



POLICY PAPER

Cutting Taxes to Protect the Lake

*A Riparian Stewardship Tax Incentive for the Lake Simcoe
Watershed*

Nolan Welsh, Research and Policy Associate

Jonathan Scott, Executive Director

Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition

October 2026

This paper presents a policy proposal for discussion. Legislative and regulatory drafting should be undertaken in consultation with Ontario legislative counsel, the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority and affected municipalities.

Contents

The Proposal	1
Why Ontario Should Act	3
What Existing Models Show	5
Designing and Testing the Pilot	7
Conclusion	11
Notes	13
Bibliography	14
About the Authors	15

THE PROPOSAL AT A GLANCE

- Exempt the assessed value of a certified riparian buffer from property tax. Homes, farm buildings and other improvements stay taxable.
- Build on the existing Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program and MPAC assessment process, with the half-acre minimum reduced or waived.
- Reimburse municipalities for 100% of forgone municipal tax revenue, so no municipality carries the cost.
- Add restoration cost-sharing and an annual stewardship payment for participating farmers.
- Run as a voluntary pilot: three-year intake, ten-year agreements, at least five years of evaluation.

SECTION 1

The Proposal

As outlined in the Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition's "Protect Our Plan: From Good Goals to Practical Progress" (2025) report, Ontario should establish a Lake Simcoe Riparian Stewardship Tax Incentive Pilot to reward private landowners who protect or restore naturalized areas along the lake and its rivers, streams and wetlands.

Under the proposed model, the assessed value attributable to a qualifying riparian buffer would be exempt from property tax. The exemption would apply only to the certified environmental area. The dwelling, cottage, farm buildings, access routes, landscaped amenity areas and other improvements would remain taxable. A riparian buffer is an area of permanent vegetation beside a shoreline, river, stream or wetland. Depending on its design and location, it can slow overland runoff, encourage infiltration, capture sediment-bound nutrients, stabilize eroding banks, shade streams, moderate water temperature, and provide wildlife and aquatic habitat.

The program would be built, as much as possible, on Ontario's existing Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program (CLTIP), and the assessment processes administered by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC). CLTIP already provides a 100% property-tax exemption for qualifying portions of properties containing certain provincially important natural heritage features. Where only part of a parcel qualifies, MPAC already has a process for separating the eligible portion from the remainder of the property.¹ The proposal would expand that existing framework by recognizing qualifying riparian buffers within the Lake Simcoe watershed as an eligible conservation-land category. It would also reduce or waive CLTIP's ordinary minimum-area requirement of 0.2 hectares, or one-half acre, for this category. That change is necessary because many ecologically valuable buffers are long and narrow and as such would not meet the existing minimum, particularly on developed shoreline properties.²

The Province would reimburse lower-tier, upper-tier and single-tier municipalities for 100% of the municipal property-tax revenue forgone. Ontario would absorb the education-tax component directly. Municipalities would therefore apply the exemption through the property-tax system without suffering a net revenue loss. The Province should also help cover the costs to the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) and its successor organization, the Lake Huron Regional Conservation Authority (LHRCA), to administer the program.

The program would include two enrolment streams. Under a protection stream, landowners with existing high-quality riparian buffers would receive the tax exemption in return for

entering into a long-term stewardship agreement. Under a restoration stream, owners of degraded shorelines or streambanks would receive technical assistance and cost-sharing for planting, fencing, erosion control, drainage correction and invasive-species management. The full exemption would begin once the restored area meets an approved establishment standard.

Farm properties qualifying for Ontario's farm property class are already taxed at no more than 25% of the applicable residential rate, meaning that a tax exemption alone may be too small to compensate farmers for retiring productive land or assuming ongoing management responsibilities.³ An agricultural supplement would recognize those opportunity costs and would draw on the practical experience of Alternative Land Use Services (ALUS), which provides participating farmers with technical support and annual payments for maintaining projects that produce ecological goods and services.⁴

Eligibility would be determined through a site-specific stewardship plan submitted by the property owner and approved by the LSRCA. A 2- to 3-metre naturalized buffer would be the objective for agricultural, rural and undeveloped properties wherever feasible. The LSRCA would retain discretion to require wider buffers on steep, erodible or highly connected sites and to approve equivalent designs where a uniform width would not produce the best ecological result. Participating owners would enter into a ten-year stewardship agreement. The agreement would identify and map the eligible area, establish maintenance requirements, permit proportionate monitoring and provide reasonable remedies for non-compliance. A new owner could assume the agreement when a property is sold. Intentional destruction or premature withdrawal could result in termination and repayment of a proportionate share of the benefit, while damage caused by flooding, ice, drought, pests or other events beyond the owner's reasonable control would be addressed through an approved restoration plan.

