lack of public trust, which is just a reflection of what are the interests that the members of any particular committee trying to protect. No offence to the municipal councillors, I know you do a lot of fantastic work and you have a lot of competing interests, but this committee that is trying to help implement the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, has to have that objective as its number one goal. The reason that people are cautious about peopling such a committee with municipal councilors or mayors, exclusively, or just with government people, is that they recognize that all those people have a number of different interests to hold in the balance. There is a perceived conflict of interest in some of the decisions that have to be made. I am not saying that is always how it has happens, but I think that is at the core of why people want to see more balance in this sort of committee. That is reflected in public opinion polls, saying that people trust information coming from non-profit organizations in a lot of cases more than they do coming from industry or coming from government. If we are going to be honest about what the public believes and what sources of information they are going to trust and who they are going to go to, we do need to have a good balance. Some people will be comfortable going	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
to NGOs and being on their public communications list and being involved in their meetings as their way to connect. Other people are going to trust government; other people are going to trust industry. We really do need to see that balance. No one segment is going to do a good job.	
We are at meeting 7 and I am still trying to wrap myself around this, and trying to still put myself into where I belong. September 1 will be our families' 46th anniversary of owning the resort in Pefferlaw. I grew up with the lake in mind. I have been on Conservation Authority chairs roundtable years ago, been involved on and on with fisheries, MNR, etc. I am still trying to come to grips with everything. I think the biggest thing, listening to the different comments from around the table, being from the business industry but also protecting the lake. The key is to try to find a balance. Without the lake and the preservation of it, we do not have the beauty and the flora and fauna to enjoy, but without the development we do not have the money to pay for the beauty and the flora and the fauna for everyone to come and enjoy. We are at a catch 22 and I think we need to try and keep that balance and perspective.	
I believe that funding should play a significant role in terms of determining participation here. Nothing has ever been resolved by committees, big or small, it is the amount of resources and funding that hits the ground and accomplishes the work that needs to happen. As well intended as we are, we will not as a committee remove any phosphorous from the lake. That requires a commitment in terms of effort and process and planning approvals, agricultural inputs, recreational inputs, it requires a coordinated effort. And yes, some social marketing and conditioning needs to be not only improved upon, but sustained as well.	
It comes down to the well-exercised term, think globally and act locally. Thinking globally is what in fact the plan does, it provides that broader outreach to policies and perspectives that are in place and have succeeded elsewhere in the world, as well as what we have witnessed here in the Lake Simcoe basin. That global thinking it encompassed in the Plan. But acting locally is still going to be the only means to achieve it. As the interest of the legislature wanes, as it can from time to time, remember we are bound by elections from time to time, and governments change, similarly, from the federal perspective. The only constant that we have is those people who not only live in the basin, but are elected in the basin to take action and to advocate for action, where otherwise it is not getting attention. I am encouraged by the models that are proposed. I think we have to do a little bit of tinkering, rather than reinvent everything. I see the potential advantage in appointments, restoring provincial appointments to the Conservation Authorities that were wiped out in the early 1990s at the same time as some of the funding changes were made. Small changes are what are required here because there certainly seems to be a consensus of will.	
I have listened to the comments about the Coordinating Committee and from agriculture's	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
standpoint I think the committee is very necessary. The Act has designated that it will be an ongoing part. I would have suggested that instead of calling it a Coordinating Committee, maybe the term monitoring or oversight committee would probably be a bit more appropriate. Looking at it, I would see it as a bit of its role. It is an opportunity for the broad stakeholder community that is here now and have been involved in this process for quite some time, to stay involved in the process and make sure that the Act itself goes in the right direction. By the fact that government has designated the Coordinating Committee to be part of the Act shows that they want to have the public input and they recognize that they do not have all the answers. It will be a chance for the public, from all sectors, to keep having the input and keep directing how this thing goes. We are doing this so quickly, just the physical Plan itself, there is a lot of science that has to catch up and there is going to be a lot of learning along the way. One of the other things, bringing more of a provincial/agricultural perspective, I see that a lot of the land use activities that this Plan will designate for generations to come are going to have a lot of impact outside the watershed. There are going to be other areas that will take this as an example of how to clean up a lake or a body of water, how to make changes in stormwater management, in general, both development and municipal. Certainly the farming practices here, the good things that have been done here, the use of Phoslock possibly in the bodies of water; that is a new practice. If it proves really successful in the long run that could be used elsewhere. The things that are going to go on here have implications outside the watershed as well, so I think it is in everyone's interest to make sure that it works. It is in government's interest to make sure that it works. There are lots of competing interests that is why the stakeholder committee is fairly broad. I like the structure of the Coordinating Committee. There can be some tweaks about the appointment process, that can be a bit ponderous, we get started months later than we should of at this process because of that. Those are details that can be worked out. I like what I see, the agricultural community can support it and we would hope to continue to be part of it in some manner.	
Is wasn't clear to me how the integrated monitoring will be coordinated. I didn't see a particular reference to a monitoring coordination group and we talked about this need for integrated monitoring and multiple agencies	If you look at your policies there is a section on monitoring on page 31.
Just curious on how that would be coordinated? Whether there would be a body to coordinate that.	We haven't addressed that but we could address it under appointing working groups. That is a great suggestion.
With regards to the coordinating groups and the working groups who is going to be your support staff, who is going to do the background work and their has got to be some financial costs in it too because one of the biggest things we found from the LSEMS working group and what we tried to achieve was to get the general public involved in this whole issue that was one of the main reasons this thing started years ago. I will just give you an example at the meeting	The support to the coordinating committees how is going to do the behind the scenes work. It is proposed that in the first two years that the new team that is being created in the MOE to implement the protection plan provide that support. Then it will be reviewed after two years. It will be reassessed after that.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
in Newmarket there was a pamphlet on our chair and if you turned that over and looked at all the private groups that supported that. Those are the people that you have to get coordinated into this program because there is a big amount of money, there is a big amount of knowledge and a big amount of help out there that can make this thing work but the other thing that you have to remember is the private person cannot afford to come here on his own ticket. So you have got to get some of this stuff figured out and there has got to be some funding to make this work.	We have asked the SciAC and SAC for feedback on the per diems and we haven't really heard much feedback to date so it is still under consideration. Except for the feedback you provided at the start of the process which is duly noted.
The subwatershed plans in the chart for 2009-2014 are they different in some way than the subwatershed plans that are being done or have already been done by the Conservation Authority for the ORM watersheds?	They could have additional requirements based on those guidelines that are going to be created in that first policy so it could require updating of those subwatershed plans that have been completed. For example the Tier 2 assessments will not have been done on the stressed watersheds that don't require municipal servicing so we are going to want to do that. But that is for the Water Quality topic.
My understanding is that municipalities are funding the cost of the subwatershed plans that have been done. I think you are going to find it a tough road to get them to fund another one.	It's not another one. I think we use the words build on very strategically. It is to get at the components that were not addressed.
Is there a separate section on financing?	There is a financing policy in the policies that you have. We can speak more to it next week.
The Build Canada fund. These things are very difficult from the municipal point of view because you spend a lot of time and money preparing an application and it is a competitive process and there is no guarantee that you will get anything. So when you start to look at how you are going to deploy your resources and whether or not that is the way you want to go. If you win you win big may be but it depends on the size of the project and how much you want to invest in to getting that done. Just a caveat about depending on that as a source. The other thing about those kinds of programs is you end up sometimes – you start of with a project that you have a particular reason for doing it. In this case it might be the Lake Simcoe plan is our reason for doing it and we are trying to meet some criteria, those criteria are not the same as those you have to met in order to get the funding from the other program so then you start to massage your project. You want to measure something one way to fit with the Lake Simcoe plan but they are saying no you have to measure it this way. Those are just some of the kinds of things that you run into in terms of trying to massage one thing to fit into someone else's criteria and you don't end up getting what you need.	We are hoping to have some kind of influence in the creation of those criteria's so that it is clear what is eligible from a competitive perspective so that you know that it would be eligible.
There are the three columns on all your charts and what I would have wished to have seen is a fourth column with the where its known what the funding commitment to these things are and I realize that perhaps you don't have that level of detail but my concern is that I would like to know what the province is committed to doing. What they are committed to putting money at and how much and then it would give municipalities a better idea of what is leftover where they are expected to anti up. Then municipalities would be able to determine what is there	Infrastructure aside because I think that is very difficult to indicate what our commitment is because we have a commitment to cost share with Build but whether it will actually translate to projects on Lake Simcoe is yet to be seen. As far as the operational component of the implementation of the protection plan we have been very careful to put down what are the Province's commitment to do things it doesn't have legal effect mind you but it really looking at our three year we have 20 million dollars. One year is already in progress

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
capacity to actually do that. What is the effect on the tax rate or a user fee. You run into stuff when you are starting to add more things onto the water user rate. It's great because people use less water and they can conserve and your water plan capacity lasts longer but on the other hand you are also effecting people's ability to live in their home and meet their basic needs so there is push back on water rates and how much you can do. It's a hard line to walk.	but we will have three more years of 5 millions dollars per year. If you look through the policies you will see where OMAFRA has the lead to implement the agricultural stewardship program so it doesn't specifically say dollars but that is our commitment to do those things.
