

Summary of: Comments Received on *Draft* Terms of Reference & How They Were Addressed

Development of Terms of Reference (ToR):

Draft ToR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee (SPC) prepared draft ToR May 1 - Posted and advertised for public comment May 8 - 10 public open houses held between June 3 and 19 - Comments received until June 20
Proposed ToR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public comments on draft ToR reviewed and considered by SPC July 3 - SPC prepared proposed ToR July 3 - Posted and advertised for public comment July 18 - Comments accepted until September 5
Approved ToR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public comments reviewed by Source Protection Authorities late September - Proposed ToR & summary of public comments submitted to MOE mid October - Minister of the Environment will consider comments when reviewing and approving ToR

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
ToR - Executive Summary			
1	ToR needs to be shared with all municipalities, not just those with municipal drinking water systems.	MVFN	No In May a hard copy of the draft ToR was sent to all municipalities within the Source Protection Region with a cover letter requesting their comments. We had 10 open houses in June which were held in communities with municipal drinking water systems but they were open to anyone.
2	Clarify who will implement Source Protection Plans	Staff	Yes ToR text was amended as follows: "This will be achieved through Source Protection Plans which will be written locally, approved by the Minister of the Environment and implemented by municipalities, <u>MOE and/or conservation authorities</u> ". [ToR, pg 6]

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
3	Reference detailed work plans (Tables 5 and 6) where you've summarized the major tasks.	1 citizen	<p>Yes</p> <p>ToR text was amended as follows: "...major tasks have been identified to complete the Assessment Report. <u>These tasks are outlined in Table 5 and are contained in the following five categories:</u> [ToR, pg 6] "...major tasks have been identified to complete the Source Protection Plan. <u>These tasks are outlined in Table 6 and are contained in the following four categories:</u>" [ToR, pg 7]</p>
4	Correct number of tasks for Rideau Valley Assessment Report	Staff	<p>Yes</p> <p>ToR text was amended as follows: "<u>17</u> major tasks have been identified to complete the Assessment Report". [ToR for Rideau only, pg 6]</p>
5	Highlight items that would benefit from or depend on public participation.	CELA/ED, MVFN	<p>Yes</p> <p>ToR text was amended as follows: <u>"Other Key Issues Discussed in the Terms of Reference include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Funding for Implementation (Section 2.2)</u> • <u>Municipal and Public Participation in the Source Protection Planning Process (Section 2.6)</u> • <u>Financial Assistance for Affected Property Owners (Section 2.7)</u> • <u>Inclusion of private wells, intakes and non-municipal systems (Section 4.2)"</u> [ToR, pg 7]</p>
6	Clarify and update note about future regulations and need to amend ToR	Staff	<p>Yes</p> <p>ToR text was amended as follows: <u>"Note: As the Ministry of the Environment provides additional regulations and guidance on Assessment Reports and Source Protection Plans, Terms of Reference may require amendment."</u>[ToR, pg 7 & 9]</p>

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
ToR – 1.0 Introduction			
1	Include a mission statement	CELA/ED, FoTW & MVFN	<p>ToR text was amended as follows: <u>“The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee has adopted the following Mission Statement to guide their source protection work:</u></p> <p><u><i>The objective of the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee, in partnership with local communities and provincial authorities, is to develop plans and policies to protect the quality and quantity of sources of municipal drinking water within our region. The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee, in collaboration with Conservation Authorities and other Source Protection Committees, will gather science-based technical knowledge on which informed consensus-based decisions can be made. We will strive to propose policies in an open and consultative manner that are effective, economical and appropriate for local communities. We will make use of the available science to assess drinking water threats and issues; and where there is uncertainty, we will be mindful of the precautionary approach.</i></u> [ToR, pg 9]</p>
2	<p>Clearly define the precautionary principle and employ it in decision making about threats and mitigation policies.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The precautionary principle is employed in the absence of scientific knowledge so is the scientific research going to be minimized when assessing threats and developing policies?</p>	<p>CELA/ED, FoTW & MVFN</p> <p>-----</p> <p>1 citizen, AFA</p>	<p>Precautionary principle has been defined in the Glossary Section (see below) [ToR, pg 50]</p> <p>How the precautionary principle will be used in decision making is explained in the new Mission Statement under Section 1.0 (see above) [ToR, pg 9]</p> <p>The role of the precautionary principle in the development of Assessment Reports is already captured in the ToR under Section 2.1: “The scientific research underway to support these plans employs the precautionary principle”) [ToR, pg 10]</p> <p>The following reference was removed from the ToR as it was unclear: “<u>The Clean Water Act is a science-based approach which is inherently precautionary</u>”. [ToR, pg 87]</p>

