

***Appendix 4 – Assessment Report Consultation***

# Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area Assessment Report

---

## **Assessment Report Consultation Plan**



**Thames-Sydenham and Region  
Source Protection Region**

# **Assessment Report Consultation Plan**

**November 12, 2010**

## Table of Contents

1	Background.....	3
2	Purpose.....	4
3	Consultation Overview.....	4
4	Target Audiences.....	7
4.1	Municipalities which do not include lands within vulnerable areas.....	7
4.2	Municipalities which include jurisdiction within vulnerable areas.....	7
4.3	Land owners within vulnerable areas.....	7
4.4	Landowners that are or could be a significant risk.....	7
4.5	First Nations.....	7
4.6	General Public.....	7
5	Approaches to Consultation.....	8
5.1	Phase 1 – July – October, 2009.....	8
5.1.1	Municipalities which do not include lands within a vulnerable area.....	8
5.1.2	Municipalities which include jurisdiction within a vulnerable area.....	8
5.1.3	Land owners within a vulnerable area.....	8
5.1.4	First Nations (not within a vulnerable area).....	8
5.1.5	General Public.....	8
5.2	Phase 2 – September –November, 2009.....	9
5.2.1	Municipalities which do not include a vulnerable area.....	9
5.2.2	Municipalities which include jurisdiction within a vulnerable area.....	9
5.2.3	Land owners within a vulnerable area:.....	9
5.2.4	Landowners that are or could be a significant risk.....	9
5.2.5	First Nations not a vulnerable area.....	9
5.2.6	General Public.....	9
5.3	Phase 3 – December 2009 – March 2010.....	9
5.4	Phase 4.....	10
5.5	Use of Website.....	10
5.6	Distribution of Report and Other Materials.....	10
6	Appendices.....	11

## List of Tables

Table 1 - Assessment Report technical studies.....	3
Table 2 - Consultation phases.....	4

## List of Figures

Figure 1 - Consultation plan overview.....	6
--	---

# 1 Background

The Clean Water Act requires the completion of Assessment Reports which will contain the science on which the Source Protection Plan will be based. These reports will identify vulnerable areas, assess the vulnerability of those areas, identify water quality issues related to the water sources and assess the risks to the water systems. General Regulation 287/07 under the Clean Water Act requires consultation on the Assessment Report.

Work on the components of the Assessment Report (AR) is being undertaken by various leads through partnerships involving system operating authority and CA staff. The following table summarizes the various projects and the systems included in those projects. It is generally anticipated that the work on the systems within a project will be completed together and this will determine when the work from a system can begin the peer review and consultation processes. Peer review involves the review of the work for technical completeness and whether it meets provincial rules and guidance. It is generally accepted that only the vulnerability assessment requires peer review due to the highly technical nature of this work. Upon completion of the peer review, stakeholder consultation on the delineation and vulnerability assessment of the vulnerable areas can be initiated. When the other components of the Assessment Report are complete consultation on those parts can be initiated. The regulations also require that the specific consultation be undertaken on the draft and proposed Assessment Reports.

**Table 1 - Assessment Report technical studies**

Ground-water		Surface Water	
Projects	Systems	Projects	Systems
Perth	Stratford St Marys West Perth -Mitchell Perth East -Shakespeare (& Milverton)* Perth South - St Pauls, Sebringville*	Essex Chatham Kent	Wallaceburg Wheatley South Chatham Kent/Chatham
London- Middlesex	City of London - Fanshawe, Hyde Park Thames Centre - Thorndale, Dorchester Kilworth Heights Subdivision, Melrose, Mount Brydges Birr	West Elgin	West Elgin
Oxford	Woodstock, Innerkip Ingersoll, Beachville-Loweville Mount Elgin* Embros, Lakeside* Thamesford Tavistock, Hickson-King*	Southern Lake Huron	LAWSS* Petrolia*
Chatham- Kent	Ridgetown Highgate		
GUDI Studies	St. Marys Oxford (Thamesford, Woodstock) City of London (Fanshawe) Thames Centre (Dorchester) Middlesex Centre (Kilworth Heights Subdivision) Chatham-Kent (Highgate)	IPZ-3 Studies	LAWSS, Petrolia Wallaceburg, Wheatley, Erie Beach West Elgin Lake St. Clair intakes (Essex Region SPA)