It's the ones where the municipalities have the lead that I am worried about.	
We have talked a lot about where do you put your money to get the best impact and I know there are long term and short term considerations to that but I guess I was just hoping that when we saw the menu of policies options and what would be in the plan and what would have priorities that one of the tools we would have to make those judgments about what we do first that cost per kilogram the effectiveness piece of that, what are the things where we can have the best impact for the amount of money with very limited resources. I saw some costs attached to mapping but that doesn't even being to cover the costs. There is going to have to be that allocation and I guess I thought the plan would give us more guidance on the allocation.	It could be in an annual implementation.
When you are doing these subwatershed studies in my experience you have to go through an iterative process with land use and watershed planning if we can't make any growth decisions because you don't know those land use decisions. Let's pick an area – the lands between Innisfil and Barrie are potentially a growth area while there hasn't been a land use decision made in those areas so how can you actually do a subwatershed study when you don't have any appreciation of whether those lands are urban or non-urban. I don't understand how the process is going to work when you don't make land use decisions concurrent with the subwatershed planning process. Then when I look at your timelines in my experience you have to do 4-5 years of monitoring before you can start doing your subwatershed planning work. I would suggest to you the timelines are you suggesting for any new urban should that even be possible within this watershed is somewhere in the 2015 to 2021 range. Then I go back to Places to Grow if Simcoe County is going to achieve its growth targets 670,000 people I don't know how they are connected now. I am getting lost in this. We can study this to death but I am not sure how it is relating to the land plan and what our other objectives are.	Timing is really critical you make a good point. We are going to create guidelines in 2009-2010 by that time the growth plan decisions should have an Official Plan amendments for conformity should be in place so I think the timing is good for us to embark on any new requirements under watershed planning because the decisions that are made are often not just a permanent decision. I will use the water allocation issue. So we have a subwatershed like the Maskinonge that is a stressed watershed for water quantity and if we do that as a priority watershed for water budget we would review the budget, look what the current takings are, what the allocation to those takings, the seasonality of those takings and then determine what is the root cause of the problem and how can we solve that. Then we would put in place direction for the permit to take water director that says thou shalt ensure that all permits are reviewed within the next year and allocated based upon a new regime based on that increased knowledge and understanding. So that is an example where land use decision really is not needed it's the taking of that water so we have to do it on a threat by threat basis. Another example is invasive species, so we are going to be doing monitoring on a subwatershed basis and we may find that round goby is in the Pefferlaw Creek again. Well the actions that we take may be specific to that watershed and doesn't require a land use decision. I don't think everything is predicated on the land use decisions necessarily. But there are those that integrate and natural heritage is one.
But if there is a degraded watercourse or creek or woodlot generally speaking from my experience the only way it gets improved is if it is subject to development. What the development does is it pays for those improvements and if there is no development than it is	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
all the public purse. You are weighing your decision making and a lot of it seems to comes back to the one tax payer and the province. We need to consider the costs associated with the Plan or else it won't be implementable.	
Wondering how the Lake Simcoe Fisheries stakeholder committee would be appointed given that the coordinating committee and the science committee are appointed by Lieutenant Governor in Council?	
Would like to have a clear understanding of how the new greenfield developments within approved settlement area boundaries are going be covered by these Transition Provision. This Policy must be clear and concise to avoid and confusion. Both approval agencies and proponents alike need to know the rules upfront to ensure other equally important community building and planning objectives are realized.	
It would appear as in other sections of the Plan and in this section a substantial amount of new work is going to need to take place to inform future decision making. This identified studies are going to take time (in many cases several years) to complete only then to be translated into public planning policy. It is essential that agencies and proponents understand that while this work is underway that other processes continue in parallel and that economic development continues. It is therefore suggested that a new section be added to the Plan that clearly addresses this issue. This can be either as part of the preamble to the Plan or perhaps more appropriately is a separate policy added to the interpretation/implementation section of the Plan.	
Like the Phosphorus Reduction Strategy this part of the plan needs a bit more work. The costs being estimated appear to be low and there is some confusion regarding where the estimated costs to complete remedial measures to address septic systems and atmospheric deposition are included. As mentioned earlier, there is also an opportunity to address additional stormwater inputs the cost of which needs to be determined. It is essential that the financial strategy include more detail, be linked to the components of the plan, and that roles and responsibilities of the partner agencies be clearly identified along with an expectation of where the funding may originate.	
Official plans are virtually in a constant state of review these days. Right now the growth plan compliance exercise is underway, which means OPs are being reviewed around much of Lake Simcoe. They will barely be through that process when the Lake Simcoe Plan arrives on the scene demanding further OP amendments. In 2011 or 2012 the ORM plan will be reviewed and changes could be made which might affect the parts of the watershed that are within the ORM plan. In the meantime, ORM municipalities also will have to comply with the ORM subwatershed plans which may contain area specific policies for individual watershed. In 2012 the SPP plans will also arrive on the scene triggering yet another compliance exercise for	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
municipalities. Shortly after that there will be 10 year reviews of the PPS, Greenbelt and Growth Plan which could require amendments to municipal OPs. So, the 5 year comprehensive OP review is almost irrelevant because we are too busy doing all these other compliance exercises. And speaking of the other plans, is there a danger that if you make policies in the LSPPlan apply to areas outside the Greenbelt or ORM plan, (in order to achieve protections in those areas that are similar to protections within the greenbelt/ORM) that in future you could again be faced with inconsistent policy around the Lake as the ORM or GB plans are revised in future?	
Some of these items listed under 1 b) should be available from the Source Protection Assessment report exercise by that point in time. I hope that the sub-lake and sub-watershed areas being defined here will match the subwatershed definitions used in the SPP process so we can avoid duplication. That seems to be what point 2 is addressing however, the source protection plans won't be out till 2012 so there could be timing issues. I guess it depends whether you have to wait until the SPP is fully approved to begin using information that is being included in it.	
Points 1 & 5 address the fact that there is an urban component to the stewardship program, particularly on the educational side. We know there will be incentive funding for the agricultural stewardship programs. As the program develops there may also need to be some incentive funding for other industries to change their ways...like tourism and marinas...for example to focus less on motorized recreation in order to reduce their carbon and contaminant footprint. It seems that MNR and OMAFA have been put in charge of both urban and rural stewardship, developing and reviewing the programs. I can see them doing farm and non-farm rural but are they the right "leaders" for an urban stewardship program?	
See my earlier comment about monitoring and the need to have one entity name and resourced to be responsible for the proper retention of the monitoring information including providing access in future to those who need to use the data.	
This is pretty thin. As a municipality looking the section of a provincial plan that indicates how the province intends to the deliver the plan, I would be very skeptical. There is no indication of a long term financial commitment by the province, there is no indication that the Province will be leading the effort to seek, or coordinate/assist with applications for funding available from the feds. Would getting federal $ for a project preclude provincial $ or could an organization get both for one project? In evaluating different strategies to repair the lake, what will the Province be considering in their funding decisions (bang for buck, value of environmental service being provided/restored, spin off benefits for local economy?) How will they make their funding decisions? There should be a clear indication of the types of funding the province intends to provide (i.e. Province will fund mapping of natural heritage and	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
hydrologic features, monitoring, research, creation of phosphorus reduction strategy, incentives for stewardship programs) and what activities other partners will be requested to fund. Where activities are mandated by designated policies, the Province should be providing all or a significant portion of new costs to municipalities and CA, otherwise these will be considered more downloading of provincial programs. Given that there will not be enough money, the Financing strategy should provide some guidance on what priorities will be used to guide allocations. What will the budgeting process be? Will there be a rolling five year funding plan that is annually updated? Will it be publicly available? Who will develop it? (Coordinating Committee? MOE?) Would investments by other organizations be included somehow in the financial reporting so that the public would know how much was being invested in the Lake? (And so that the Province could gauge the cost of the effort, especially since this is being considered as a model for other lakes.)	
Bullet 1: I recommend that the word "commenced" be replaced with the word "submitted". Bullet 2: This is in conflict with the subsequent Bullet 3. Why are specific locations being singled out, regardless of the merits of the application or how far along the application is in the planning application approvals process? This is unfair and potentially in bad faith. In the interests of fairness, applications that have undergone comprehensive review and been subject to rigorous decision-making processes, that have obtained draft plan approval, should not be subject to the policies of the Plan. Bullet 3: I recommend that this section be amended to state: If an application for a draft plan of sub-division approval has been submitted prior to the effective date of this Plan, and is subsequently approved, subsequent planning applications and decisions shall be exempt from application of the Plan policies. It would be extremely unfair, not to mention a matter of bad faith, for the rules to change subsequent to the submission of an application for draft plan approval, which is very far along in the planning process and represents a significant investment, given the new PPS, "complete application" requirements, increased decision-making timelines, and OMB appeals of non-decisions of municipalities.	