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)	
3	Identify the scope of drinking water source protection early in the ToR (e.g. focused on WHPAs & IPZs, not entire watershed).	1 citizen, AFA	No	Our work currently focuses on protecting municipal source water (wellhead protection areas and intake protection zones). This scope could be broadened if municipal councils or the Minister of the Environment chooses to elevate “other” systems and/or MOE allows threats to be assessed and addressed in Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas. The first paragraph of the Executive Summary accurately describes the scope of our work as “...protect sources of drinking water, primarily sources of municipal drinking water”. [ToR, pg 6]
ToR - 2.1 Timing & Regulations				
1	Indicate when future Regulations will be released	2 citizens	No	We do not know when MOE will be releasing future regulations. We are given general timelines but they often change.
2	Identify the areas the first five regulations cover	1 citizen	Yes	ToR text was amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Clean Water Act and it’s first 5 regulations came into effect July 2007 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>These regulations defined Timelines and Source Protection Areas and Regions and provided rules for developing Source Protection Committees and Terms of Reference.</u> [ToR, pg 10]
3	MOE has not provide enough guidance regarding long-term implementation	Town of Smiths Falls	No	The SPC will continue to push for additional guidance from MOE on issues that are important to municipalities and the public (e.g. elevation of “other” systems, implementation funding). This is clearly documented throughout Section 2.0 [ToR, pg 10-14].

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)	
ToR - 2.2 Funding				
1	Municipalities are concerned about potential implementation costs they will have to incur	Town of Smiths Falls, City of Ottawa and individual Councillors from two other municipalities	No	The SPC and Conservation Authorities will continue to raise this issue at the Provincial level on behalf of all our municipalities. This is clearly documented in Section 2.2 [ToR, pg 10]
ToR - 2.6 Municipal and Public Participation				
1	Incorporate local and Aboriginal traditional knowledge	CELA/ED, FoTW & MVFN	Yes	ToR text was amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “<u>The Source Protection Committee and Conservation Authorities are committed to soliciting and including relevant local and traditional knowledge from First Nations, various interest groups and the general public</u>”. [ToR, pg 13] Our approved Public Engagement Strategy will also be revised to more clearly reflect this commitment.
2	Indicate that a cross-section of the public will be engaged in "peer reviews" of studies and reports.	1 citizen	No	Technical studies are being prepared by conservation authority technical staff, municipal staff and consultants. These studies will be peer reviewed by consultants before undergoing public consultation. The SPC can establish working groups to assist them with the development of reports. Multi-stakeholder working groups could be established to assist with the development of Source Protection Plan policies which should begin in 2010.
3	You have not established a good relationship with the farming community. Recent open houses were the first occasion for Landowners to talk to source protection staff.	1 citizen	No	Since 2005 staff have presented to a number of different groups including agricultural and landowner associations. Staff continues to seek new opportunities for dialogue with all interested groups and stakeholders as outlined in our approved Public Engagement Strategy.

