



***Draft Proposed Assessment Report:  
Overview of major comments and how they have  
been addressed***

SPC meeting

October 21, 2010

## *Mapping Comments*

- Map legends sometimes very small and may not be legible if the map was reduced to half the size.
  - Some maps revised to ensure legibility at ½ size. Remaining maps are considered to meet rules. All maps are provided digitally and can have printing sizes modified if necessary.
- Some maps showed both WHPA-C and WHPA-C1, which is not in compliance to the Technical Rules.
  - Maps were revised to show only WHPA-C where it had been delineated. These were all RJB figures.

## ***Water Budget Comments***

- Mainly editorial comments involving rewording to text/tables.
  - **All text/tables have been revised as suggested by the comments.**
- Many comments on revising wording within the text to align with the Technical Rules.
  - **All Text has been revised to align with Technical Rules.**
- Some comments not addressed as pending comments from official peer review.

## ***Groundwater Vulnerability Comments***

- The method used to determine aquifer vulnerability within the Peel Region WHPAs was not an approved method (same as York Region's) and therefore an application to use an alternative method needs to be submitted and approved.
  - **Peel Region is in the process of applying for the alternative method.**
- There was some confusion regarding the aquifer vulnerability delineated for the HVAs (Chapter 4) and the aquifer vulnerability delineated for municipal WHPAs.
  - **More text was added to Chapter 4 (Regional GW Vulnerability) to make this clear.**

## ***Surface water intakes - IPZ***

- Maximum IPZ-3 vulnerability score leads to scores in some cases being greater than IPZ-2 – not allowed according to rules
  - No longer using maximum and using IPZ-3 score for each intake. Maps and text revised.
- Questioned whether IPZ-1 delineation has been undertaken according to the rules.
  - Explained that all IPZs delineation according to rules except Washago/Sandcastle
- No 120m set back for Washago/Sandcastle IPZ-1.
  - Explained that high degree of uncertainty due complex hydrology and so applied this conservative approach. Further analysis required if revision required.

## *Issues*

- Report did not include some required content when an Issue has been identified.
- **Report being revised to include:**
  - **Areas where issues are a significant threat**
  - **Provide table of all potential circumstances leading to issue**
  - **Statements in regards to no local Circumstances being identified and whether related Conditions are identified**

## *Threats*

- Most comments relate to managed lands and requesting that more detailed methods be included:
  - Clarify that the methods used were in accordance with the MOE guidance bulletins
  - To be consistent with all other sections of the report a detailed methodology is provided in the appendix, thus avoiding repetition of the same information