

General				
Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> Assessment Report			How Comments Were Addressed by SPC	
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed</i> AR
0.1	Excellent Scope, content and presentation of the AR is great. Information is well presented and the format of the report is impeccable.	Friends of the Tay Watershed	Yes	N/A
0.2	Two Reports Required MOE requires that two Assessment Reports be prepared – one for the Mississippi watershed and one for the Rideau watershed.	MOE (comment 2)	Yes	Two <i>Proposed</i> ARs will be created to meet MOE’s legislative requirement.
	Combination of the two ARs in one document is an improvement over the two Terms of Reference.	Friends of the Tay Watershed		
0.3	Executive Summary The executive summary should appear first, ahead of the Table of Contents	CA staff	Yes	This change will be made in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs
0.4	Glossary Revision In the definition of Transportation Pathways, “transportation crossings” should be replaced with “transportation corridors”	Carleton Place OH	Yes	This revision will be made in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs
0.5	Glossary Addition Add a definition for lithology as it is used on page 5-9.	City of Ottawa	Yes	This definition will be added to the <i>Proposed</i> ARs

General				
Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>			How Comments Were Addressed by SPC	
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>
0.6	MOE Rules versus Guidance Correctly reference when something is a requirement under MOE's Technical Rules and when something is suggested in MOE guidance.	MOE (comment 1)	Yes	Any incorrect references will be fixed in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
0.7	Timeframe for Updating AR It is the SPC that determines when an AR needs to be updated, not the MOE	MOE (comment 3)	Yes	This change will be made in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
0.8	Name of Systems The name of municipal drinking water systems should be consistent with the Terms of Reference	MOE (comment 5)	Yes	The legal name of each municipal drinking water system will be referenced at the beginning of the <i>Proposed ARs</i> to match the Terms of Reference. The common name will then be used in the rest of the <i>Proposed ARs</i> .
0.9	Number of Systems Be consistent throughout the AR about how many municipal systems there are	MOE (comment 7)	Yes	This change will be made in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
0.10	Great Lakes Agreement AR must include statement about how the Great Lakes agreements were considered	MOE (comment 4)	Yes	A statement will be included in the <i>Proposed AR</i> stating that the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreements were considered in our work but did not warrant any actions because there is not a direct connection between the MRSPP and the Great Lakes or the St. Lawrence River.
0.11	GIS Layers Municipalities would like to receive the GIS layers from the Assessment Report	City of Ottawa Tay Valley	Yes	All municipalities will receive the GIS layers in the coming months

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
1.1	Provincial Funding The section called Provincial Funding on page 1-9 should be removed	MOE (comment 12)	Yes	This section will be removed in the <i>Proposed ARs</i> and captured in an Accompanying Document
1.2	Municipal Focus Page 1-10 indicates that municipalities are the focus of the Clean Water Act. This should be corrected to indicate that protecting municipal sources of drinking water is the focus of the Act.	MOE (comment 13)	Yes	The first bullet on page 1-10 will be revised in the <i>Proposed ARs</i> .
1.3	Ottawa River Watershed Section 1.4.7 should be reworded to remove reference to the need for a broader inter-jurisdictional committee. This section should be limited to discussing work with Gatineau on identifying potential threats to the City of Ottawa intakes	MOE (comment 14)	Yes	Section 1.4.7 will be reworded to remove reference to the need for an inter-jurisdictional committee. Additional wording will be added regarding work with Ville de Gatineau.
1.4	MNR Water Budget Role MNR's water budget role is not project management, they lead the water budget portion of the AR and assist and guide regions to complete this technical component	MOE (comment 37)	Yes	Section 1.3 will be revised to reflect that MNR's role in source protection planning is overseeing the water budget component.
1.5	Threats and Issues Do not refer to significant threats as being prioritized in source protection planning. Issues are not subject to policies.	MOE (comment 46)	Yes	Section 1.5.2 will be corrected in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>

Chapter 1 – Introduction				
Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>			How Comments Were Addressed by SPC	
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>
1.6	Clusters of Private Wells The “Future: Protecting Other Systems” must be modified to remove reference to MOE advising municipalities to wait to designated clusters of private wells	MOE (comment 11)	Yes	This section will be removed in the <i>Proposed ARs</i> and captured in an Accompanying Document