Municipalities identified with an asterisk (\*) include vulnerable areas from water systems in neighbouring municipalities  
Note: Milverton is outside of the TSR SP Region but included in the technical study

The Assessment Reports are to be submitted to the MOE one year from the approval of the Terms of Reference (April 20, 2010). MOE has accepted that it is unlikely that all work on the Assessment Report will be completed by the due date in the larger and more complex regions. They have therefore accepted that some components of the Assessment Report will be identified as data gaps at the time of submission of the first Assessment Report. There is an expectation that work would continue on those gaps in parallel with work on the Source Protection Plans. The remaining aspects would be expected to be submitted sufficiently in advance of the due date of the Source Protection Plan to allow for the approval of that work prior to the completion of the Source Protection Plan. Those aspects of the Assessment Report which we expect cannot be completed prior to the submission of the Assessment Report are identified in Phase 4 in the following table.

Due to the size and complexity of the AR it is not adequate to await its completion prior to initiation of consultation. Instead, a phased approach to consultation is proposed and described in the consultation plan. This Consultation Plan outlines the planned consultation on the Assessment Report in the Thames-Sydenham and Region.

## 2 Purpose

This consultation plan is intended to:

- Describe the consultation on the vulnerability assessment work including vulnerability zones (the lines on the map); Issues and Threats; Risk Assessment; and Tier 1 Water Budget.
- Meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act and related regulations and rules.
- Allow adequate opportunity for stakeholder input into the technical work comprising the Assessment Report.
- Increase the local community awareness of the Source Protection Planning process

## 3 Consultation Overview

In order to allow for adequate stakeholder engagement in the development of the Assessment Report a phased approach to consultation is planned. These phases allow multiple opportunities for stakeholders to be involved in the consultation process. The phases will allow multiple times and locations to be involved. The phases align with the availability of technical reports. The phases are also intended to target local information at the local communities. The 4 phases of consultation are described in the following table

**Table 2 - Consultation phases**

Phase	Description	Anticipated consultation
1. Vulnerability Assessment (Draft)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WHPA –A, B, C, D delineations</li> <li>• IPZ -1, 2 delineations</li> <li>• Vulnerability scores</li> <li>• List of activities which would be threats with a given vulnerability score</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependant on completion of work by consultants</li> <li>• Dependant on completion of peer review including possible revisions as a result of peer review comments</li> <li>• Local targets (systems or groups of nearby systems)</li> <li>• Municipal information packages</li> </ul>
2. Issues and Threats (Final Draft)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerable areas from previous consultation</li> <li>• HVA, SGRA</li> <li>• IPZ3 (preliminary)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local targets</li> <li>• Municipal consultation</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues</li> <li>• Conditions</li> <li>• Significant Risks (preliminary)</li> </ul>	
3. Assessment Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed draft containing all aspects of the Assessment Report except for those identified in Phase 4 below.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional open houses/public meeting</li> <li>• Internet posting and notices</li> <li>• Municipal and First Nations consultation required</li> </ul>
4. After submission of the first Assessment Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tier 3 Water Budget – SGRA Vulnerability Assessment</li> <li>• Significant Risks - Refinements based on site specific Risk Assessment</li> <li>• IPZ 3 vulnerability assessment</li> <li>• GUDI based WHPAs (WHPA E and F)</li> <li>• Prior to completion of SP Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation on the additional components</li> <li>• Consultation on the proposed AR – required regional open houses/ public meeting</li> <li>• Municipal and First Nations consultation required</li> </ul>



## **4 Target Audiences**

### ***4.1 Municipalities which do not include lands within vulnerable areas***

While these municipalities are not directly impacted by some aspects of the Source Protection planning process, it is important to maintain a flow of information to ensure they understand the process and the scope of the impacts in the region. Information will be made available to these municipalities on a regular basis. The focus on the municipalities outside of vulnerable areas will be on the process and to work ahead.