The proposed governance structure is in direct conflict with the principles identified and the governance structure recommended by the LSEMS Working Group.	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
On July 6, 2007, the Premier stated that "The new act would… create a governance structure as recommended by the Lake Simcoe Environmental Management Strategy Working Group". Has the Premier changed his mind? Is he unaware that his commitment is not being honoured? The governance model being proposed is neither accountable, transparent, simple, easily understood, based on a single point of contact, or integrated with the mandates and requirements of other organizations and agencies. In addition, it does not promote information sharing, cooperation and coordination of effort nor does it discourage duplication and overlap. Accountability and transparency Provincial government decision-making processes are not well understood or easily monitored by the public. Further, neither provincial government staff, the Minister and/or Cabinet are easily accessible to the public. Conversely, local government agencies, that will be charged with implementing the Plan %u201Con the ground%u201D, must adhere to rigorous requirements to ensure that decision-making processes are transparent and elected officials are held accountable for their decisions. Decisions of local municipalities are made by a Council of directly elected officials. The public is allowed to attend Council and Committee meetings and may make deputations to Council and/or appeal decisions. Staff and ☐ouncilors are accessible to the public. Municipalities are also required to undertake consultation with members of the public on a regular basis. LSRCA has an established Board of Directors – generally elected representatives who are appointed by LSRCA%u2019s member municipalities %u2013 who meet on a regular basis in an open forum to make decisions and are accessible to local citizens and groups. Further, decisions of LSRCA are subject to appeal. This ensures that the decision-making process is transparent and that decision-makers are held accountable. Lastly, LSRCA staff are accessible to the public and undertake consultation with the public and stakeholders on a regular basis. Simplicity and easily understood	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
In my opinion, the proposed governance structure is neither simple nor will it be easily understood by the public. Appropriately resourced; Cost efficient The financing strategy is weak and does not address the issue of cost efficiency in any meaningful way. Based on a single point of contact Will the offices of the Lake Simcoe Plan Project Team be located in the watershed and open to the public? Implementable Many of the practitioners, from both the public and private sector who will be charged with implementation %u201Con the ground%u201D, have repeatedly identified that a number of the proposed regulations, policies, and programs are not implementable. Integrated with the mandates and requirements of other organizations and agencies As conflicts, duplication, and overlap with the mandates and requirements of other organizations and agencies have been identified on numerous occasions, it is clear that the proposed Plan and governance structure are not integrated with established mandates or requirements. Promotes information sharing, cooperation and coordination of effort Centralizing implementation of the Plan at the provincial level will not promote information sharing, cooperation and coordination of effort at the local watershed level, particularly between local government agencies, the provincial government and other stakeholder groups. Discourages duplication and overlap Given that LSRCA currently undertakes many activities, pursuant to the Conservation	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Authorities Act, that are described in the proposed Plan, it is unclear how establishing another Lake Simcoe watershed focused organization (the new temporary Lake Simcoe Plan Project Team in MOE with dedicated staff) will discourage duplication and overlap. General Both the LSEMS Working Group and Steering Committee recognized the excellent work that was undertaken as a direct result of the LSEMS partnership and the success of the LSEMS program. The intent of the recommendations of both groups with respect to a governance structure was to preserve and enhance the structure of the LSEMS partnership, not to create a completely new governance structure. Specifically, both groups recognized that the LSRCA should continue to remain the lead agency for the next iteration of the LSEMS program. Lastly, the majority of the recommendations of both LSEMS groups addressed the two key issues that were identified, namely: increased opportunity for stakeholder participation and increased/sustainable funding. Both groups recognized that this is better accomplished through a bottom-up versus a top-down approach.	

Bill 99

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
I am interested in understanding the difference between a "regular" policy and a "designated" policy. As I look at the Bill I notice that there are a number of provisions in the Act that are linked to Section 5(3) Designated Policies and it would be very helpful to have Chris present some kind of flow chart that outlines the provisions affected, implications and possible case examples.	What the legislation speaks to is the fact that once we put policies in the Plan, we have to state whether they are a designated policy. There are a couple of places where that makes a difference. It comes down to the legal effects of those policies. In a general way, it speaks to the flexibility associated with those policies. One place that it speaks to that is Section 6(1). What this speaks to is where the Plan includes policies that are meant to affect the Planning Act or the Condominium Act; they are policies that provide direction for decisions that would be made under those Acts. If they are designated policies, the decisions have to conform with the policies. If they are not designated polices, the decisions has to have regard to those policies. What it says is that if you have it as a designated policy, it is fairly inflexible; you have to conform to it. Whereas to have regard to means it is given serious consideration, but there is some flexibility there. There is another similar provision in Section 6(9) and that speaks to prescribed instruments. You may recall that what the legislation allows for is for us to define certain legal instruments as prescribed instruments. The place where we state whether an instrument is a prescribed instrument is we have to include them in a list in regulation. Once there is this list of prescribed instruments, if we put a policy in the Plan that is meant to provide direction to someone making a decision around one of those instruments, for example, a sewage works approval under the Ontario Water Resources Act, we could put in regulation that that is a prescribed instrument. The director that is issuing the sewage works approval has to consider these policies. If it is a designated policy, they have to conform with that policy; there is very little flexibility, they have to do what the policy says. If it is not a designated policy, then they have to have regard to those policies. It means there is a little bit more flexibility, they still have to give it serious consideration and the intent would be that they follow that general direction, but there is more flexibility to make decisions around site specific considerations there may be.
You are saying that there is this list of prescribed instruments at the front, under the definition section. There is a whole series of things that are prescribed instruments. There are two that are exempt: the Planning Act and the Condominium Act. In Section 6(1), a decision under the Planning Act or the Condominium Act, which is exempt from the prescribed instruments, it has to conform with the designated policies and have regard to the other policies. Then in Section 6(9), the prescribed instruments, so that is the other set in the definition. If something under there, if it is designated it has to conform. If it is not designated, it has to have regard to. What is the legal difference?	The legal effect in both situations is the same. They are simply different parts of the Act that deal with the two different situations, the Planning Act and the Condominium Act versus prescribed instruments. The legal effect of the policies, if they are designated policies or not designated policies is the same in both situations. The reason that the Planning Act and Condominium Act are exempt from the definition of prescribed instruments is because they are dealt with through the other provisions not as a prescribed instrument. That is just a matter of saying the Plan and the Act ones, here are the rules that apply and for the other instruments, here are the rules that apply. But in both cases, a designated policy is a conform to policy and a non-designated policy is a have regard to policy.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
In the two subsections that you have cited and that are under discussion right now, the legal effect is no difference?	Correct.
The reason that the Planning Act and the Condominium Act are exempted under the definition of prescribed instruments is because they are treated differently in different parts of the legislation.	Right.
But there are other areas that Section 5(3) refers to?	Section 5(3), the first part (a) refers to paragraph 6 and 9, we just did those two. The other one that is mentioned is (b). That section is telling you what policies can be designated policies. Everything in Section 5(1) on policies would be designated policies. There are only two places in Section 5(2), paragraph 6 and 9 that could be designated policies as well.
Under "Contents of the Plan", Section 5(1), any of those policies can be designated.	That is right. In Section 5(2), paragraph 6 and 9 are designated policies. These are the policies that can be designated policies. Other policies would just be regular policies that people give regard to. Designated polices, certain areas would actually have to conform and you actually have a legal effect.
Under Section 5(2), paragraph 6 and 9, as I understand, those are the only two paragraphs where designated policies can apply.	Those are the only two policies that can be designated policies.
What are these things? What are you describing?	Paragraph 6 deals mainly with when you have a conflict and how you resolve those conflicts. These are policies that speak to how conflicts get resolved between this Plan and another plan, for example, and then you would have to follow those policies. Section 6(4) tells you what prevails in case of a conflict. Section 6(4), says that if there is a conflict between a policy in this Plan and a policy in one of these other plans and policies that is listed in Subsection 5. If there is a conflict there, that the one that provides the greatest protection to the ecological health of the Lake Simcoe watershed is the one that prevails. However, that can be subject to additional policy direction that is put in the Plan. The general rule is the one that says that whatever is most protective prevails, but the Plan itself can include policies that provide a more specific direction in relation to that conflict. If it includes that type of policy, then those would have to be designated policies. Where the Plan speaks to conflicts, you have to follow what the Plan says about resolving those conflicts; you do not have a choice, it is not flexible where there are policies that deal with conflict. If you look at Section 6(5), it speaks to the Provincial Policy Statement, Greenbelt Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine, the Growth Plan, or another unidentified plan, if there is a conflict between a policy that is put into this Plan and one of those other plans or policies, that is the conflict that it is speaking to. Generally speaking, where there is a conflict, the one that is most protective of the ecological health of the watershed prevails. If there is need to or reason to, the Act does allow this Plan to include policies that vary from that general direction. There is a legislative provision that says that the most protective one

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	prevails. If there is reason to vary from that for some reason, we can put in place a policy in the legislation that says in this specific situation, despite what is most protective, here is how conflict gets addressed. I am comparing the Lake Simcoe Plan with a plan under a different act.