Chapter 2 – Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region (watershed characterization)				
Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>			How Comments Were Addressed by SPC	
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>
2.1	Physiography Section 2.2.2 contains a typo – MVSPA is noted twice, the second reference should be RVSPA	MOE (comment 26)	Yes	This correction will be made in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>

Chapter 3 – Water Budget

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
3.1	Water Stresses Rename Section 3.4.1 “Sub-watershed Surface Water Stresses”	Tay Valley	Yes	This change will be made in the <i>Proposed ARs</i> . Section 3.4.2 will also be renamed “Sub-watershed Groundwater Stresses” to be consistent.
3.2	Quarry Dewatering Is quarry dewatering included in the groundwater takings described in the water budget?	City of Ottawa	Yes	The Tier 1 water budget incorporated all Permits to Take Water issued for quarry dewatering.
3.3	Size of Areas and Region On page 3-5 indicate the size of the two Source Protection Areas and the Region	MOE (comment 38)	Yes	The sizes will be included in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
3.4	Table of Water Takings A table should be included that identifies all the types of water takings in the region	MOE (comment 39)	Yes	A new table will be included in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
3.5	Population Increase Include the percentage in population increased used in the future demand scenarios and the source of the information	MOE (comment 40)	Yes	This percentage and the source of the information will be included in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
3.6	PTTW Were actual takings or permitted takings used in the Permit to Take Water calculations	MOE (comment 41)	Yes	This will be clarified in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>

Chapter 3 – Water Budget

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
3.7	Consumptive Factors Put the consumptive factors in Appendix 3-3 and 3-4 into a new table in the AR	MOE (comment 42)	Yes	A table will be added to the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
3.8	Future Scenario Provide a sentence describing the results of the future scenario under the surface water stress section	MOE (comment 43)	Yes	A statement will be added to the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
3.9	Size of Areas Add a column to Table 3-3 indicating the size of each area being assessed	MOE (comment 44)	Yes	A column will be added in the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
3.10	Additional Maps Maps are required to show the groundwater stress assessment and surface water stress assessment for each subwatershed.	MOE (comment 45)	Yes	Two additional maps will be added to the <i>Proposed ARs</i> , one showing groundwater stress assessment results and one showing surface water stress assessment results. The current map will be revised to show only the moderately stressed areas (groundwater or surface water)

Chapter 4 – Drinking Water Quality Threats and Issues Approach

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
4.1	Salvage Yards Why are waste disposal sites, but not salvage yards, identified as a threat category	Tay Valley	Yes	The Provincial Threats Tables identify land use <u>activities</u> involving chemicals or pathogens as drinking water threats (e.g. handling and storage of fuel, DNAPLs or solvents). The tables do not list broad land uses categories, such as a salvage yard, as drinking water threats because the land use itself does not pose a contamination threat. It is specific activities associated with that land use that may pose a threat.
4.2	Threat #20 What does threat # 20 (“activity that reduces the recharge of an aquifer”) entail	Tay Valley	Yes	A Tier 2 or 3 water budget can identify significant drinking water threats pertaining to water quantity. These threats would fall under threat 19 and 20 of the Prescribed Drinking Water Threats list (from Ontario Regulation 287/07). A Tier 2 or 3 water budget was not done for the Mississippi-Rideau region because the Tier 1 results did not identify any water quantity stresses that warranted further study. An example of an activity that reduces the recharge of an aquifer is creating impervious surfaces such as roads and parking lots.
4.3	Cumulative Impacts of Development Is the impact of cumulative development considered a threat (e.g. subdivisions on private septic systems in an IPZ)	Tay Valley Carleton Place OH Friends of the Tay Watershed	No	MOE did a hazard rating for all land use activities that involve a chemical or pathogen and that determined which are considered a significant drinking water threat in certain sections of a Wellhead Protection Area or Intake Protection Zone (depends on the vulnerability score). The threats that pertain to residential land uses are septic systems and home heating oil (furnace oil). In the Provincial Threats Tables these are only considered threats close to municipal wells, not intakes.