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
4	You need to do a better job of dispelling false rumours (e.g. meters on private wells)	1 citizen	No MOE and the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region proactively dispel false rumours as they arise. This is accomplished through our approved Public Engagement Strategy. Both groups took a number of different steps to dispel the false rumour of meters on private wells.
ToR - 2.7 Financial Assistance for Affected Property Owners			
1	If the general population benefits from Source Protection Plans then the general population should pay for implementation	5 citizens	No The SPC and Conservation Authorities will continue to push for the provincial Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program to provide funding to landowners beyond 2012 to implement approved source protection plan policies. This is clearly documented in Section 2.7 [ToR, pg 13] An additional task has also been added under Section 7.0 to assess the costs and benefits of policies when developing Source Protection Plans (see below) [ToR, pg 42]. A new mission statement has also been included in Section 1.0 (see above) which states “we will strive to propose policies ... that are effective, economical and appropriate for local communities” [ToR, pg 9]
2	Investigate other financial instruments available locally to support the implement of source protection plans	AFA, OFEC & 1 citizen	No Staff recently produced a brochure listing all existing funding programs currently available in Eastern Ontario for stewardship projects. Staff will research other financial instruments that could be used to implement source protection plan policies. An additional task has also been added under Section 7.0 to assess the cost s and benefits of policies when developing Source Protection Plans (see below) [ToR, pg 42].

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
3	Compensation is required; the Government must pay for land they take.	1 citizen	<p>No</p> <p>Compensation is not permitted under the <i>Clean Water Act</i>, however the Act established a financial assistance program called the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program. The SPC and Conservation Authorities will continue to push for this program to provide funding to landowners beyond 2012 to implement approved source protection plan policies. This is clearly documented in Section 2.7 [ToR, pg 13]</p> <p>Staff will also research other financial instruments that could complement the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program. An additional task has also been added under Section 7.0 to assess the costs and benefits of policies when developing Source Protection Plans (see below) [ToR, pg 42].</p>

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
ToR - 3.0 The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region			
1	Ottawa River watershed should be shown on the watershed map. You must work with Ottawa and Quebec to protect the full watershed.	1 citizen	<p>ToR text was amended as follows: <u>“The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region is also part of the larger Ottawa River watershed. This watershed measures approximately 146,000 square kilometers, 34% of which is in Ontario and the rest is in Quebec. Our region makes up about 6% of the Ottawa River watershed. Under the <i>Clean Water Act</i> the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee can only develop source protection policies within the Mississippi and Rideau watersheds.</u></p> <p><u>A map of the Ottawa River watershed can be found on page 18.”</u> [ToR, pg 15]</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The Ottawa River watershed is a large inter-provincial area governed by many different groups. MOE and the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region have been establishing contacts and a working relationship with colleagues across the River in Quebec. Steps will be taken to establish additional contacts upstream on the Ontario side.</p> <p>This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting.</p>

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
ToR - 4.2 Other Drinking Water Systems			
1	Private wells and intakes should be protected through source protection planning ----- Source protection planning should remain focused on municipal systems and plan policies should be limited to WHPAs and IPZs.	FoTW, FOCA & I citizen ----- 3 citizens	No Clusters of private wells and intakes can be included in the source protection planning process by the Minister of the Environment or municipal councils. This option is outlined in Sec 4.2 of the ToR and further guidance on this issue is pending from MOE. The scope of evaluating and addressing threats in Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (outside of WHPAs and IPZs) will be determined by the pending Assessment Report Regulation and Director's Rules. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting.
2	State that the SPC will take an active role in encouraging municipal councils to elevate "other" systems, including working with MOE to develop guidance and funding for municipalities to make this happen.	1 citizen	No The SPC has pushed hard for MOE to provide sufficient guidance and funding to municipalities to enable them to decide whether or not to elevate "other" systems. Once MOE provides further guidance the Committee will evaluate under what circumstances it would be appropriate for them to encourage the elevation of systems.