What does paragraph 9 deal with?	It deals with prescribed instruments in conflict.
So, you are dealing with legislation as opposed to plans? That is the difference there?	Yes.
In other words, you are going to establish policies that establish ways to deal with conflict between policies in the Lake Simcoe Plan and policies in other plans, as well as prescribed instruments, where there is conflict, you are going to designate that policy as a designated policy. You must do it this way. Were there any other references? It would be really helpful to provide for the SAC the interplay between the designated and regular policies and prescribed instruments and exempt instruments and where those occur, what sections are affected in the legislation. Because it does get a bit difficult to follow at times.	We should be able to provide this next week. It would be meant as guidance to the SAC.
Our organization, the Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition, submitted almost the same question. We asked, will for example, forest cover minimums, permeable surface minimums and setbacks from watercourses, wetlands and the lake be designated? It would by worrying and extremely disappointing if the very protections that most of our members more care about were not designated, but open to interpretation as they have been in the past. The lack of regard for the Places to Grow legislation exemplified in recent OMB decisions makes us extremely skeptical that undesignated protections will be meaningful. I want to refer back to the comment made earlier about zero tolerance. We do have zero tolerance in every other aspect of legislation. You can speed; that is zero tolerance. Police officers may give some dispensation, but the law is that you cannot drive over 60 km/h in a designated zone. The penalties may vary, but the law does not. You cannot steal. It does not say you can steal a loaf of bread, but you cannot steal $1,000. The penalties, but we have zero tolerance about stealing. Yet for some reason, something that affects the very way we live, we think we cannot have zero tolerance. We cannot say that it is illegal to build within 100 m of a lake that is in jeopardy. I do not really understand that. It is not as though this has not been done in jurisdictions all over the world. In our breakout group we mentioned that this was done in Lake Como, Lake Lucerne, it is done all over the world. Here we think the environment is the one thing that we have to be flexible about. Then we talk about cost as though somehow there is a cost if we cannot develop wherever we want, but there is no cost to degradation to the environment. Yet we all know the exact opposite is true. In our breakout group we said, within municipal boundaries we understand that there has to be a different set of rules and regulations. Because after all, if MAH says that there is enough land in Simcoe County, Barrie and Orillia to accommodate	Any of the policies can end up being designated policies.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
future growth, we cannot then turn around and take that away, and then cry foul because the rural countryside is being spoiled. It is the same for developers. They cannot say on the one hand give us certainty to let us know what we can do because uncertainty is the greatest danger we have, but where it affects their interests, that is where we want flexibility. Either say we want flexibility everywhere and let it be a free for all, or let us have some rules and regulations. As a developer, you give me the rules and regulations; I will find a way to make money. Where I do not make money, is when the rules and regulations are flexible. So, do not give me anything that is flexible. That is not to say that there are not places where you have to be discretionary. For example, cottages, you have a cottage here and there and an empty lot. Maybe that is the kind of thing where you have regards to. But again, that depends on the governance structure you determine. If the governance structure is going to be the OMB, where the average person has no chance against a developer, then that will not work either. If you are going to create a governance structure that works, then maybe there is the odd thing that can have regards to. In Section 5, policies to achieve the objectives of the Plan, those are designated. And yet, on the next page, policies reflecting key natural heritage features, those are going to have regards to. How can one be designated and the other have regards to, they are the same thing. We need those in order to achieve the objectives of the Plan. Unless the objectives of the Plan are also flexible. We would like to know that forest cover minimums, permeable surfaces, setback minimums from watercourses, wetlands in the lake be designated. We do not want to have to continue to go to the OMB to fight for that kind of thing. This is the absolute crux of the entire argument.	
I thought you had said with Section 5(2), the only ones that would be designated were 6 and 9. The others would have regard to.	I am not saying they absolutely will be. Any of the policies may be. It is a decision to be made.
That is very relieving. Then the question is, do you suspect that forest cover minimums, permeable surface minimums, setbacks from watercourses and lakes and wetlands be designated? Is that the expectation?	That is one of the things that we are looking at. We want to hear from the group, which of those areas are the most critical that you see to be in this first Plan. It may be that you want to designate certain things right away because they are so important. You want to set those standards now and you do not want to have to argue about them later. There are others that as we go and do amendments to the Plan in future years, you may want to designate additional policies or modify polices. We are looking for where are those critical showstoppers that would make this Plan both aggressive, but also workable. Because we have to think about this as being something we can implement as well. It has to be somewhat reasonable, but we do need to hear what people think are the showstoppers in terms of things that need to be mandatory, very prescribed, versus those things where we can improve things over time through voluntary measures, etc. It is getting that balance, particularly in the first Plan.
Just to be clear, those 4 things are the showstoppers for us.	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
The results of legislation and policy on the ground do not just depend on the words that are written. Obviously intent, how that intent is articulated and also enforcement. I went through a red light and I got caught. I fought it and I won because I had evidence and there were circumstances that the judge felt I should be let off. That says to me we do need flexibility in the system and the judge recognized that. I went through a red light; I admit that. The previous comment was wrong in the sense that you do not always pay when you do something wrong if there are outside influences or different circumstances. I disagree.	
I did not say that the enforcement should not be flexible. That is what that judge did. She understood that there were special circumstances and therefore did not penalize you the same way. I am saying the rules should not be flexible. The rule is is that you cannot speed. Yes, you want to break the law, maybe there are extenuating circumstances where you get a slap on the wrist.	
On the conflict issue, one of the big questions that has been outstanding for me, I am the Councillor for downtown Barrie. On a weekly basis, I go through the process of approving intensification. The City has made a major change in the way it grows. We are having a lot of success in attracting higher density development to my ward, which happens to be the city centre. We put up a high-density development with 1,000 residents. That is 1,000 suburban homes that do not have to be built on the edge of Barrie or elsewhere in the County. It reduces sprawl, it reduces greenhouse gas emissions, allows people to walk and is much better for the environment. That is the vision in the provincial Growth Plan and we are implementing it. In the Lake Simcoe Plan, those 1,000 residents are going to flush their toilet and add phosphorous to the lake. This is a real world example of the conflict issue. Because the conflict issue is designated, would an argument be in your mind successful where a developer argued that they should be allowed to put up this condo project because it conforms with all of the objectives of Places to Grow, reduces greenhouse gas emissions, etc., and the City or the Conservation Authority or the province challenged that under the Lake Simcoe Plan, saying, no you are adding phosphorous to the lake? I know we are a couple of steps removed here in the sense that there are targets for both that are in-between. The 1,000 residents help us achieve our urban growth centre target under the Growth Plan, which is mandated. The phosphorous reductions, that I am anticipating, or at least levels are under the Lake Simcoe Plan. Are anticipating that the conflict provision would then overrule the Growth Plan in that kind of circumstance? By designating it, by implementing, is that how this all shakes out?	First of all, you have to figure out if there is a conflict. Really, there is only a conflict if both tests cannot be met. If it is a situation where the Growth Plan is saying one thing, and the Lake Simcoe Plan puts in place a requirement to that, absolutely means there is no way that you meet that other policy, then there might be a conflict. Simply saying you have phosphorous loading targets on one hand, and growth targets on the other hand, there is not necessarily a conflict there. Assuming there was a conflict, the general provision in this legislation that says the one most protective of the Lake is the one that applies, a decision does have to be made as to which is more protective. It is not always going to be pure black and white. Then what the legislation allows for is the Plan to provide policies that clarify certain situations. If we are actually anticipating a conflict and we are anticipating that it is grey in terms of what may be more protective, or we want to provide in the Plan additional direction that says in this situation it is okay not to follow the Lake Simcoe Plan, or it is okay not to follow the Growth Plan, whatever the case may be. That policy is a designated policy, it has to be conformed to and essentially, it would take precedence.
You got to the reason for my comment. We have a target for intensification, to grow more sustainably, and I am in the midst of implementing that politically. We are going to have a target for reducing phosphorous. Where those two are in conflict, and I recognize that on an individual development application, you have two buckets that are you filling up and the	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
relationship between them will be very difficult to understand. My comment is this: please do not leave it to the OMB to figure that out. The clarity on those conflicts is going to be absolutely critical. For the policies to be effective, for the Plan to be effective, the Policy Development Team's need to understand the fallout and the rollout implications for the planning process, so that those conflicts are not left for interpretation because I fear that if they are, they will be interpreted either inconsistently or they will not be interpreted in the context of the Plan.	