Chapter 4 – Drinking Water Quality Threats and Issues Approach

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>
4.4	Wildlife Is wildlife (e.g. geese) being assessed as a potential drinking water threat	Kemptville OH Carleton Place OH	No	Currently, if a SPC can define a human land use activity that is resulting in a threat (e.g. waterfowl are congregating near a municipal intake because adjacent shorelines are void of vegetation) the SPC can apply to MOE to include the activity on the list of prescribed drinking water threats. The SPC will continue to follow up with MOE on this concern.
4.5	Heating Oil Tanks Provide a greater explanation of how home heating oil tanks in basements were enumerated in the Mississippi-Rideau region	City of Ottawa	Yes	Additional wording will be added to the <i>Proposed ARs</i> to explain that since no information was available regarding how people heated homes and business (e.g. oil or other methods) the significant threats enumeration had to assume all buildings had a tank of furnace oil in the basement. A property questionnaire was mailed to property owners with their significant threats notice to collect information to help refine this inflated enumeration.
4.6	Tay River Spills Encourage government agencies that are responsible for monitoring spills to provide a follow up report to the local community after a spill to alleviate concerns about the safety of a water source	Friends of the Tay Watershed	Yes	The SPC will consider this comment when developing their Source Protection Plans.

Chapter 4 – Drinking Water Quality Threats and Issues Approach

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
4.7	Quarries Quarries should be identified as a drinking water threat since they fit the description.	Tom Graham	No	The Province did not designate quarries as a threat, they designated them a transport pathway because quarries increase the vulnerability of groundwater to contamination by reducing the protection above it (soil thickness above the aquifer). Resource extraction requires permits to restrict such operations from exposing the water table. If an operation is going to do that they have to put safeguards in place (different permit). Other activities related to quarries (on site fuel storage) may be considered a threat if they match the list of prescribed threats.
4.8	SGRA Definition Section 4.1 provides an incorrect description of Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas – they are not areas of high groundwater vulnerability.	MOE (comment 27)	Yes	This section of the description will be deleted from the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
4.9	Significant Threats Summary Table A summary table for significant threats should be provided for each kind of threat as opposed to each drinking water system	SPC member	Yes	A new table will be added to the <i>Proposed ARs</i> that tabulates the number of significant threats by Prescribed Drinking Water Category for both groundwater and surface water systems.

Chapter 5 – Groundwater Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> Assessment Report		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed</i> AR	
5.1	Ottawa Municipal Wells City staff endorse the delineation and vulnerability scoring of the three City of Ottawa Wellhead Protection Areas	City of Ottawa	Yes	N/A
5.2	Lanark Contamination The word “approximate” should be removed in describing the Issue Contributing Area on page 5-17 so it is consistent with figure 5-2b.	MOE (comment 8)	Yes	In the <i>Proposed</i> ARs, the word “approximate” will be added to figures 5-2a and 5-2b which shows the Issue Contributing Area for Lanark Village’s groundwater contamination.
5.3	Map Labels Figures 5-8a, 5-8b and 5-11b are inconsistent. Individual wells names should be labeled.	MOE (comment 9 and 10)	Yes	In the <i>Proposed</i> ARs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> figure 5-8b will be relabeled “<u>Kemptville Municipal Wells, Kernahan St, Alfred St and Van Buren St</u>” figure 5-11b will be relabeled “<u>Munster Municipal Wells 1 and 2</u>” and “<u>Richmond Municipal Wells 1 and 2</u>”
5.4	Modified ISI Method Methodology, rationale and limitations for modified approach must be documented	MOE (comments 21 and 28)	Yes	Pages 5-6 to 5-10 explain the modified ISI methodology and why it was used in the Mississippi-Rideau region.
5.5	Consistent Stratigraphy There are inconsistencies about which WHPAs have the Ottawa and Oxford/March formation above the Nepean formation.	MOE (comment 22)	Yes	Inconsistencies will be corrected in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs
5.6	Model Type What numerical model was used to delineate the WHPAs	MOE (comment 23)	Yes	MODFLOW was used to delineate all WHPAs, this will be stated in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs.