The pilot would accept enrolment for three years and would operate in at least two contrasting settings: an agricultural tributary landscape, such as the Holland Marsh, and a mixed shoreline, residential and rural landscape selected by the LSRCA. Evaluation would continue for at least five years so that restored vegetation would have time to establish and the ecological, fiscal and administrative performance of the program could be assessed.

The proposal is not intended to replace environmental regulation or pay landowners merely to comply with existing legal obligations. It is intended to secure additional protection, restoration and long-term management that would not otherwise occur.

SECTION 2

Why Ontario Should Act

Lake Simcoe is one of southern Ontario's most important ecological, agricultural and recreational assets. Its 3,612-square-kilometre watershed spans 22 municipalities, includes some of Canada's most productive farmland, provides drinking water to seven municipalities, and supports a provincially significant all-season fishery. More than 500,000 people currently live in the watershed, with the population projected to reach approximately 900,000 by 2051.⁵

The lake nevertheless remains under considerable environmental pressure. Despite significant efforts and an overall reduction from their peak, LSRCA calculated phosphorus loads at a three-year average of 71.3 tonnes, which is substantially above the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan's long-term objective of 44 tonnes per year.⁶ Excess phosphorus contributes to excessive aquatic plant and algae growth. When this organic material decomposes, it consumes dissolved oxygen required by lake trout, lake whitefish and other coldwater species.⁷ Phosphorus loading is affected by precipitation, tributary flows and seasonal conditions, so annual figures vary and should not be treated as a simple scorecard. The long-term evidence nonetheless demonstrates that further phosphorus reduction remains necessary.

71.3

tonnes
3-year average

**44**

tonnes
Plan objective

Annual phosphorus load to Lake Simcoe against the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan's long-term objective. Loads vary with precipitation and tributary flow, so single years are not a scorecard.

Phosphorus is also not the lake's only stressor. Ontario's latest monitoring report identifies climate change, invasive species, urbanization and rising chloride concentrations as significant pressures. Quagga mussels, water soldier, warmer temperatures, changing ice cover, increased water clarity and altered nutrient cycling have changed how Lake Simcoe functions.⁸ The lake therefore requires an integrated strategy that includes wastewater treatment, stormwater management, agricultural best practices, septic maintenance, development controls, road-salt reduction and natural heritage protection.

Riparian buffers are one practical part of that broader strategy. A 2022 analysis of 36 peer-reviewed studies estimated the average phosphorus-removal effectiveness of riparian

buffers at 54.5%.⁹ These authors emphasized, however, that effectiveness varied significantly according to soil, slope, vegetation, buffer width, hydrology and seasonal conditions. Bare soil, saturated conditions and snowmelt could substantially reduce performance. That evidence supports the expansion of properly designed buffers, but it does not justify promising that every buffer will remove a fixed percentage of phosphorus. Water must pass through the buffer rather than bypass it through hard surfaces, tile outlets, ditches or concentrated flow paths. Vegetation must be suited to local conditions and maintained over time. Buffer width must also reflect the physical characteristics and ecological objectives of the site.

54.5%

average phosphorus removal across 36 studies

Effectiveness varied significantly with soil, slope, vegetation, buffer width, hydrology and season. The figure supports expanding well-designed buffers. It is not a guarantee that any single buffer will perform at this rate.

Ontario's Lake Simcoe Protection Plan ("the Plan") already recognizes the importance of shoreline and streamside naturalization. The Plan uses 30 metres as an important benchmark for vegetation protection and encourages the renaturalization of public shorelines and streamside areas to at least 30 metres where practical and feasible. It also encourages owners of existing cottages and residences to naturalize shorelines and streamside areas.¹⁰

The challenge is that much of the land capable of delivering these benefits is privately owned. Regulation remains necessary to prevent new environmental harm, particularly where development, site alteration or vegetation removal is proposed. Regulation, however, is designed primarily to establish minimum standards and control harmful activity. It does not necessarily persuade an owner to restore a shoreline that has been maintained as a lawn for decades, retire a cultivated strip beside a stream, install livestock fencing or assume a long-term obligation to control invasive species. Those actions impose real costs. Restoration may require site planning, the installation of native plants, trees, fencing, erosion-control works, and alternative livestock-watering systems, as well as regular annual maintenance. Agricultural owners may forgo crop or pasture revenue. Residential owners may surrender lawn space, views or recreational space. The public receives many of the resulting ecological benefits, but the individual owner carries much of the cost. That is the central policy gap. Preventing new harm and encouraging additional restoration are related but separate goals. A strong environmental regime should achieve both.