Mine is another real world example and it has to do with retroactivity and grandfathering. If, for example, development was approved perhaps 15 or 20 years ago by the OMB, and the development has not been built yet. And that it was identified that maybe two-thirds of the development is actually on woodland that should be protected. How might the provisions in this Act and the ensuing Plan deal with that, as it exists at the moment?	The Act is worded such that outstanding decisions can be affected. A development proposal partway through its approval process could in theory be affected. If all of the approvals are in place, then it affects decisions. If there are not any planning decisions to be made, it cannot affect planning decisions. What may then be affected are some of the other regulatory instruments. If a proposal requires approvals under the Public Lands Act or the Conservation Authority Act, in theory, those could be affected. Again, if there are decisions to be made. The legislation cannot reverse decisions.
In terms of retroactivity, unless there are decisions yet to be made, development such as that, which was envisioned before we even knew the lake was having problems could proceed?	There could be some nuance if it is partway through the approvals process. If there something that had some approvals 10 years ago, yet still has a couple approvals to go through, then those other approvals can be affected. There other thing that can be done in relation to prescribed instruments, a number of those instruments have ongoing operational requirements. Sewage treatment plants or stormwater facilities, some of these approvals are instruments that might set out monitoring requirements or other requirements that are in place on an ongoing basis. These policies in this legislation allow for provisions within those instruments to change. You can provide direction to the director associated with a sewage works to say now you must amend that instrument to put in place these certain requirements. Certainly, in that case you can change the way things are happening.
That would seem to be something that was done at a time when knowledge about all of this stuff and the scientific knowledge about the needs of the lake were not even envisions at that point. That would seem to indicate that some of the things, such as wetlands, permeability of roads, protection of woodlands, should seriously be thought to be made designated policies.	
I have a concern that we all want this Act to succeed in what it is trying to accomplish. We all want to protect the lake. We have numerous pieces of legislation, Places to Grow, the Planning Act, Lake Simcoe Act, etc., all of which we acknowledge are interrelated. In terms of retro approvals, within this watershed there is already more development approved than the allocation under the Places to Grow Act. Yet, we have new developments, which meet the intent, such as what was described within urban areas, which are being delayed during this period of uncertainty. I would strongly encourage that this be sorted sooner rather than later.	The anticipated timeframe for this Plan could be in effect in January/February. The legislation has to get passed and then Cabinet would have to approve a Plan subsequent to that. Winter would be the earliest timeframe. The Plan can speak to grandfathering or transition in whatever makes sense. It is all predicated on the legislation.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
I had the sense that yes, we are aware of that and when this becomes a problem, we will sort it out. I do not think we have that luxury. I think it is having an impact on development, on managed growth within communities today. It is not something which we can sort out some time down the road, or trust that market conditions will take care of it because that development in Tay Township is not really going to happen for a while. I do not think that is reasonable. I think it needs to be sorted out now before we get too far down the road.	
If I use the example that was cited earlier, that farm field some place, which has approval for development now. A developer has a piece of property in an urban environment, which is promoted by Places to Grow, which is not yet approved. The developer is being stalled; the other one can go ahead. If I add up all those other ones that can go ahead, and not all of them fall in this category, but the ones that are already approved already exceed the provisions of Places to Grow. The developer is never going to get there and he is going to be continue to be stalled, yet this is the one we collectively think we have the least impact on the lake and the one that will have the most is already grandfathered. I have a concern that if we do not sort that out until we get there, and maybe market conditions will take care of it. We know it is there; we ought to sort it out now and say here is the reality of the world we live in. This is not hypothetically; it is real today.	Once a draft Plan comes out, there will be an understanding of what it is anticipated to come out of this Plan. As far as conflicts between what is in an official plan and the Growth Plan, this Plan would not resolve that. As far as the extent to which this Plan may affect any development that is in the process of being approved that would be known when this draft Plan comes out. Or at least a pretty good indication. I am not sure that this process necessarily resolves all the issues that you raised.
I am not expecting that this process resolve it. What I am identifying is that these are not hypothetical issues, which are being raised and somewhere it needs to be addressed. I do not think this process is the right place for it; here we are talking about this lake, this watershed. I am talking about the things that affect it. We are potentially allowing, not deliberately, but allowing because they are already approved, things that are in contradiction to this to go forward, while we restrict those which are not yet approved. I understand that, in fairness we have to deal with what is already approved. We cannot pull the rug out from people who have already gone through that process. My concern is that 5 years down the road, we wake up and say this Plan did not work. It did not fail because of all the good intentions, it failed because of what was already done and we did not acknowledge that before we started. That is my concern. This process is not the way it to resolve it, other than to flag it. This concern is not hypothetical, this is very real and it exists today.	
The business of approvals that we given 10, 20 years ago and are still outstanding and nothing has ever been built, this came up when we were discussing the reform of the Planning Act. There were suggestions at that time that development approvals should have a best before date. Whatever is agreed to as a timeframe, if no action occurs, it is just deemed revoked. That was discussed at the time but it did not come forward as part of the Bill 51 changes. Municipalities are caught by this. In one of the northern communities in Durham, we have an	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
application that has been sitting there for 20 years, but nothing ever has been built. That best before date, you might want to go back at that, then, it would give the opportunity to say yes you can reapply, but the new rules are in force. If you have not developed within 10 years, or whatever is deemed acceptable, then you have to revamp your application to conform to the new rules. I do not know how far you want to go with that, but it probably belongs in the Planning Act, it is not just around here that it is an issue; it is an issue everywhere.	
You may have your approvals, but the environmental regulations still require you to do now level 1 if it was not contemplated 10 years ago. We have to clear up these broad statements with more specifics.	It probably depends on the specific thing you are concerned about. The environmental approvals are a completely separate regulatory approval that does happen essentially after the development is approved. It sort of gets planned together, but it is approved afterwards and separately. That can be affected. Whereas planning approvals are a little bit different.
Those are the different regimes, but it is ironic that you can be approved, draft plan approved, but the environmental regulations will apply and your draft plan will have to be amended if your draft plan cannot comply with the new environmental regulations.	
Planning and development approvals in this province are not measured in years, they are measured in decades. For example, north Oakville was starting to be planned in 1987. It came into the urban boundary in 1999. We have not moved a blade of grass and it is 2008, and I am probably about 18 to 24 months away from it. It is 20 years, plus or minus, where we have actively pursued planning approvals. We have not been sitting on our hands, we have not been sitting on old applications, we have been bumping up against Places to Grow, a bunch of changes through the process, servicing issues and it is not for a lack of wanting to go forward. If you say to me planning approvals have a best before date, and you are going to measure it in 30-year increments, I am in. If you are going to measure it in months or years, I am out. It is just not that black and white. Do not get caught up in a best before date because there really is no best before date in our world, it just takes so long, it is so complicated that you just cannot measure it in black and white terms.	
Can you point out where the Condominium Act and the Planning Act are referred to? They are treated separately in a separate place.	Section 6(1) deals with the Planning Act and Condominium Act, and then a few of the subsections after that also deal with nuances to that. But generally, it is Section 6(1) that deals with the Planning Act and Condominium Act. Section 6(1) lays out the basic effect of the plan as far as those decisions under those acts. It was Section 6(9) that deals with prescribed instruments.
Can you explain why those acts appear in a different place or why they are treated differently than all of the other acts that are listed in part of the earlier conversation?	To a certain extent, it is simply a drafting preference, but it relates back to how those decisions work and who implements the decisions. And also to a certain extent, the certainty that we knew we wanted to be able to affect the Planning Act and Condominium Act decisions versus the other ones was a little less certain. To a certain extent, it also relates to the drafting perspective. If you look at some of the other provisions afterwards around conflicts and bringing plans into conformity, some of the provisions had to be

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	drafted specific to apply to the Condominium Act and the Planning Act. It relates to how they get implemented and who implements them as in the municipalities as opposed to the province. It is largely for drafting reasons more than anything else.
In terms of the provision that restricts municipalities from making more environmentally restrictive regulations than what is outlined in the Act. I do not think we should restrict municipalities from creating bylaws and regulations that are more environmentally restrictive. It is not just my opinion, actually it is Campaign Lake Simcoe, at least 45 groups around the lake support that idea. Why is that in there?	It is in there partly because we have seen that in other legislation that relates to other plans. It is there not as something that has to get used, but as something that is provided for. Where it has been used in some other situations is to protect access to certain resources, like aggregates, for example. We provided it in the legislation just so that it was enabled; I am not sure to what extent it will get used here or not. I have not heard any discussions yet about policies being needed that would relate to this, but I have not been privy to all of the discussions. It is there as a possibility, the extent to which it gets used depends on the Plan and whether it needs to be used. It does not apply to every policy in the Plan. There is nothing that says if the setback in this situation is 5 m, a municipality can never go beyond that. Unless we state that in the Plan, specifically, then that is not the case. It is not an assumed thing; it is only if the province thinks for some reason it is necessary.