### ***4.2 Municipalities which include jurisdiction within vulnerable areas***

These municipalities need to be kept current and engaged with the Source Protection planning Process. Their participation will include all four phases of the consultation process. Significant effort will be focused on engaging those communities containing Wellhead Protection Areas (WHPA) and Intake Protection Zones which are likely to be the focus of many of the policies of the Source Protection Plans.

### ***4.3 Land owners within vulnerable areas***

These landowners may or may not be impacted by the Source Protection planning process. They will be included in all four phases of consultation. The early phases of the consultation are intended to allow these landowners to determine how closely they should remain involved in the Source Protection Planning process.

### ***4.4 Landowners that are or could be a significant risk***

At this point, these landowners have not been identified. They will be included in consultation in phase 1 as they are within the vulnerable areas. Specific efforts will be made to directly engage them in Phase 2 and 3 of the consultation. The regulation requires that landowners who are known to be involved in an activity which poses a significant risk to municipal drinking water source be contacted as part of the consultation on the Assessment Report.

### ***4.5 First Nations***

At this point, no First Nation Systems are part of the Source Protection Plan. Efforts will continue to involve First Nations in initiating technical studies. Once a system is identified, formal consultation on the vulnerability assessment will commence. Until this time, First Nation Communities will be kept informed of the Source Protection planning process.

### ***4.6 General Public***

The general public outside of vulnerable zones will be kept informed about the Source Protection planning process. It is important that all landowners have an opportunity to understand the process and to determine that, in fact, their properties lie outside of a vulnerable zone and therefore, are not directly impacted by this process.

## 5 Approaches to Consultation

### 5.1 Phase 1 – July – October, 2009

Phase I involves consultation on the identification of vulnerable areas and a general overview of threats and issues. The key messages to be communicated will include details regarding the planning process to date, local vulnerable areas and scores, the science behind the vulnerability mapping and the next steps.

#### 5.1.1 Municipalities which do not include lands within a vulnerable area

- distribution of updates and other printed material
- invitations to public meetings held throughout the region

#### 5.1.2 Municipalities which include jurisdiction within a vulnerable area

- letter and package of information to municipality which includes maps of vulnerable areas
- meeting with municipal staff/council as required

#### 5.1.3 Land owners within a vulnerable area

- A series of public meetings will be held as outlined in Appendix A. The meetings will each be held from 3:00 – 7:00 as an open house format. A 10 minute presentation will be available throughout the meeting as required.

#### 5.1.4 First Nations (not within a vulnerable area)

- general distribution of tabloid
- public meetings

#### 5.1.5 General Public

- invitation through newspapers for public meeting
- media articles
- general distribution of tabloid
- response to requests for information/presentations

## **5.2 Phase 2 – September –November, 2009**

Phase 2 Consultation involves the results of issues evaluation, threats assessment and the Tier 1 Water Budget. The key messages to be communicated will include details regarding the planning process to date, how threats are determined, the science behind the threats assessment and the next steps.

### **5.2.1 Municipalities which do not include a vulnerable area**

- distribution of updates and other printed material
- invitations to public meetings held throughout the region

### **5.2.2 Municipalities which include jurisdiction within a vulnerable area**

- letter and package of information to municipality which includes maps of vulnerable areas
- meeting with municipal staff/council as required

### **5.2.3 Land owners within a vulnerable area:**

- A series of public meetings will be held as outlined in Appendix A. The meetings will each be held from 3:00 – 7:00 as an open house format. A 10 minute presentation will be available throughout the meeting as required.