The proposed incentive should therefore complement existing regulation. A property

should not qualify for benefits where a buffer is already required through a development approval, subdivision agreement, site plan, conservation-authority permission or other binding legal instrument. An owner could qualify only for additional width, higher ecological performance, a longer stewardship commitment or restoration beyond the existing requirement. The Province is better placed than individual municipalities to establish the program. Water and pollutants cross municipal boundaries. A buffer in one municipality may provide downstream benefits in another. If municipalities were expected to finance the tax reduction themselves, those with extensive shorelines, tributaries or agricultural areas would bear a disproportionate cost. Local participation would vary according to fiscal capacity and political priorities, undermining a consistent watershed-wide approach.

The Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008 expressly authorizes policies respecting stewardship programs, pilot programs, best management practices, research, monitoring and public outreach.¹¹ The Plan also states that implementation should be cost-effective, maximize watershed benefit and recognize the fiscal circumstances of those responsible for carrying it out.¹² A provincially funded pilot is therefore consistent with both the statute and the Plan's implementation philosophy. The objective is not to suggest that a tax incentive will solve every Lake Simcoe problem. It will not replace wastewater improvements, stormwater retrofits, septic programs, agricultural nutrient management or road-salt reduction. Its strongest rationale lies in phosphorus and sediment management, erosion control, natural cover, habitat and climate resilience. It should be advanced as a targeted measure that fills a specific private-land stewardship gap.

SECTION 3

What Existing Models Show

Ontario does not need to create the proposed program from nothing. Existing provincial, Canadian and international programs provide most of the required legal, administrative and policy precedents.

The closest Ontario comparator is the CLTIP. The program provides a 100% property-tax exemption for qualifying portions of properties containing specified natural heritage features, including provincially significant wetlands, provincially significant areas of natural and scientific interest, certain endangered-species habitat, Niagara Escarpment Natural Areas and qualifying community conservation lands.¹³ CLTIP demonstrates that Ontario can use the property-tax system to recognize public ecological benefits provided by privately owned land. It also provides an existing administrative chain. The Ministry of Natural Resources identifies or approves eligible land, landowners apply and commit to protecting

it, MPAC adjusts the property's tax treatment and municipalities apply the exemption. Participating owners must maintain eligibility and permit inspection where required.¹⁴

The principal limitation is not institutional capacity, but eligibility. Ordinary riparian buffers are not currently eligible unless they happen to fall within another listed category. The current half-acre minimum is also poorly suited to linear buffers on developed properties. A 100-foot-wide shoreline lot with a 50-foot-deep buffer contains approximately 5,000 square feet, or only 0.115 acres. Such a buffer could be ecologically meaningful while remaining far below the present minimum.

MPAC's existing process addresses another important concern. Where only part of a property qualifies under CLTIP, MPAC can separate the tax treatment of the eligible land from the remainder of the parcel. Buildings, improvements and the land associated with their use remain taxable.¹⁵ A Lake Simcoe program can therefore be designed so that a valuable waterfront residence does not receive a general exemption. Only the apportioned assessed value of the certified environmental buffer would qualify.

Ontario's farm property class provides a further design lesson. As previously mentioned, eligible farmland is taxed at no more than 25% of the municipal residential rate, while the residence and associated land remain taxed at the residential rate.¹⁶ This means that a tax exemption on a relatively small agricultural buffer may produce only modest annual savings. In some cases, the financial benefit would be far lower than the value of the land removed from production. The property-tax component should therefore be supplemented rather than abandoned. Residential, recreational and rural owners may respond to the tax exemption itself. Agricultural owners are more likely to require establishment assistance and an ongoing payment tied to acreage and management obligations.