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
3	Include a list of "other" drinking water systems, especially those regulated under the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002</i>	CELA/ED, FoTW, MVFN & 1 citizen	<p>Yes</p> <p>ToR text was amended as follows: "In the Rideau Valley Source Protection Area there are several of these systems that could potentially be included." was replaced with "<u>In the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region there are many clusters of private wells and intakes that could potentially be included. There are also approximately 600 public and private facilities designated under the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002</i> that could be included. Appendix 1 provides a summary of these facilities.</u>" [ToR, pg 25 (Appendix 1 is on pg 53)]</p> <p>Staff will compile a list of potential clusters of private wells and intakes once further guidance is received from MOE on elevating "other" systems.</p>
4	It should be required that communal systems or clusters of private wells serving new developments be elevated before municipalities can approve the development	1 citizen	<p>No</p> <p>Clusters of private wells and intakes can be included in the source protection planning process by the Minister of the Environment or municipal councils. This option is outlined in Sec 4.2 of the ToR and further guidance on including such systems in the source protection planning process is pending from MOE.</p>
5	It should be required that "Other" systems in Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas be elevated.	1 citizen	<p>No</p> <p>Clusters of private wells and intakes can be included in the source protection planning process by the Minister of the Environment or municipal councils. This option is outlined in Sec 4.2 of the ToR and further guidance on including such systems in the source protection planning process is pending from MOE.</p>
6	Priorities should be established for elevating "other" systems (e.g. those serving children)	CELA/ED & MVFN	<p>No</p> <p>Once further guidance is received from MOE on elevating "other" systems the SPC will evaluate under what circumstances it would be appropriate for them to prioritize such systems.</p>
7	Definition of "source water" should include private surface water intakes	FOCA	<p>No</p> <p>Clusters of private wells and intakes can be included in the source protection planning process by the Minister of the Environment or municipal councils. This option is outlined in Sec 4.2 of the ToR and further guidance on including such systems in the source protection planning process is pending from MOE. The definition of source water does not exclude private surface water intakes.</p>

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)	
ToR - 5.0 Matters Affecting Neighbouring Source Protection Committees				
1	Contacts need to be made for the Bonnechere and Madawaska watersheds	MVFN	No	MOE and the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Region have taken steps to establish contacts and working relationships with colleagues on the Quebec side and steps will be taken to establish additional contacts upstream on the Ontario side. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting.
2	Provide greater clarity in the title regarding Emergency Response on the Ottawa River	SPAs	Yes	ToR text was amended as follows: <u>"Sharing of Information with Agencies Responsible for Emergency Response on the Ottawa River"</u> [ToR, pg 27]
3	Cross-regional issues should be more clearly described such as defining relevant planning area, drawing up evaluation guidelines, and identification of parties to undertake these evaluations.	CELA/ED & MVFN	No	These specifics are largely unknown at this time. There are details required from future Regulations that will shape how these matters can be addressed. Once such details are known planning areas, evaluation guidelines, and lead agencies will be identified where appropriate.
4	Add climate change as an inter-regional issue	CELA/ED & MVFN	No	The pending Assessment Report Regulation and Rules will provide greater clarity on how climate change can be incorporated into source protection planning. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting.

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR			How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)	
ToR - 6.0 Work Plan and Budget for Assessment Report				
1	Watershed Characterization Study – if the scope is to compile existing information then this must be clearly stated early in the ToR.	1 citizen	Yes	“Identify and describe subwatersheds in the source protection area and <u>compile existing information on watershed characteristics (such as water quality, surficial geology, rainfall patterns, etc.)</u> , vulnerable areas, threats, issues and concerns.” [ToR, pg 32]
2	Water Budget - Consider climate change and the need to adapt based on future projections	MVFN	No	The pending Assessment Report Regulation and Rules will provide greater clarity on how climate change can be incorporated into source protection planning. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting.
3	Groundwater Vulnerability Studies - Insert Council Resolutions from Municipalities leading Technical Studies	Staff	Yes	ToR text was amended as follows: “All Assessment Report tasks in the Rideau Valley Source Protection Area are being <i>led</i> by source water staff from the Mississippi Valley and Rideau Valley Conservation Authorities (CA staff) except for the vulnerability studies on the Westport municipal well and the City of Ottawa municipal intakes <u>which are being led by the municipality (see council resolutions on pages 38 and 39)</u> [ToR, pg 30]
4	Aquifer Vulnerability Study – Update vulnerability scores based on geological surveys and the risk of heavy metal contamination.	MVFN	No	The pending Assessment Report Regulation and Rules will provide greater clarity regarding the aquifer vulnerability study. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting. Vulnerability scores reflect how susceptible local groundwater or surface water is to contamination (e.g. is groundwater protected by overburden or not), vulnerability does not reflect if there are local threats present. Risk of contamination will be assessed in the threats evaluation.