### **5.2.4 Landowners that are or could be a significant risk**

- direct mail followed with a kitchen table meetings with any landowner who is a significant risk, when information becomes available

### **5.2.5 First Nations not a vulnerable area**

- general distribution of tabloid
- public meetings

### **5.2.6 General Public**

- invitation through newspapers for public meeting
- media articles
- general distribution of tabloid
- response to requests for information/presentations

## **5.3 Phase 3 – December 2009 – March 2010**

Phase Three involves the formal consultation for the draft proposed Assessment Report includes public meetings held throughout the region, as shown in Appendix A. These sessions are timed to satisfy the requirements of the regulation. Dates are set based on the previous consultation phases and completion of technical studies. The key messages communicated include details regarding the process for establishing the

Assessment Report and the consultation that has taken place to date. Additional local consultation was undertaken as required.

#### **5.4 Phase 4**

Phase four involves consultation of parts of the Assessment Report which were not available when the proposed AR was consulted on. Location and dates of consultation will be based on a due date for the updates. It is anticipated that this will be in 2011.

Phase 4 will include local consultation on those aspects of the Assessment Report that have a local impact. There will also be a general Source Protection Area focus similar to that undertaken in phase three above.

#### **5.5 Use of Website**

The website [www.sourcewaterprotection.on.ca](http://www.sourcewaterprotection.on.ca) will be used extensively for the purpose of extending the consultation beyond the public meetings. A description of the process, vulnerability maps and scores, materials used in the consultation as well as the draft assessment report will be available on-line. The web site will describe options for submitting comments as well as the ability to provide comments on-line. Comments collected through the consultation will be posted on the web site as well as forming part of the submission to the MOE with the proposed Assessment Report.

#### **5.6 Distribution of Report and Other Materials**

The web site will include access to interactive mapping products through a geoportal. It will also include the availability of documents. The web site will be promoted as the primary method of accessing the documents and mapping products. CDs will also be made available to those who request them. Printed copies of the reports will be made available for review at CA offices and at the public meetings. Various summary products will be available for the public at the public meetings.

## **6 Appendices**

Appendix A – LTVSPA Assessment Report Consultation Schedule

Appendix B – SCRSPA Assessment Report Consultation Schedule

Appendix C – UTRSPA Assessment Report Consultation Schedule

Note: When included as part of the Assessment Report for a Source Protection Area only the appropriate schedule is included

## Appendix A – LTVSPA Assessment Report Consultation Schedule

**Table 1: Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area Phase 1 and Phase 2 Consultation Schedule**

No.	PHASE 1 Meeting Date	PHASE 2 Meeting Date	Meeting Location	IPZ/WHPA	# of parcels in IPZ-1 or WHPA-A	# of parcels in IPZ-1 and 2 or WHPA-A, B, C, D	Methods of Notification
1	Aug. 4, 2009 3:00 – 7:00	Nov. 16, 2009 3:00 – 7:00	Royal Canadian Legion Branch 221 at 142 John Street, West Lorne	West Elgin (IPZ)	34	179 (phase 1), 193 (phase 2)	ad in paper direct mail website
2	Nov. 9 and Nov. 10, 2009 3:00 – 7:00	Nov. 9 and Nov. 10, 2009 3:00 – 7:00	Merlin Agricultural Hall, 150 Aberdeen Street, Merlin	Chatham/South Kent (IPZ)	71	332	ad in paper direct mail website
				Wheatley (IPZ)	119	360	ad in paper direct mail website
3	Oct. 27, 2009 3:00 – 7:00	Nov. 18, 2009 3:00 – 7:00	Willson Conference Room (Phase 1); Rudy Brown Building Room 110 (Phase 2); University of Guelph Campus at Ridgetown	Ridgetown (WHPA)	216	938	ad in paper direct mail website
				Highgate* (WHPA)	85	108	ad in paper direct mail website