It is a bit of the chicken and the egg. For example, if in the Plan there is no designated policy that says everyone in the watershed, or at least shoreline residents, must not use fertilizer on their lawn anymore. We would love to be able to see a municipality take that on. That is going to be more protective for the lake. Without knowing what sorts of things the community around Lake Simcoe will endorse and will not endorse, it is hard to see why you would put something in the Act that is going to restrict municipalities from doing something that is clearly very positive for the lake. It should not be there.	Presumably, if it is used, there would have to be good reason for it.
Every decision that is made around this room from a business perspective, I have to deal with and implement. That is why I have been very vocal on the point about where will these policies apply. If the apply equally in the urban areas versus the new urban areas, if there are ever any new urban areas in this community, or the rural areas, I have a very different position. To me, the rubber hits the road if you apply these policies in our planned growth areas. That is where I fall offside with a lot of the things that I have heard this morning and some of the things that are being considered today as to what will be a designated policy. I plead, when you are making that conscious decision as to what is a designated policy, first please ask yourself, does it apply to the urban areas versus the non-urban. And then every single time you are making that decision, assuming you are saying it is going to apply equally across every single location across the watershed, tell me that you have balanced your decision-making. That you have looked at the environment, that you have thought about the economy and you have thought about the social implications of what you are doing. Because if	You are right that the legislation does not speak to the breadth of societal values found within the watershed. That was intentionally done, not to ignore those other interests, but just to focus the legislation on the environmentally issues. This Plan cannot be all things to all people. That does not mean that everything else gets ignored and that is one of the main reasons why this Plan gets approved by Cabinet. Because around the Cabinet table is the breadth of societal interests, at least at the provincial level. Just to confirm what the legislation says around your comment. When we have to go to Cabinet and provide the full analysis of what is being presented as a proposed Plan, we are required to do the kind of economic analysis that you are asking of us. Not only are we looking at the cost of implementing the Plan and who is going to pay for the cost, that is the financing strategy, but we are working with Economic Development and Trade Ministry to do a full economic analysis of the costs and benefits of the Plan to

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
you just take, as this legislation is currently written, I do not believe it is balanced. It is an ecological first, an environment only piece of legislation and the Plan, if permitted to be written that way, will have the same impact, which I do not think has been seriously considered on the other two pillars that I have advocated we need to consider in decision-making, in writing the Plan and the legislation, which comes back to the transitional provisions and the grandfathering. Here is where I have a real fundamental problem. We did not speculate when we bought our land. We bought lands inside the urban boundary, the planned growth areas. If you are going to come back to us now and say by the way, we are going to change all of the rules, and we may take away substantive amounts of your land base. I am not talking about cutting down the trees, I am not talking about filling in the valleys, I am not talking about plowing in wetlands. If you are going to use tableland for linkage purposes that is the only commodity that we have as a development industry. That is the only place that I can build the product that we provide. No one has once mentioned about the housing consumer and the affordability that all of this policy restrictiveness has on providing affordable housing. Who is advocating for the consumer? Who is speaking up on behalf of the people who are employed in our industry? I had the unfortunate position of letting go a third of my workforce in my land department last Monday. It was not because we do not have good land holdings, we have substantive land holdings all within the urban boundary. We cannot bring our communities to market. This legislation has impacts for the 11 people that I had to escort out the door last week. I asking you, please, I know green is good and we advocate that, but there are real people, real professional people out on the street because we cannot deliver our communities. It is the decisions that are made around tables like this that are faceless. And you cannot be faceless anymore. I will bring the 11 people here if you would like to meet them. You ask them about their kids and their mortgages. Please, I ask for balance in your decision-omaking. I want to make sure that you take serious consideration of when you are applying these policies inside an urban area versus outside an urban area. Please take that into consideration. Please balance all of your decisions when you are deciding what should be designated versus what should not be designated. When you are grandfathering things, please recognize you are taking away something that someone made a fundamental business decision on, that they did not speculate. It was not as if they bought a farm field out in the middle nowhere, they bought a property that had rights associated with it. What you will do, because you can, is take it away. I seriously think we should be very somber and very careful in making that type of decision.	the economy.
Can we get a copy of that?	At the next meeting, we are going to be talking about the costs and financing strategy.
I am referring to the economic cost benefit of the proposed measure.	I will have to see how far they are with it. I am meeting with them later today to see where it is at.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
How can they be doing it if we have not finished the Plan?	It is an iterative process. Right now, we are working with ranges, we have not landed, so we are looking at ranges of costs. It is an art not a science.
I cannot speak unequivocally right now for the Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition because it is not something that I had addressed with them, but I think they will agree with me. In terms of the earlier comments, we are not saying there should be no regulations within municipal boundaries, even for new development. What is being said is, there is already in effect a very stringent set of rules and regulations within the City of Barrie and the Town of Orillia, and you do not want to be governed by two sets of rules and regulations when this is exactly the kind of thing we wish to encourage. We want to encourage growth in that area to relieve the pressure on greenfields, farms, forests, etc. On the one hand, we say we want to relieve that pressure, we should do everything we can to encourage that kind of growth. There are ways in which we can wean the municipalities away from their own set of regulations into a more holistic set that is more in keeping with the spirit of the Act. That is perhaps where the with regards to legislation comes in. For example, we develop in the city, we have a building, we want windows in the building, but the fire regulations no longer allow windows there because we are too close to the adjacent building. No one is going to recommend that we tear down that building or that 100 feet before we have a window, so we have put in effect in lieu of regulations that allow a deluge system to be put in place or fusible link shutters to be put in place so that we can still have our windows, but recognize that this is an urban environment and it needs different regulations. Our recommendation would be to let the municipal regulations rule until you put in place a set of in lieu of regulations, in conjunction with the development community, so that they can say yes, we understand the spirit of what you are trying to achieve. We can achieve that by doing in lieu of things, given the fact that this is an urban environment.	
I want to make something clear to people because we heard another comment about the OMB and it is province-wide that it should be abolished and everyone agrees with that. There is something that is not well understood. If we abolish the OMB, we do not extinguish appeal rights. We all have appeal rights of decisions. My understanding is that judges and the courts have quite clearly communicated they want the OMB to stay there because they do not want those cases, they do not understand them and they do not want to be in that fight. If we abolish the OMB, those cases go to court; they did not disappear.	The legislation has no effect whatsoever in terms of the OMB being the decision maker. It does not affect who makes decisions around planning decisions, who the arbiter is, who the implementer is. What it does is provide direction into that process. Hopefully it would provide clarity. The intent is that the Plan provides direction into those existing processes.
I do not regard the OMB as a bad idea. We do need an appeal board. We just do not like how the OMB has been operating. The OMB did not used to be the way it is now. It used to be the friend of the little person. It used to be that the OMB would bend over backwards if there was a single objector, they would bring in their own technical advisors to help that person because they understood that that person could not defend themselves properly. The trouble is the	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
OMB has now changed. The OMB, in one development, such as Moon Point, approves a development with septic tanks, and in another development they approve and part of the evidence for their approval is that this development is taking away septic tanks. We feel we cannot win with the OMB and that is the problem. It is not that there should not be an appeal board; it just should not necessarily be that one.	
In particular, Section 27 gives the Lieutenant Governor in Council authority to make regulations, to designate participating municipalities for the LSRCA. To be clear, I think what that is indicating is there are municipalities that are currently outside our jurisdiction, in relation to this Act. Those municipalities would be the portion of the City of Orillia that flows into Lake Simcoe and the upper portion of the City of Kawartha Lakes that flows into Lake Simcoe. Some of Kawartha Lakes is already in. The onus as I read this would be on the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make those regulations as opposed to the current process for joining the authority, which is the municipalities asking to become a member of the Conservation Authority. Am I correct in that interpretation?	The Act provides authority for Cabinet to make that regulation.
This would be driven by Cabinet, as opposed to the municipalities. That is fundamentally a very major shift from the way it is right now and I wanted to make sure I was clear on that. If we were to assume that that might happen, those municipalities would be required to participate in the current program of the Conservation Authority, not just the floodplain regulations program that is referred to under Section 24 of the Lake Simcoe Protection Act.	What this does say is for the purposes of this Act, so they would only be required to participate to the extent that it relates to this Plan. But to the full breadth of the Plan potentially, not just relating back to Section 28.