Alternative Land Use Systems (ALUS) provides the strongest Canadian comparator for that agricultural stream. Working through local partnerships, ALUS provides farmers with technical assistance and annual per-acre payments for environmental projects. Eligible work can include riparian buffers, wetlands, windbreaks, erosion-control projects, livestock-exclusion fencing and alternative watering systems. The importance of the ALUS model lies not only in the payment. Projects are designed with local knowledge and integrated into working farm operations. Payments recognize that ecological goods and services require ongoing management rather than a one-time installation. The program also generally emphasizes new or enhanced environmental benefits rather than paying indiscriminately for every existing natural feature.

Three lessons follow for Lake Simcoe. Participation should be voluntary and practically delivered. Landowners should receive technical support rather than simply a list of regulatory specifications. Agricultural payments should continue for as long as the agreed ecological service is being provided.

Virginia's Riparian Forest Buffer Tax Credit offers a narrower but useful international precedent. A landowner harvesting timber beside a mapped waterway may claim an income-tax credit for preserving a forested buffer under a certified Forest Stewardship Plan. The buffer must generally be between 35 and 300 feet wide, remain in place for at least 15 years and undergo annual verification. The credit equals 25% of the value of the retained timber, up to \$17,500, and may be repaid if the buffer is harvested prematurely.¹⁷ Virginia's program is not a general property-tax exemption and is principally connected to forestry. Its value lies in demonstrating that a tax benefit can be tied to defined buffer standards, technical certification, a long-term commitment, continuing verification and repayment for early removal.

North Carolina's conservation tax credit provides a different precedent. The program offers an income-tax credit based on the fair market value of qualifying donated conservation land or interests. Eligible purposes include farmland and forest protection, wildlife conservation and floodplain protection. The legislation caps individual and aggregate benefits and excludes dedications already required by regulation or ordinance.¹⁸ The North Carolina model therefore contributes two important design principles. First, governments can limit fiscal exposure while testing a conservation incentive. Second, public benefits should be reserved for additional conservation rather than ordinary legal compliance.

Taken together, these comparators point toward a clear Lake Simcoe model. Ontario should use its existing conservation-land assessment system rather than create an entirely separate municipal rebate program. Relief should apply only to the qualifying land, not to buildings or improvements. Agricultural participation should be supported by annual payments and technical assistance. Benefits should be tied to a durable agreement, independent certification and proportionate monitoring. Land already subject to a binding conservation requirement should not qualify unless the owner provides an additional ecological benefit.

The proposal is therefore not an untested invention. It combines components already operating in Ontario and elsewhere into a Lake Simcoe-specific pilot.

SECTION 4

Designing and Testing the Pilot

The pilot's purpose should be to increase the area, quality and permanence of naturalized riparian land in parts of the Lake Simcoe watershed where private-land stewardship can produce meaningful environmental benefit.

The program should apply to privately owned properties adjoining Lake Simcoe, Lake Couchiching within the watershed, permanent or intermittent streams, rivers, tributaries,

wetlands and other hydrologically connected features approved by the LSRCA. Eligibility should depend on ecological function, not merely proximity to water. Each participating property should have an LSRCA-approved stewardship plan identifying the certified area, existing conditions, restoration requirements and long-term maintenance obligations.

Qualifying areas should consist predominantly of native trees, shrubs, grasses, sedges or other deep-rooted perennial vegetation appropriate to local conditions. Routine tillage and fertilizer use should be prohibited. Livestock should be excluded, with fencing and alternative watering supported where necessary. Pesticide use should generally be prohibited except for approved invasive-species control. Concentrated runoff, tile outlets and drainage channels should be addressed so that pollutants do not simply bypass the buffer.

The program should distinguish between protection and restoration. Existing high-quality buffers could qualify immediately if they are not already legally protected and the owner enters a ten-year stewardship agreement. This would provide a meaningful incentive to secure natural features that could otherwise be degraded or removed. Degraded properties would enter the restoration stream. The Province would provide cost-sharing for eligible work and the full tax exemption would begin once the LSRCA certified that the buffer had been established. A direct establishment grant would be simpler than asking MPAC to administer several temporary levels of tax relief while vegetation matures.

Agricultural properties would receive an additional annual stewardship payment. The rate should not be fixed before consultation and economic modelling. It should reflect the acreage enrolled, the management obligations, the productivity of the land and the importance of the site. Priority should generally be given to marginal, erosion-prone, frequently saturated or environmentally sensitive areas rather than removing highly productive farmland without a strong ecological rationale.