\*GUDI systems

**Table 2: Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area Phase 3 Consultation Schedule**

No.	PHASE 3 Meeting Date	Meeting Location	IPZ/WHPA	# of parcels in IPZ-1 or WHPA A	# of parcels in IPZ-1 and 2 or WHPA - A, B, C, D	Methods of Notification
1	February 17, 2010 3:00 – 7:00	Royal Canadian Legion Branch 221, 142 John Street, West Lorne	West Elgin (IPZ)	34	193	direct mail (for significant threats) ad in paper website
2	February 18, 2010 3:00 – 7:00	Merlin Agricultural Hall, 150 Aberdeen Street, Merlin	Chatham/South Kent (IPZ) and Wheatley (IPZ)	71 (Chatham/South Kent), 119 (Wheatley)	332 (Chatham/South Kent), 360 (Wheatley)	direct mail (for significant threats) ad in paper website
3	February 22, 2010 3:00 – 7:00	Willson Conference Room Ridgetown Campus, University of Guelph	Ridgetown (WHPA) and Highgate* (WHPA)	216 (Ridgetown), 85 (Highgate)	938 (Ridgetown), 108 (Highgate)	direct mail (for significant threats) ad in paper website

# Lower Thames Valley Source Protection Area Assessment Report

---

## **Summary of Consultation and Comments**

General Description of Commenter	No.	Comment	Response
CA staff	1	Add list of issues studies conducted to Issues Section 5	List of studies will be added to Section 5
CA staff	2	Mark Watershed Characterization vulnerability map so that it references the Section 4 for more current information	Maps 35 and 38 of the Watershed Characterization summary will have a watermark put across them: 'Refer to Appendix 1 for Updated Map'
CA staff	3	Make available the Thames and St. Clair Region Watershed Characterization Reports on CD	Thames and St. Clair WCR will be copied onto CDs
CA staff	4	Watershed and subwatershed meanings need to be defined more consistently. It is noted in the January 2010 meeting of the Source Protection Committee, it was decided that Watershed should relate to the Source Protection Area scale while any smaller scale should be referred to as subwatersheds	Use of 'watershed' and 'subwatershed' were standardized in some sections, but this needs to be revisited to ensure that the terms are used consistently throughout AR
CA staff	5	If possible, Population density map in section 2 should better distinguish between ranges	New Map 2-1 will be created and added to Appendix 1 to show population density; figure in Section 2 will be deleted and pop. density text revised to refer to Map 2-1
CA staff	6	Map 3-1 should include a reference to table 3-2, Map 3-5 should include a reference to table 3-4, Map 3-6 should include a reference to table 3-5 and 3-6. The reference should be made in the legend of the map with the subwatershed and code labeled, but adding in brackets: refer to (relevant) table 3-X	References to tables will be included on maps
CA staff	7	Tables 3.4, 3.5, 3.6: table headings should be Subwatersheds with names (pp.3-15)	Change will be made in Section 3
CA staff	8	Correct the font sizes on Page 8-3 and 8-4	Corrections will be made in
CA staff	9	Page 1-14 add in brackets, after municipal technical studies: 'such as the vulnerability assessment, issues evaluation and threats assessment studies'.	Text will be added in Section 1 as was done in the section summary.
CA staff	10	Table 3-1 missing subwatershed 11T, add this to the table	Row will be added to table 3-1 - groundwater
CA staff	11	Table 3.2: 'SW' to be Code, 'Name' to be 'Subwatershed'	Corrections will be made in Section 1
CA staff	12	Indexed report on CD: correct 'quality' to 'quantity' for title of Section 3.0	Corrections will be made in CD index
CA staff	13	Add data gaps to summary section 3 and other summary sections missing data gaps	Data gaps will be added to section summaries