Chapter 5 – Groundwater Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> Assessment Report		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed</i> AR
5.7	Ratio of WHPA-C to WHPA-D In some cases WHPA-C (5 year) is 50% of the area of WHPA-D (25 year). This should be clearly explained in the report	MOE (comment 24)	Yes This situation only applies to 2 of the 7 WHPAs in the Mississippi-Rideau region: Munster and Richmond. The furthest extent of these WHPA-Ds is a wetland, where significant groundwater recharge is occurring. Shortly after in WHPA-C, groundwater flow slows considerably and remains steady towards the well. This explanation will be added to the <i>Proposed</i> ARs.
5.8	Transport Pathways It must be clearly explained what considerations resulted in transport pathways increasing the intrinsic vulnerability in a WHPA and maps must show these areas.	MOE (comments 25 and 31)	Yes Although this information is already provided in the report and shown on figures (e.g. Section 5.5.2), the text will be reviewed to ensure consistency and clarity.
5.9	What is a WHPA Section 5.3.1 needs to reword the definition of a WHPA and remove the word “zone” when talking about WHPA areas (including Table 5-viii)	MOE (comment 29)	Yes This section will be corrected in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs
5.10	Vulnerability Scoring Incorrect vulnerability scores shown for WHPA-C in Table 5-x	MOE (comment 30)	Yes This will be corrected in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs
5.11	Vulnerability – Munster Provide justification for increasing intrinsic vulnerability because of high density wells and sewer services and for considering ponds a transport pathway.	MOE (comment 32)	Yes A justification for increasing intrinsic vulnerability because of high density wells and sewer services and for considering ponds a transport pathway will be included in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs

Chapter 5 – Groundwater Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> Assessment Report		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed</i> AR	
5.12	Vulnerability – Richmond King’s Park Clarify that clay deposits increase vulnerability in this WHPA	MOE (comment 33)	Yes	The clay deposits in the Richmond King’s Park shallow WHPA range from 4 to 8 metres thick resulting in high and medium intrinsic vulnerability. Clay deposits only provide low intrinsic vulnerability if the clay is relatively thick/deep. This will be clarified in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs
5.13	Westport Not GUDI The Assessment Report should indicate whether or not wells in this system are connected to a surface water source that short circuits the groundwater flow system. If so, a WHPA-E is required for Westport	MOE (comment 34)	Yes	Confirmation will be provided in the <i>Proposed</i> AR that wells 2 and 3 are not connected to a surface water source.
5.14	Westport Cross-Section This cross section is limited in the horizon axis	MOE (comment 35)	No	This WHPA study was completed by a different consultant and a cross-section was requested to match those provided by the other WHPA consultants. Figure 5-12b is what was provided. These cross-sections are not required in the Technical Rules and were included to provide the reader with a better understanding of what the aquifer looks like underneath the ground.
5.15	Uncertainty Analysis Local knowledge was not considered in the uncertainty analysis, only the uncertainty of the data was considered.	MOE (comment 36)	No	We based our uncertainty analysis solely on the data used in the study, there was not sufficient time, nor a scientific method, to cross reference local knowledge against the study findings and consider this when determining the uncertainty analysis.
5.16	Transportation Corridors Greater clarity is required to explain why transportation corridors are not threats in this region. A discussion about spill response would be appropriate	MOE (comment 47)	Yes	This section will be revised to be more accurate in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs

Chapter 5 – Groundwater Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> Assessment Report		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed</i> AR
5.17	<p>Sewage Lagoon Sewage lagoons are not conditions because the activity still exists, they are captured as an activity threat.</p>	MOE (comment 48)	Yes	This correction will be made in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs
5.18	<p>Issue Contributing Areas Documentation of issues must include a list of drinking water threats that contribute or may contribute to the parameter or pathogen of concern. Better documentation of how the issue contributing areas were delineated is also requested.</p>	MOE (comment 50 and 51)	Yes	Additional information will be provided in the <i>Proposed</i> ARs