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
5	Threats & Issues Evaluation – keep the scope limited to prevention of possible pollution, do not broaden it to the point where implementation could become impossible	1 citizen	No The pending Assessment Report Regulation and Rules will provide greater clarity regarding the threats and issues evaluation. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting.
6	Threats & Issues Evaluation – include geological risk factors for possible heavy metals	MVFN	No The pending Assessment Report Regulation and Rules will provide greater clarity regarding the threats and issues evaluation. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the Source Protection Committee at their August 7 meeting.
7	Threats & Issues Evaluation – include climate change as threat for IPZs (e.g. higher water temperatures produce higher bacteria counts)	MVFN	No The pending Assessment Report Regulation and Rules will provide greater clarity on how climate change can be incorporated into source protection planning. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting.
8	Threats & Issues Evaluation – known or suspected threats with direct, indirect and cumulative impacts from point and non-point sources should be evaluated and addressed in Source Protection Plans	CELA/ED & MVFN	No The pending Assessment Report Regulation and Rules will provide greater clarity regarding the threats and issues evaluation. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting. Currently draft guidance requires that both known issues and potential threats to municipal source water be assessed (point and non-point sources, and direct, indirect or cumulative threats). How such threats are addressed in source protection plans will be the subject of a future regulation.

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft ToR</i>		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
9	Threats & Issues Evaluation – look at threats in the broader watershed, not just within WHPAs and IPZs (e.g. municipal sewage plants, uranium exploration)	4 citizens	No The pending Assessment Report Regulation and Rules will provide greater clarity regarding the threats and issues evaluation. This matter will be further reviewed within the context of the proposed Assessment Report Regulation and Rules currently posted on the EBR for public comment. A report will be considered by the SPC at their August 7 meeting.
10	Include social and economic data and analysis in Assessment Reports so that it is used when developing Source Protection Plan policies (e.g. attitudinal studies, review of past actions to implement watershed plan recommendations, listing of various public concerns and who is active within various drinking water system areas, trends in land use development).	1 citizen	No Some social and economic information is contained in the draft Watershed Characterization Report (e.g. watershed plan recommendations). Additional research will be undertaken to gather other socio-economic data to assist in the development of Source Protection Plans. This comment is further addressed in Section 7.0 (see below) where a task was added to assess the environmental, social and financial costs and benefits of potential source protection plan policies. [ToR, pg 42]
11	Residents and authorities for non-municipal systems need to be educated and have groundwater tested regularly for heavy metal contaminants.	MVFN	No If the SPC becomes aware of a potential threat to a non-municipal system that is beyond the scope of their work, they will notify the proper authorities to ensure that it is dealt with appropriately (e.g. Mississippi Valley Conservation is currently working with local residents and other agencies to raise awareness and undertake sampling for uranium in private drinking water).
12	Who are the people and consulting firms preparing the technical work? There is not much detail provided in the ToR.	1 citizen	No Conservation authority staff involved in technical studies are specialist in their fields (e.g. Professional Engineers, hydrogeologists) and a variety of engineering consulting firms have been awarded different studies.
13	Introduce an escalation process to inform and advise authorities (MOE, MOH) where there is known scientific information or perceived threats to non-municipal systems.	MVFN	No If the SPC becomes aware of a potential threat to a non-municipal system that is beyond the scope of their work, they will notify the proper authorities to ensure that it is dealt with appropriately.