Once a site is certified, the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks would approve eligibility and transmit the required information to MPAC. MPAC would apportion the assessment and identify the qualifying land as exempt. The municipality would apply the exemption to the tax bill. Ontario should reimburse the municipal portion of the exemption automatically. In a two-tier municipality, both the lower-tier and upper-tier amounts would be replaced. The transfer could be calculated through a straightforward annual reconciliation:

Provincial reimbursement = eligible exempt assessment × applicable municipal tax rate or rates

The Province should provide interim payments based on the approved assessment roll and reconcile in-year changes later. Municipalities should not have to apply to a discretionary grant program after their budgets have been adopted.

Before launch, MPAC and the LSRCA should conduct a parcel-level fiscal analysis. The Province needs reliable estimates of the number of potentially eligible properties, the assessed value of qualifying land, participation under different program designs, municipal revenue implications, restoration costs, administrative costs and the agricultural payment required to produce meaningful uptake. The pilot's financial exposure can be managed through a three-year intake cap and an annual appropriation. Priority could be given to sites with strong hydrologic connection, significant restoration potential and a high likelihood of long-term success. A cap should be informed by assessment data rather than an arbitrary per-property limit.

Administration should divide responsibility according to institutional expertise. The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks should sponsor the policy, align it with the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and oversee evaluation. The Ministry of Natural Resources should administer the conservation-land eligibility framework. The Ministry of Finance should fund and reconcile municipal reimbursement. MPAC should determine assessment treatment. The LSRCA should lead landowner outreach, site planning, certification, technical assistance and ecological monitoring.

The LSRCA is the logical delivery body because it already conducts watershed monitoring and works with municipalities and private landowners on planning, restoration and stewardship matters. The Province should provide new funding for this role rather than requiring the Authority to absorb the work through existing municipal levies or core programs.

The application process should remain straightforward. A landowner would submit an expression of interest and basic property information. The LSRCA would undertake a desk-top review, confirm that the proposed benefit is additional to existing legal obligations and conduct a site assessment where appropriate. An approved stewardship plan would then be transmitted for provincial eligibility approval and MPAC processing.

Monitoring should combine annual landowner confirmation, dated photographs, GIS and aerial-image screening and risk-based field inspection. Remote sensing can identify major vegetation removal or land disturbance, but it cannot determine every ecological condition. Some ground verification will remain necessary. Drones may sometimes be useful, but should not become the central monitoring tool. Any drone use should follow applicable law, be proportionate to the purpose and operate under a published privacy and data-retention policy.

Non-compliance should be addressed proportionately. Minor deficiencies should result in notice and a reasonable opportunity to correct the problem. Damage caused by flood, ice, drought, fire, pests or other events outside the owner's control should trigger an approved restoration plan rather than automatic repayment. Negligent failure to maintain the site

could result in suspension, while intentional removal or development contrary to the agreement could lead to termination and proportionate recovery of previous benefits.

The pilot should also permit landowners to combine complementary forms of support where they pay for different things. A restoration grant might pay for plants and fencing, an annual payment might support agricultural opportunity and maintenance costs and a tax exemption might recognize the continuing conservation status of the land. The same expense or ecological service should not be paid twice, and applicants should be required to disclose other public or charitable funding.

The pilot should be introduced through a staged implementation process. First, Ontario should establish an inter-ministerial working group with MPAC, the LSRCA and municipal finance representatives. The working group would map potential parcels, estimate fiscal exposure, define the required legal changes and develop the stewardship agreement. Second, the Province should consult Indigenous communities, municipalities, farm organizations, shoreline and cottage associations, environmental organizations, assessment professionals and prospective participants. Third, Ontario should establish the eligible riparian category, municipal reimbursement mechanism, monitoring rules, privacy policy and administrative workflow. If the required assessment amendments cannot be completed promptly, Ontario could begin with a temporary direct grant calculated to approximate the intended tax benefit and migrate participants into the CLTIP-based structure once it is operational. Fourth, the Province should open a capped three-year intake in at least two contrasting pilot areas. One should focus on an agricultural tributary landscape. The other should include a mix of shoreline, residential and rural properties. Final selection should be made by the LSRCA using current information on riparian condition, phosphorus and sediment pathways, restoration opportunity, landowner readiness and municipal support. Finally, Ontario should evaluate the program before deciding whether it should be expanded and adapted for other parts of the province.