Chapter 5 – Groundwater Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> Assessment Report		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed</i> AR	
5.19	<p>Quarries and Intrinsic Vulnerability Chapter 5 should integrate the following wording from the Niagara Peninsula Source Protection Area (NPSPA): “Aggregate operations, i.e. pits and quarries, are transport pathways because they reduce the amount of overlying material to filter and/or attenuate contaminants. In the NPSPA there are 31 authorized aggregate sites, and 103 historic pit and quarry locations. The vulnerability category for historic and licensed pits and quarries were raised to high as there is no protection to the aquifer. These locations are already generally classed as highly vulnerable (Table 4.2) because they are often sited where the resource is close to surface and correspond with overburden or bedrock aquifers.”</p>	Tom Graham	Yes	The following wording will be added to sections of Chapter 5 where a quarry has created a transport pathway: bedrock quarries are transport pathways because they reduce the amount of overlying material to filter and/or attenuate contaminants.

Chapter 6 – Surface Water Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
6.1	IPZ-1 and 2 for Ottawa Intakes City staff endorse the delineation and vulnerability scoring of IPZ-1 and IPZ-2 for the two City of Ottawa Intakes.	City of Ottawa	Yes	N/A
6.2	Revise IPZ-3 for Ottawa Intakes City of Ottawa staff would like the area vulnerability factors in IPZ-3 for the Ottawa intakes to be changed to 8 within the 24 hour time-of-travel and 4 beyond the 24 hour time-of-travel zone.	City of Ottawa	Yes	The City of Ottawa will work with source water staff and MOE technical experts to explore an alternative approach to scoring the Ottawa River IPZ-3s. City staff will report back to the SPC in sufficient time to allow the SPC to consider requesting an Assessment Report update.
6.3	Golf Course in Perth IPZ-1 The Town of Perth's water treatment plant should test their raw water after heavy precipitation for chemicals applied to the golf course, not just after each application as is done now. Shoreline planting should also be encouraged to prevent runoff.	Friends of the Tay Watershed	Yes	This comment will be forwarded to the Town of Perth's water treatment plant staff.
6.4	Storm Sewers Concerned that untreated stormwater from Perth enters the Tay River so pleased that Perth's entire storm sewershed was included in IPZ-2 and that Smiths Falls' sewers were included in IPZ-3.	Friends of the Tay Watershed	Yes	N/A

Chapter 6 – Surface Water Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
6.5	Tay River Control Structures The effect of Parks Canada's water management regime involving the control structure at Bolingbroke should be considered in relation to water flow and possible contamination opportunities	Friends of the Tay Watershed	Yes	Staff will explore this concern and any new information will be integrated into a future updated Assessment Report.
6.6	Smiths Falls WTP Additional wording is required to explain that the old back-up intake is not being studied and that all regulatory requirements to exempt it were met	MOE (comment 6)	Yes	This additional wording will be added to the <i>Proposed ARs</i>
6.7	Section 6.2 The first paragraph in this section along with the subsections called "The Debate" and "Provincial Technical Guidance Requested" should be removed.	MOE (comment 15)	Yes	Section 6.2 will be revised in the <i>Proposed ARs</i> as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.2 will be renamed "<u>Developing a Local Methodology that Meets the Provincial Technical Rules</u>" • First paragraph will be removed • Subsections called "First Time for Surface Water Studies" and "Current Technical Rules for Surface Water Vulnerability Scores" will be kept • Subsection called "The Debate" will be renamed "Developing a Local Methodology" and it will be reworded to focus on how the SPC met the technical rules. It will not raise concerns about the current Provincial Technical Rules. • Subsection called "Provincial Technical Guidance Requested" will be deleted and captured in an Accompanying Document

