

Comment number	Source of Comment	Chapter	Page	Section	Review comment	SWP Region Response
G1	Internal	5		Table 5-6 to 5-11 - The "are or would be tables"	These tables have now been updated and need to swapped out with the new ones. This change will need to occur for all chapter 5s.	All tables have been replaced with new ones.
G2	MOE (Ministry of Environment)			all mapping	Legends are very small in most cases. Typeface and symbols may not be legible if the map was reduced to half its original size (Technical Rule 12).	All map legends are legible at 8 1/2 x 11. Some figures were revised to improve the resolution of the legend. All maps are provided digitally and can have printing sizes modified if necessary.
G3	MOE			all mapping	A number of maps show both WHPA-C and WHPA-C1 either in the legend or, in some cases, actually delineates both for a WHPA on the map. Technical Rules 47 and 48 only allow the delineation of WHPA-C or WHPA-C1. This must be corrected (e.g. NV AR, Chapter 18) in all cases in all ARs for the SPR.	Maps are revised to only indicate either WHPA-C or WHPA-C1 not both.
G4	MOE			Groundwater Vulnerability	It was indicated in Chapter 4 of each AR that the Aquifer Vulnerability Index (AVI) method was used to determine groundwater vulnerability across most of the SPR. However, in some instances other methods (ISI and WWAT) were applied, as documented in the individual well supply sections. Such contradictions to the documented use of groundwater vulnerability methods must be resolved. In addition, the Water table to Well Advective Time (WWAT) method is not an acceptable method under the Technical Rules and has only been accepted as an alternate method by the Director for those supplies within the Regional Municipality of York. In other areas (e.g. NV AR, Chapter 7 Peel Region) it has not been accepted and therefore a method from Technical Rule 37 must be used unless an application for an alternative method is submitted and approved.	1. Text was revised in Chapter 4 to make it clear that this chapter only deals with Regional Groundwater Vulnerability (i.e. HVAs and SGRAs). It also now refers the reader to the individual municipal chapters for information on the groundwater vulnerability methods used for each system. 2. Peel is in the process of applying to the director for a rule change request for the use of WWAT method.
G5	MOE			Groundwater Vulnerability	Transport pathways are considered in the analysis of groundwater vulnerability within the WHPAs. However, it is often unclear from the text and/or the mapping where these areas are and where groundwater vulnerability ranking has been changed. This must described and clearly shown on maps to comply with Technical Rules 5(2), 9(1)(i) and 38(2).	Text has been revised to make clear that if transport pathways are present then they are identified on the vulnerability score map with an increase in VS in 30m radius.
G6	MOE			Groundwater Vulnerability	Where wells are considered as transport pathways, the reason for applying a 30-metre buffer must be consistently provided in all ARs and identified as transport pathways in all cases (some are, some are not) on the accompanying maps and figures.	Methodology to identify transport pathways differed depending on who lead the study (CA vs. municipality). There were a number of consultants involved and although consistency across the region was aimed for it was not always possible. For most of the region a 30-metre buffer around well identified as transport pathways were used (including rationale for using 30m buffer) and the details on the methodologies for transport pathways have been provided in the appendix.
G7	CKL (City of Kawartha Lakes)			Appendices	Please ensure biographies of SPC members are in Appendices	The SPC member biographies are available at www.ourwatershed.ca
G8	CKL	Summary	16		Use "City of Kawartha Lakes" instead of Kawartha Lakes	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G9	CKL	Summary	33-36		remove all references to Palmina in the well system name in text and on tables. The well system should be referred to as Western Trent	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G10	CKL	Summary	33	Para 1	1st para-typo use <u>are located</u> instead of <u>is</u> when referring to Wood of Manilla and Woodville.	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G11	CKL	Summary	34-		1st line should read Kawartha Conservation watershed.	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G12	CKL	Summary	34		under Threats-quotations are incomplete	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G13	CKL	Summary	34		under conditions add "there are no confirmed Conditions for Western Trent"	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G14	CKL	Summary	34		under number of significant threats, include explanation about enumeration of fuel threats i.e. difference between TCC and SGBLS methods.	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G15	CKL	Summary	35/36		add footnote to clarify how fuel threats were enumerated or that the methods for TCC and SGBLS were different.	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G16	CKL	Summary	36		threat 21 should be "1 parcel" instead of 0	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G17	CKL	Summary	124	2nd para	1st sentence-typo should be <u>to</u> .	This comment refers to the summary report and will be addressed at a later date
G18	Public				I appreciate the opportunity to hear about what is being started to protect our water, but I am disappointed there wasn't more info on the quality of our current water and the process of testing.	There is a section on water quality in both the watershed cahacterization chapters and in each municipal chapter.
G19	Public				We just receive the info package in the mail in the last week. Today we found out that the funding to help with the investigation and pump out of the septic systems has already been used up. We are willing to be proactive, but do not wish to incur unnecessary expense (retired - senior citizen).	It is not the intention of this consultation to require residents to incur unnecessary expenses prior to policies being developed. However, if residents would like to be proactive there should be additional stewardship (early response) funds available in the spring of 2011 to address activities that have been identified as threats.

Comments on Draft Proposed Assessment Report - Generic Comments (All Assessment Reports)

Comment number	Source of Comment	Chapter	Page	Section	Review comment	SWP Region Response
G20	Public			Rope IPZ	Note: Every winter we find an inordinate amount of salt dumped on the road in from of our property- this falls within the intake protection zone pointed out in your literature, and needs to be addressed.	The potential for salt to be a significant threat to the intakes has been addressed in the report. The proportion of impervious surface in the IPZ is used as a proxy for salt application, and greater than 80% of IPZ with impervious surface is needed to be a significant threat. For the Rope IPZ, impervious surface was less than 80% and therefore application of salt on roads is not considered a threat.
G21	Public				Note: As well as fertilizer use, what about incentives to reduce chemical use of cleaners for sinks, toilets, etc. Willing to be proactive but will incur even more expense than those outside the "boundaries"	It is not the intention of this consultation to require residents to incur unnecessary expenses prior to policies being developed. However, if residents would like to be proactive there should be additional stewardship (early response) funds available in the spring of 2011 to address activities that have been identified as threats.