The evaluation framework must distinguish between participation, ecological outcomes, fiscal performance, durability, fairness and administrative feasibility. Participation measures should include the number and type of properties enrolled, hectares and kilometres protected or restored, geographic distribution, completion rates and participation among agricultural, rural, residential and recreational owners. Ecological measures should include vegetation establishment and survival, buffer width and condition, livestock exclusion, erosion control, changes in exposed soil and modelled reductions in sediment and phosphorus. Where practical, participating sites should be compared with baseline or non-participating sites. Estimates should include uncertainty ranges and should not present modelled reductions as directly measured results.

Whole-lake phosphorus loading should continue to be monitored as an important environ-

mental indicator, but it should not serve as the sole or primary measure of pilot success. Annual lake loads are influenced by weather, tributary flow, wastewater, atmospheric deposition, septic systems, agricultural activities and other factors beyond the scale of the program.¹⁹

Fiscal measures should include the amount of municipal revenue reimbursed, restoration and agricultural payments, administrative and monitoring costs, cost per hectare enrolled, cost per kilometre protected and cost per modelled kilogram of phosphorus reduced. These costs should be compared with relevant alternative interventions, while recognizing that riparian buffers also provide erosion, habitat, flood-management and climate-resilience benefits that may not be captured in a single phosphorus calculation.

Durability measures should include annual compliance, restoration survival, maintenance deficiencies, corrective action, withdrawal, property transfers and renewal. A program that enrolls many properties but fails to maintain them would not represent lasting success.

Fairness should be evaluated explicitly. Ontario should report the distribution of benefits by property class, property value, municipality and land-use type. It should publish average and median benefits and determine whether payments are proportionate to ecological value. This information will be essential to demonstrate that the program is not primarily a tax reduction for wealthy property owners.

Administrative performance should include application-processing times, cost per application, inspection frequency, assessment appeals, participant satisfaction and municipal satisfaction. The pilot should not be expanded if it requires disproportionate administrative effort relative to the environmental benefits achieved.

The program should be considered successful if it produces additional riparian protection and restoration, attracts participation across different land uses, maintains high compliance and vegetation survival, protects municipalities from revenue loss, delivers benefits at a reasonable public cost and can be administered without excessive complexity.

SECTION 5

Conclusion

Lake Simcoe's protection has always depended on shared responsibility. The Province establishes the statutory and policy framework. Municipalities manage land use, infrastructure and taxation. The LSRCA provides watershed science and delivery expertise. Private landowners control many of the shorelines, streambanks and fields where protection and restoration must occur.

Ontario's current framework does not fully align those responsibilities. Regulation can prevent new harm, but does not always induce voluntary restoration or compensate owners who provide a continuing public ecological benefit. Municipalities cannot reasonably be expected to finance a watershed-wide tax incentive from their local property-tax bases. Agricultural owners may face opportunity and maintenance costs that are far greater than the value of a conventional land-tax exemption.

A Lake Simcoe Riparian Stewardship Tax Incentive would address those gaps. It would use Ontario's existing conservation-tax and assessment infrastructure, limit tax relief to the qualifying environmental area, keep municipalities financially whole and provide additional assistance where restoration or agricultural participation requires it.

The proposal is intentionally structured as a pilot. Important fiscal, assessment and participation questions must be answered through parcel-level modelling and real-world implementation. Ecological performance must be measured honestly and with appropriate uncertainty. The program should not promise that every buffer will remove the same share of phosphorus or that natural infrastructure can replace every engineered intervention. What it can offer is a fair and practical exchange: public support in return for defined, verifiable and sustained private-land stewardship.

Ontario already possesses the legislative authority, assessment machinery, watershed expertise and program precedents needed to test that exchange. A carefully designed Lake Simcoe pilot would determine whether property-tax relief, restoration support and agricultural stewardship payments can together produce cleaner water, healthier shorelines and a more durable partnership with the people who own and care for the land.