Chapter 6 – Surface Water Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
6.8	Wind Conditions AR must include basic information about what wind conditions were applied to extend IPZ-2	MOE (comment 18)	Yes	An appendix about the wind conditions that were applied will be included in the <i>Proposed ARs</i> .
6.9	Smiths Falls Is emergency intake 0m from shore? How can the emergency intake and the main intake have the same source vulnerability factor of 1.0 when one is so much further from shore and deeper in the river than the other?	MOE (comment 19)	Yes	The Smiths Falls emergency intake is right on the shore so it is 0 metres from shore. There are two source vulnerability factors that can be assigned to an intake, 0.9 or 1.0. The two Smiths Falls intakes are both less than 2 metres deep and both less than 30 metres from shore. The Ottawa River intakes were assigned 0.9 because they are hundreds of meters from shore and very deep in the river, all other intakes were assigned 1.0 because there are much closer to shore and shallower in comparison to the Ottawa River.
6.10	Ottawa River IPZ-1 Are there hydrodynamic conditions that would allow the IPZ-1 200 meter semi-circle to be extended to a full circle	MOE (comment 20a)	Yes	The study consultant is currently providing a response to this comment and the responses will be included in the <i>Proposed ARs</i> .
6.11	Ottawa Sewer Systems What sewer discharge or storm event was used to delineate IPZ-2	MOE (comment 20b)	Yes	Half full sewer conditions were used to delineate IPZ-2. This clarification will be added to the <i>Proposed ARs</i> .
6.12	Assigning Area Vulnerability Was the preliminary IPZ-2 delineated into Quebec used in assigning an area vulnerability factor for iPZ-2	MOE (comment 20c)	Yes	No, Quebec was not factored in when assigning the area vulnerability factor. Only the IPZ-2 delineated according to the Technical Rules was used to determine the area vulnerability factor.

Chapter 6 – Surface Water Sources

Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> Assessment Report		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
6.13	Chalk River IPZ-3 cannot be extended up to Chalk River	MOE (comment 49)	Yes	In the <i>Proposed ARs</i> , the map showing the AECL Chalk River Laboratory will be modified to simply show the laboratory location in relation to the Ottawa River intakes, no reference to an IPZ will be made. The discussion will be modified to be consistent.
6.14	Wetland Mapping A small wetland shown near the Smiths Falls intake is not longer present.	Smiths Falls	No	Unfortunately, the MNR data sets used by the study consultants did show the wetland to be present. It is acknowledged that the most current MNR wetlands data set does not show the wetland. The new data will be incorporated at the first available update opportunity.
6.15	Impervious Surface Map It is difficult to see the colour contrast between the time of travel delineations for IPZ2 or WHPA-B and the 8-80% impervious surface designation.	SPC member	No	The line colours for the WHPAs and IPZs will be changed in the updated Assessment Report to provide more contrast.

Chapter 8 – Data Gaps and Future Work

Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> Assessment Report		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
8.1	Data Gaps Data gaps must meet the intent of the Director's Memo dated October 2009.	MOE (comment 16)	Yes	All data gaps listed in section 8.1 meet the intent of the Director's Memo, all other knowledge gaps are listed as knowledge limitations in section 8.2

Chapter 8 – Data Gaps and Future Work

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
8.2	<p>Refining Significant Threats Count Section 8.1.2 should be removed, refining the significant threats count is not in scope for the updated AR.</p>	MOE (comment 17)	Yes	MOE indicates refining the significant threats count is not an efficient use of time or financial resources. Our threats count will be updated by June, 2011 because property owners are returning completed property questionnaires that were mailed out with the Significant Threat notices on October 12, 2010. Also our numbers could drop if municipal well casings are deepened in Kemptville and Merrickville (vulnerability scores will decrease in large areas). Since no staff time or financial resources are involved in refining the count, any revised counts will be provided to the MOE by June, 2011 as AR updates.

Chapter 9 – Findings and Considerations

Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>		How Comments Were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>	
9.1	<p>Additional Summary Table A new table should be added summarizing how many of each type of significant drinking water threat was enumerated.</p>	SPC member	Yes	A new table will be added that identifies how many potential significant drinking water threats were enumerated in the Mississippi-Rideau region for each threat category