Our interpretation and certainly I would welcome you to take a look at our EBR response on this, that it is a very important distinction because Sections 20 and 21 mandate of the Conservation Authority's Act, enables it to do a number of programs that are very similar to the Lake Simcoe Act and Plan, which we obviously, would want to do in partnership. I was not clear if the Lieutenant Governor in Council could enact those municipalities to join for the purposes of the regulation only. It is for the purposes of joining the Authority as it currently exists right now.	The way it is worded is for the purposes of this Act; it was not intended when this was written to be absolutely any purpose that the Conservation Authority has. The concern was in relation to implementing this Act specifically.
That needs to be clarified because if it is not clarified here is the circumstance. We have a board of directors of 18 people that deals our mandate under the Conservation Authority's Act. Under the Clean Water Act, we have now another board of directors that is source water protection authority under the Clean Water Act. That is our second board of directors. This could potentially lead us to a third board of directors currently needs some clarification around that. That would be very helpful to us. I know we can do this through ongoing dialogue with the MOE staff. That would be a critical understanding for us to have as we move forward.	
During the LSEMS deliberations, especially in the working group, there was a lot of discussion and consensus arrived about governance and what that might look like. I have perused the Act	Next week we are going to be talking about the Coordinating Committee and more about the role and how they would work and some discussion about sub-committees. And the

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
several times and there is no mention of governance structure, or what it might like look. The Act enables two committees, a Science Committee and a Coordinating Committee. The Coordinating Committee, under Section 19, seems to be a committee that will bring in a lot of the people that we talked about in the working group. In the next round of talks about the Act, when you are talking about amendments to the Act, one thing I would like you to consider as an amendment to Section 19 is to have the Coordinating Committee have the authority to authorize ad hoc committees as it deems necessary to conduct the business of the Coordinating Committee. It should be enabled to do so, to fulfill a concept of openness and inclusion as articulated in the recommendations of the LSEMS working group. How does the average that we heard from in our public consultations around the lake have a direct and meaningful input into the decisions surrounding the lake? We are all in favour of the Plan, but at the end of the day, people from Orillia, from Barrie, from Beaverton, from Keswick, Virginia Beach, Innisfil, they are looking for somewhere where they can express their opinions about the lake and what is wrong with it and how to fix it. As the Plan stands right now, the venue I see for that happening comes under Section 19. I would like to recommend when it is time for amendments to the Act that that be carefully considered, that that Coordinating Committee can strike the ad hoc committees so that these people have a place to go to voice their concerns.	public engagement piece as well.
What date or milestone determines the time at which the provisions of the Act/Plan become operable, see Section 3(4). Delay will encourage activity inimical to the Act's objectives. Since an interim regulation was put into effect in December 2007, the intent to introduce legislation was already clear at that time. It seems fair and appropriate that December 6, 2007 be the effective date of the Act. In any case, the effective data should be no later than the date of the first reading. Please give us an effective date that is effective.	The effective is whatever is stated in the Plan. But it cannot be earlier than the date the Plan is approved. It is not retroactive in the sense that it can reverse decisions that have been made prior to the Plan coming into effect.
If I were a developer, developing in a greenfield that I thought was going to be subject to this Act, I would pull out all stops to make sure I got my act together. I think you have to protect yourself against that.	That is the way the legislation is currently worded that decisions that are unmade as of when the Plan comes into effect, can be affected, but not decisions that have not been made.
Right now, you have an interim control bylaw that you put into fed. Give that some teeth in the meantime, put a little bit of a hiatus on things until you can get the Act together. You do not want to have an Act and a Plan that is meaningless. If you already have an interim control bylaw, why not use it?	
I want to emphasize how pleased I am with the provisions in the Act and what I am seeing coming forward in the Plan and obviously, we have to work out some of the details. One of the areas that I am concerned about is an accountability piece. It has to do with Section 12, which talks about progress reports. It is actually Section 12(2) where it talks about the Minister shall, from time to time, prepare a report that describes the extent to which the objectives of the	Some of your comments are consistent with some of the intent, we just had not drawn the lines quite as clearly as some of what you have stated. As far as changing time to time to be a specific timeframe, that was a comment that the SciAC also made.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
Lake Simcoe Protection Plan are being achieved. It is a little bit worrisome to see from time to time because from time to time could be never. We want to know what we are doing is actually achieving an objective, so we have to be able to report on these things. Reporting is an important aspect of accountability and it fulfills many other functions as well. It is a useful education and outreach tool and it has many other reasons. If for your consideration, you would think about amending Section 12(2) so that it would read something like, that the Minster shall within 5 years of this Act coming into force and every 3 years after prepare a report. No longer than 5 years and every 3 years after. You give consideration to the fact that you have to get things up and running, but you want to establish a regular reporting on the outcomes of the objective. In line with that particular amendment, then you could go to Section 5, the contents of the Plan, which would refer to one or more targets related to the indicators. The other thing that I would like to add in here is including timelines. One or more targets, including timelines. Again you are reinforcing this idea that no only do you have targets, you also have to achieve things in certain timelines. In Section 5(1), #8, it says the methods that will be used to assess whether the objectives of the Plan are being achieved, what you could do here that supports the idea of reporting is that whether the objectives of the Plan are being achieved and the reporting provisions on these objectives. Again, it reinforces this idea of accessibility. In line with this, Section 19, I would recommend and if we are going to have a discussion about the Coordinating Committee and the committees, we can talk about this a little bit more next week, you can add a responsibility or role for the Lake Simcoe Coordinating Committee in that it would have as one of its activities, the coordination of the report that looks at the outcomes of the Plan. You are taking this responsibility for the preparation of the evaluation of the outcome of the Plan from the Minister and you are asking that the Coordinating Committee do this. Then you would have to amend Section 19(2), paragraph 4, that would then have to say, provide a report within at least 5 years of the Act coming into force and every 3 years after to the provincial legislature or the Minister on an evaluation of the extent to which the objectives of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan are being achieved. In other words, you are giving this added function to the Coordinating Committee. It is not that the Coordinating Committee is actually going to carry this out, building on the previous suggestion, about the idea of having these ad hoc committees. Maybe you would then assemble an ad hoc committee that would do this work. There are some good opportunities for having an objective evaluation away from government. You could also have members of government; they would be members of this Coordinating Committee anyway. It is a more independent evaluation. It helps political people be able to say we are making progress because an independent body has said that we are making progress or not making progress. The other thing I would add around timelines is Section 5(2), paragraph 15, it says, policies	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
respecting research and monitoring programs, including performance monitoring programs to assess the effectiveness of the policies set out in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. I would also include targets and timelines in that paragraph as well. In terms of water quality trading, you could provide a stronger role for the Lake Simcoe Science Committee that the Minister would seek their advice on the development of the report. I think you are going to have a great deal of problems. The way I see this right now is that the Minister is responsible for a report and I think it would provide some good coverage for both the Minister and the department to have the Science Committee advise them the Minister on the development of that report. You could also take a look at the role of one of the ad hoc committees. Maybe there is a committee that is concerned with economic instruments and their application. It is not just a natural science based approach, but it is a panel of experts that would be engaged in the development of the report. I know what the legislative amendment process is like and you do not want to load up too many amendments, I am not suggesting that. And maybe there are other ways to bring these ideas forward. You have good legislation; you do not want to tinker with it too much. These are some ideas for your consideration.	
I think you want to strengthen the accountability pieces. It serves the public interest; it serves other economic interests and things like that, and ecological interests.	We could put that in the implementation section.
I would want to see it in the legislation if it is possible. I think it has greater strength if it is in law.	
In Section 6(6), actions to conform with the Plan, it says no municipality shall undertake within the Lake Simcoe watershed any public work, improvement of a structural nature or other undertaking that conflicts with a designated policy set out in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. What is a definition of an improvement of a structural nature? Is it fixing a road, widening a road, putting up a bus shelter, moving the road because? If you have to reconstruct a bridge, is that a structural improvement? What is considered a structural improvement? Further to that, who decides if it conforms with the Plan? Do the municipalities provide some kind of documentation that in their view it conforms with the Plan? Or is someone else going to judge whether it conforms with the Plan, it is going to be done through a Class EA process, if it is road work or a sewage work? When is that judgment going to be and how do you know if you have met the test for conformity? It is a designated policy so it is conform to issue. How involved would the MOE propose to be getting into these things? Are you going to look our 5-year capital plans? Are we going to bring forward our budget? I do not know where the line is drawn on this kind of a statement.	No, I do not think the MOE intends to get into approving capital plans. This speaks to conflicts; you cannot do something that is directly contradictory. You cannot do something that directly conflicts. Part of it is that you are coming up with policies and you do really have to be clear about what the intent is to affect or not affect. If what we say is no development or site alternation within 30 m, but we do intend to allow a road to be constructed, we should say that. We should try to be as clear as we can about what is permitted or not permitted. That is part of it. That is not any different than any other plan. If, generally speaking, certain infrastructure things are permitted and certain other things are not permitted, again we should be trying to provide clarity there. If we cannot provide that clarity, then we should probably not be having it as a designated policy, in which case there is flexibility. Part of it is just in drafting in policies, trying to be aware of the effect and what it means and does not mean.