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
14	If it is unknown how risks will be mitigated then forecast the types of risks and mitigation costs that are realistic and develop a suitable budget OR pilot one or two studies through to the Source Protection Plan stage and build a forecast on that experience.	AFA & 1 citizen	No Source Protection Plan policies to mitigate risks will be the subject of a future regulation. The tasks and budgets outlined in the ToR are to complete Assessment Reports and Source Protection Plans, implementation costs are not included in these budgets. A new task was added under Section 7.0 (see below) to assess the costs and benefits of policies when developing Source Protection Plans [ToR, pg 42]
ToR - 7.0 Work Plan and Budget for Source Protection Plans			
1	When developing policies to address risks the environmental benefits and socio-economic impacts must be assessed and considered.	OFEC & 1 citizen	Yes ToR text was amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Develop policies to address issues and threats that pose a risk to drinking water • Determine who is responsible for implementing these policies • <u>Examine the environmental, social and financial costs and benefits of implementing these policies</u>” [ToR, pg 42] This issue is also addressed in the new mission statement in Section 1.0 (see above) which states “we will strive to propose policies ... that are effective, economical and appropriate for local communities” [ToR, pg 9]
2	Who will maintain these water quality standards after 2012?	1 citizen	No Municipalities will play a large role in implementing Source Protection Plan policies but MOE, conservation authorities and others will also have responsibilities. Progress on implementing plan policies must be monitored and reported on to the province. Each plan will also have to be periodically reviewed and updated (this review cycle will be established by MOE). Details will be in future regulations.

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft</i> ToR		How Comments were Addressed by SPC		
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)	
3	That Plans provide explicit links to watershed planning and watershed-subwatershed plans, including links to their existing implementation processes.	1 citizen	No	<p>The content of Source Protection Plans will be the subject of future regulations and guidance.</p> <p>The draft Watershed Characterization Report includes tables on watershed plan recommendations and this information will be available to the SPC when developing Source Protection Plans. Source protection planning will also complement the efforts of other agencies involved in watershed planning.</p>
ToR - Glossary				
1	Define "precautionary principle" and "stewardship"	1 citizen	Yes	<p>ToR text was amended as follows: <u>"Precautionary principle says that the absence of scientific certainty about a risk should not bar the taking of precautionary measures. It addresses situations in which the risk cannot be estimated with any reliability and in which uncertainty prevails regarding the relationship, if any, between cause and supposed effect (Source: Science-based Decision-making for Protecting Ontario's Drinking Water Resources: A Threats Assessment Framework, Technical Experts Committee Report to the Minister of the Environment, November 2004)".</u></p> <p><u>"Watershed Stewardship means caring for water, land, air and biodiversity on a watershed basis, while recognizing that everything is connected in a watershed and is effected by natural as well as human activities.</u></p>
General				
1	Leave ToR in draft form and open for public comment until future regulations and guidance are released from MOE	AFA & 1 citizen	No	It could be a couple of years before all the regulations, rules and guidance are finalized. The ToR can be amended to reflect future regulations and guidance.

Summary of Comments Received on <i>Draft ToR</i>		How Comments were Addressed by SPC	
Comment	Commenter	Change ToR	Changes to ToR Wording are Underlined (page numbers in brackets refer to proposed ToR)
2	How can we know that our concerns are even considered or that the Province will do something especially since not much has been done since Walkerton.	1 citizen	No The Walkerton Inquiry resulted in two new pieces of legislation: the <i>Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002</i> which deals with the treatment and distribution of drinking water and the <i>Clean Water Act, 2007</i> which protects source water. All comments received on our draft ToR have been summarized in this document which is part of the public record to ensure transparency and accountability. All comments were considered by the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee when developing and approving the proposed ToR. The province will receive this summary of comments as well as comments received by September 5, 2008 on our proposed ToR. The Minister of the Environment will consider these comments when reviewing and approving our ToR.
3	Encourage water conservation	OFEC	No This is a practice that conservation authorities have always promoted and they will continue to do so. The SPC will examine water conservation policies within the development of source protection plans.
4	There should be public access to raw water quality data	OFEC	No Municipalities test the quality of the raw water entering their drinking water systems and this data is made available to the public in annual reports. The SPC will provide links to this information on their source protection website to facilitate the public having easy access to this information.

List of Acronyms:

AFA – Arnprior Federation of Agriculture
FOCA – Federation of Ontario Cottage Associations
MOE – Ontario Ministry of the Environment
OFEC – Ontario Farm Environmental Coalition
SPC – Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Committee

CELA&ED – Canadian Environmental Law Association & Environmental Defence
FoTW – Friends of the Tay Watershed
MVFN – Mississippi Valley Field Naturalists
SPAs – Mississippi Valley and Rideau Valley Source Protection Authorities
ToR – Terms of Reference