Other				
Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>			How Comments Were Addressed by SPC	
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>
10.1	Extending Municipal Well Casing: Municipal well casings should be extended down into the Nepean aquifer in Kemptville and Merrickville to reduce the intrinsic vulnerability of their source water	Kemptville OH Carleton Place OH	Yes	The SPC has pushed for this project to be funded through the ODWSP and both the Municipality of North Grenville and the Village of Merrickville-Wolford applied again for ODWSP funding during the latest round of applications. A response is expected in the new year. This project would substantially reduce the number of potential significant drinking water threats in the Kemptville and Merrickville Wellhead Protection Areas.
10.2	Municipal Implementation Costs Municipalities are concerned they may have to bear costs to implement the Source Protection Plan (e.g. cost of hiring a Risk Management Official)	Tay Valley Carleton Place OH Perth OH Carp OH Kemptville OH	Yes	The SPC has lobbied for stable long-term provincial funding through the final three phases of the source protection program (implementation of the Plan, monitoring of Plan policies and review and updating of the Plan). The SPC will continue to raise this concern on behalf of our member municipalities.
10.3	Compensation Compensation should be given to property owners financially impacted by Source Protection Plan policies (e.g. cost of implementing a policy or costs associated with increased taxes because property now taxed as residential rather than agriculture)	Carleton Place OH Perth OH Carp OH Kemptville OH	Yes	Since their formation the SPC has been pushing for a generous ODWSP program to continue beyond 2012 so that property owners can access funding to help them implement Source Protection Plan policies. The SPC will consider including the following statement in their Source Protection Plan objectives: “the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee expects a level of financial commitment from the province of Ontario to ensure the successful implementation of Source Protection Plan policies. The SPC also expects that landowners will not be unduly affected by the implementation of these policies” (Better Farming, November 2010).

Other				
Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>			How Comments Were Addressed by SPC	
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>
10.4	Private Wells Source Protection policies must protect all wells, not just municipal wells.	Kempville OH Tom Graham	Yes	A municipal council or the Minister of the Environment can designate a cluster of private wells or intakes to be included in the source protection planning process. MOE is developing guidance to help municipalities identify which clusters, if any, a municipality may want to designate. The question of who pays to study such clusters has not been answered yet so municipalities have been advised by the MOE to wait to make this decision.
10.5	Harmful Activities in Rural Areas Delineating a Wellhead Protection Area or Intake Protection Zone is having the effect of pushing harmful activities such as bedrock extraction quarries into vulnerable rural areas serviced by private wells.	Tom Graham	Yes	The SPC will consider this comment when developing their Source Protection Plans and this concern will be captured in an Accompanying Document
10.6	HVAs and SGRAs These vulnerable areas must be protected from all potential risks, especially intrusive and potentially harmful activities such as bedrock extraction. Municipalities must integrate all vulnerable areas into their planning policies in order to best protect all local residents	Tom Graham	Yes	Highly Vulnerable Aquifers (HVA) and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (SGRA) are mapped in the AR. The SPC cannot impose mandatory policies in these areas through the Source Protection Plan but the Committee can develop voluntary policies and/or recommend municipalities protect these areas through their planning process (Official Plan and zoning policies). The SPC will consider this comment when developing their Source Protection Plans and this concern will be captured in an Accompanying Document .

Other				
Comments Received on <i>Draft Assessment Report</i>			How Comments Were Addressed by SPC	
Comment		Source	Addressed	Response or Integration into <i>Proposed AR</i>
10.7	<p>Carp Wastewater Collection Carp's municipal wastewater (sewage) is connected to the City of Ottawa's main trunk. The concern is that there is a large wastewater storage tank in Carp very close to the municipal well and that this could pose a threat if the tank ever cracked or leaked (e.g. earthquake).</p>	Carp OH	Yes	The collection and transmission and municipal wastewater is included in the provincial Threats Tables. When developing the Source Protection Plan the SPC will look into the facility in Carp and work with City staff to determine what safeguards or risk management measures are in place to prevent a leak and what spill response measures are in place if there was a leak.
10.8	<p>Tay River Vulnerable The Tay River IPZ has a substantial number of potential significant threats identified. As a small, shallow river an especially precautionary approach should be used when developing source protection policies to provide adequate protection.</p>	Friends of the Tay Watershed	Yes	The SPC will consider this comment when developing their Source Protection Plans.
10.9	<p>Policies by Municipality In the Source Protection Plan, present policies by municipality as well as by Wellhead Protection Area / Intake Protection Zone.</p>	Tay Valley	Yes	The SPC will consider this comment when developing their Source Protection Plans.