REFERENCES

Notes

1. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, “Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program,” accessed July 28, 2026; Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, “Managed Forest or Conservation Land,” accessed July 28, 2026.
2. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, “Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program,” section “What Is Eligible.”
3. Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness, “Farm Property Class Tax Rate Program,” accessed July 28, 2026.
4. ALUS, “Frequently Asked Questions,” accessed July 28, 2026; ALUS, “ALUS Ontario East,” accessed July 28, 2026.
5. Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, “Introduction,” Lake Simcoe 15-Year Monitoring Report, updated June 22, 2026.
6. Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, “Phosphorus Loads Update 2021–2023,” “Summary,” accessed July 28, 2026.
7. Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, “Phosphorus Loads Update 2021–2023,” section “The Effect of Phosphorus Loading on Lake Simcoe’s Coldwater Fishery.”
8. Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, Lake Simcoe 15-Year Monitoring Report, “Highlights” and “A Changing Lake,” updated June 22, 2026.
9. Yushiou Tsai, Hope M. Zabronsky, Asim Zia and Brian Beckage, “Efficacy of Riparian Buffers in Phosphorus Removal: A Meta-Analysis,” *Frontiers in Water* 4 (2022): article 882560, <https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2022.882560>.
10. Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (Toronto: Queen’s Printer for Ontario, 2009), chapter 6, particularly policies 6.11, 6.14 and 6.15.
11. Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008, S.O. 2008, c. 23, ss. 4–5, particularly s. 5(2), paras. 11–16.
12. Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, chapter 1, “Implementation of the Plan.”
13. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, “Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program,” section “What Is Eligible.”
14. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, “Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program,” sections “How It Works,” “How to Apply” and “How to Stay Enrolled.”
15. Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, “Managed Forest or Conservation Land,” sections “Assessing Conservation Lands” and “How These Programs Work.”
16. Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness, “Farm Property Class Tax Rate Program.”
17. Virginia Code § 58.1-339.10, “Riparian Forest Buffer Protection for Waterways Tax Credit”; see also Virginia Code § 58.1-439.12.
18. North Carolina General Statutes §§ 105-153.11 and 105-130.34A; North Carolina Department of Revenue, “NC Conservation Tax Credit,” Directive TA-25-1, revised February 5, 2026.
19. Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, “Phosphorus Loads Update 2021–2023,” section “Calculating the 2021–2023 Loads to Lake Simcoe.”

SOURCES

Bibliography

GOVERNMENT AND LEGAL SOURCES

Lake Simcoe Protection Act, 2008, S.O. 2008, c. 23.

Municipal Property Assessment Corporation. “Managed Forest or Conservation Land.”

North Carolina Department of Revenue. “NC Conservation Tax Credit.” Directive TA-25-1. Revised February 5, 2026.

North Carolina General Statutes. §§ 105-130.34A and 105-153.11.

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness. “Farm Property Class Tax Rate Program.”

Ontario Ministry of the Environment. Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. 2009.

Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks. Lake Simcoe 15-Year Monitoring Report. Updated June 22, 2026.

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. “Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program.”

Ontario Regulation 282/98, General, under the Assessment Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. A.31.

Virginia Code. §§ 58.1-339.10 and 58.1-439.12.

ACADEMIC AND TECHNICAL SOURCES

Tsai, Yushiou, Hope M. Zabronsky, Asim Zia and Brian Beckage. “Efficacy of Riparian Buffers in Phosphorus Removal: A Meta-Analysis.” *Frontiers in Water* 4 (2022): article 882560.

ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAM MATERIALS

ALUS. “ALUS Ontario East.”

ALUS. “Frequently Asked Questions.”

Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. “Phosphorus Loads Update 2021–2023.”

Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. “Planning.”

Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition. *Protect Our Plan: From Good Goals to Practical Progress*. November 2025.

COLOPHON

About the Authors

Nolan Welsh is RLSC's Research and Policy Associate. He is an economics major at McGill University. Nolan completed internships at Queen's Park and for his local Member of Parliament, and was recently commissioned as a trainee officer in the Canadian Armed Forces.

Jonathan Scott is Executive Director of RLSC. He has served as a municipal councillor and chair of a conservation authority, and works at the intersection of land-use, environmental protection and public policy advising clients across the country. He holds a Master of Laws from the University of Toronto and an MBA from Queen's University, and teaches at Queen's University Faculty of Law.

RLSC thanks the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority's technical staff and the Holland Marsh Growers' Association for their review of this policy paper. This work was funded in part by the Ontario Greenbelt Foundation.



Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition

We work to protect and restore the health of Lake Simcoe and its watershed through research, public education and practical policy.

rescuelakesimcoe.org