Who would be the arbiter?	It is a matter of a conflict in this case. The basic requirement comes down to the municipality to not do something in conflict with the Plan.
Who decides if you are in conflict? You can have different opinions about this.	You are in conflict in law when you cannot comply with both. Hopefully, the policy will so

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
	clear, we will have policies on conflict, that will guide us through that. It is a discussion between MOE and the municipality. We would try to resolve it that way.
If we do a road work, we have to do a Class EA and there are different classes associated with different kinds of road work, for example. If there is an existing road that goes along the shore of Lake Simcoe, then when you propose to do that road work, with the conflict be resolved during the EA process, for example?	It could be, an EA for sure.
Because clearly expanding the road to 6 lanes from 4 may be in conflict.	The way Class EA work now is you need to do the checklist, the municipality is responsible.
So, this is going to be on the checklist?	Yes.
That is part of the answer, where and when do we make the determination.	The Class EA.
It is kind of late for the municipality because we have already budgeted and planned. I am wondering if during the EA is a little late to decide if it is a 4-lane or 6-lane.	When you plan for that type of infrastructure development you are planning for a number of things, the carrying capacity of the road, the AADT requirements, turning lanes, etc. There are engineering requirements based on need. When you do get to the EA you are actually requesting what you feel you need from an engineering perspective, so it is a little late. It is an effective date. If there is a policy in here though that should be considered in coming with what you end up submitting for your EA. You do not wait for the EA to come back and say by the way, there a policy that you completely ignored. You consider it up front. But if you did not, then the EA process is supposed to allow for that to happen. Changes can get made.
We have been talking a lot about using the subwatershed approach. I was wondering if that notion should be pulled through the Act a bit as well as the Plan, and including, for example, in the definition section, etc. There have been some really forward thinking recommendations from the policy group on that. I think it would be a good thing if they were reflected in law.	We passed out a package of maps. That came from the good discussion we had last week about subwatershed planning. We took the information that was in the natural heritage slides and put it on maps. We also spoke to the LSRCA and found out what their schedule of subwatershed planning was in the Oak Ridges Moraine as well as the additional work they are doing outside the Moraine and so there is a map of that as well. We took that information and put it into a tabular format for you, so you can look across the subwatersheds and see the percent cover, the percent wetlands. That was directly in response to that excellent discussion we had last week.
That is really good. I do think that this is going to be a way to pull the whole thing right through to the report out to the public as an approach to this, which I think is very progressive.	
I see us potentially heading down what I see as a legit issue with the Places to Grow plan. It was a great plan; it has won planning awards all across North America. And then someone finally stood up and said how are we going to implement it. Mayor McCallion says it best: show me the money any time she is talking to the province about infrastructure. Regional Chair Gary Carr (Region of Halton) has taken on a campaign for fairness. He is saying if you are going to impose growth limits on us, or you are going to put growth on us, we do not have	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
the infrastructure in place to be able to pay for it. Now I fast forward and we are doing a great plan for Lake Simcoe. The Plan is going to include various thresholds, various targets. I read through the information that was presented last week, $117 million for retrofitting ponds, which is probably a drop in the bucket based on my experience. If all the sewage treatment plants have to be upgraded to a higher level of standard, which I think is going to be suggested to achieve any reduction in phosphorous, we are going to fail. Not because the Plan is not good, but we cannot implement it if it is not cost effective. I would like you to reverse your thought process and come with some thoughts on how we are going to implement it financially. It is one thing to say, and I appreciate there is a cost to not doing anything; I totally understand that, I am not disputing that point. At some point in time, there is going to be some real money has to be spent and it is going to come out of the one taxpayer in the province, you and I. Because there is only one taxpayer. I can see a local politician saying, legitimately, if you are asking me to hit these targets, from a growth perspective or from an environmental perspective, our tax payer cannot afford. When you come forward next week with a financial plan, tell me how you are going to connect the targets with the financial realities that we are all going to be faced with. Because without the financial question being answered, the best plans are going to fail. I do not think anyone in the room wants to be associated with that.	
In terms of policies for governing the requirements for management of stormwater and wastewater, and it is probably more of an implementation question, and back to this transition. If I have a subdivision approved, draft approved, who gets to determine compliance on those remaining approvals that are still required and the answer is municipalities. That is what I heard. I am supportive of targets. In terms of the sewage treatment targets of 44 tonnes. What happens for a project that has capacity within a sewage treatment plant today, does one get to in today because you comply with the existing limits on that plant and you delay doing the upgrades to the plant until the capacity of that plant has been reached? I would like an example of an existing subdivision, within an urban area, and how do we get through to building permits. What check off list do we have to go through that says I had certain approvals, I may need new approvals because of the Plan, how do I get there? Sewage treatment plant, to me, is one of the key items. Are there going to be different rules to the subdivision that is not registered and serviced, than those that are registered and serviced? When does one trigger the targets of this effluent limit in phosphorous? The example would be Places to Grow says to the municipality, you have to achieve certain densities, but it is done at a regional scale. I am assuming that the Plan is going to say that phosphorous targets will be done on a regional scale and you have tried to divide them down into 6 or 7 categories. Is each category self-standing? Urban will be given 7 tonnes of	I do not think there is an answer to that question yet. Certainly, we are going to be looking at a subwatershed approach to help inform how we would approach those kinds of allocation targets.

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
phosphorous, a portioning of targets, do we have the technology today to be able to look at a plan and say yes you are allocated "x" grams of phosphorous per acre, you have achieved that. You can go past the approvals stage.	
All I would want, and let us stick within the urban envelope, and again there is a myriad of approvals, you are 2 years before you know whether you know if you want to go to trading. That bothered me because I thought trading was on the mark from day 1. In the absence of knowing whether urban development can achieve its targets, then I am not so comfortable. It was asked very specifically at the last meeting, are you endorsing the 44 tonnes. As a target, I endorse it. If I cannot achieve it from the urban side, then I cannot endorse it. I have emailed Bruce Macgregor saying you have sewage treatment plants, so what population do you have tributary to your plants? With Places to Grow, can you meet that target?	It is a lake target right now.
In terms of talking about amendments to the Plan, I certainly support getting the Plan right in the first place so we do not have a lot of amendments to the Plan. That would be ideal. But in the case where you do need to make amendments to the Plan, I do not think a hearing officer is the best idea. Why would it not be the Minister or a representative from MOE and not someone as ambiguous as a hearing officer who would review proposed amendments to the Plan?	The onus stays on the Minister and Cabinet to make a decision on the amendments. The hearing officer is a mechanism to help resolve issues and reach the point of having recommendations if it is necessary.
It is just an intermediary?	Yes.
The point remains that we do not think that a hearing officer is necessarily accountable enough or it is a filter that may be replaced with someone who is more accountable to the public.	We thought the public accountability was there because it does ultimately come back to the Minister and Cabinet to actually make the decision. The hearing officer is a way to help beyond any impacts.
With respect to process, many agencies already have responded to the EBR posting of Bill 99. I am sure individuals and people around the table had a role in those comments. Under the EBR legislation, is there any obligation now on the provincial government to do anything with the comments that come through that EBR posting and what specifically is that obligation?	We have an obligation to take into account the comments. We do look at them, we do compile them and we do present them to the Minster. We put them into whatever policy thinking we are doing. There is a decision notice that then has to be put on the registry. That decision notice tells you how we took into account those comments.
That decision notice, how does that factor into our timing here, will we see that before the second reading?	You will see the Plan in 2 weeks. Once a decision has been made, essentially, the Minister has to say how they considered the comments in making that decision but that is sort of after the fact, after it becomes it law, it would be after second reading. As far as this group is concerned, just as part of the consultation, there has been some commitment to have further discussions about possible amendments. We are summarizing the comments that we have received. Our commitment is to share with you the comments that we can legally share. The comment period closes on Saturday and we are in the process of compiling them. We did print off a few of them today hoping that we could get them into tabular format today, but we did not get to that. We will share those with you.
This section deals with the Lake Simcoe Science Committee. Under that it talks about the Science Committee providing advice to the Minister with respect to ii) current significant	

Questions/Comments from SAC	Responses from PDT – if necessary
threats and potential significant threats to the ecological health of the Lake Simcoe watershed. I think that the Science Committee should be able to identify threats to the watershed and potential future threats. While I am not happy about the use of significant threats in the content of the Plan, I understand the difficulty in getting that changed. I do believe that the Science Committee should be looking at threats and not significant threats; that they should not have to deal with this other bar. If the Science Committee is doing their job they are going to be able to advise the Minister on things that are happening to the lake that may well turn out to be extremely significantly. They should be able to advise the Minister on threats.	