General Description of Commenter	No.	Comment	Response
CA staff	14	Issues Evaluation Methodology figure to be corrected for ' screening' box in section summary 5 and Section 5	Figure 5-1 will be corrected in Section 5 and summary 5
CA staff	15	Update SPC members table in section summary 1 to include First Nation members and to match the Section 1	Table of Source Protection Committee members will be updated in summary 1
CA staff	16	One thing which came up as we were putting together the SCR assessment report was that there was a misleading table in the LT one and Chris suggested that we address this correction as a comment. I am not sure if that should come in the form of a formal letter or if this message will suffice. In any case the issue is with Table 3-7, which suggests that the average recharge that the SGRA criteria were based upon was done for each of the 8 subwatersheds in the LTVSPA. In actual fact the average recharge was calculated on the 2 subwatersheds which were used in the Conceptual Water Budget. The attached table more accurately describes the way the SGRA calculation was done.	Table 3-7 in section 3 will be replaced with the table attached to Mark's email.
MOE	17	The document does not fully show the application of the TR to the data obtained from the technical work undertaken in this SPA. For example, the report is not clear on the existing circumstances or potential circumstances that would lead to the presence of threats related to agriculture as per the requirements in TR 119-122, 125, 128, 133 & 136. Significant, moderate and low threats were identified for each sub watershed related to pathogens, chemicals and DNAPLs, but not discussed thoroughly throughout the text.	In appendix 10 reference will be added to provincial tables of drinking water threats and new tables of circumstances to be posted on our web site until MOE posts on their web site.  Threats related to agricultural activities were identified as a data gap to be added to amended AR.
MOE	18	AR discussion good; related details not always clear. For example, Map 1-3 Drinking Water Systems shows two additional surface water intakes located outside of the SPA; it only became clear later in the review that LTV SPA has three large intakes from Lake Erie and two groundwater systems to match the ToR. Though it is understood that the committee consciously decided to include some references to the two other sw intakes as these systems serve a significant portion of the municipal water connections within the SPA boundary, these systems should not be shown on maps and the report would benefit from increased clarification as to any text pertaining to these 2 systems outside of SPA boundaries.	Separate Legend to indicate drinking water systems within the region and outside region

General Description of Commenter	No.	Comment	Response
MOE	19	On page 2-18 (discussion on drinking water systems), there is mention of three groundwater supplies that service three First Nations. It is not clear whether these systems are included in the total count of DWS in the area or separate. They are not included in the TOR and therefore it should be clearly stated that these three systems are separate. The report would benefit from updated wording to reflect that these FN systems exist within the watershed area, however have not been elevated to form part of the official system count.	Text in Section 2 will be revised to be more clear about the FN groundwater supplies not being included in the SPP unless requested by the FN.
MOE	20	It is unclear as to how the West Elgin and Wheatley treatment plants primary and emergency intakes are counted for (pg 2-19). Is there 1 or 2 intakes?	Text on page 2-18 and 2-19 to be revised to clearly indicate that there are two intakes each at West Elgin and Wheatley. A note with asterisk in Table 2-7 can be made to indicate that these systems also have emergency intakes
MOE	21	Section 3.2.5: LTV SPA may consider clarifying that water users taking more than 50,000 L/day are required to have a permit to take water (PTTW).	Information will be added to Section 3
MOE	22	Section 3.2.4: LTV SPA may consider "softening" the final few sentences to indicate any updates made to the recharge numbers may be included in a future update of the Tier 1 water budget.	A commitment to undertake this work as described in the AR has been made, therefore the text will remain.
MOE	23	4.3.5 Report should document the methodology for assessing both SWAT components	More info on the SWAT components methodology will be added to Section 4
MOE	24	Page 4-24, paragraph 2, line 2: MOE groundwater studies were not reviewed through a peer review process	Municipalities relied upon an MOE review of the reports and as a result peer review of that work was not included in our peer review process.
MOE	25	Future Significant Threats are identified. Maps are very well laid out but maps need to link vulnerable areas to circumstances (as per admin comments as well)	Add a reference to Appendix 10 for activities and circumstances which would result in significant, moderate or low threats

General Description of Committer	No.	Comment	Response
MOE	26	Page 3-8, sec 3.2.6: the SW water budget calculations are based on annual average basis. This statement contradicts with what has been said in page 3-12, 2nd paragraph. For SW demand calculations, the monthly average of water quantities should be used.	Although stress calculations rely on monthly information, average annual water budget components were included as a summary to demonstrate the balance. This will be clarified in the text.
MOE	27	Page 3-14, table 3-4: it is suggested to add another column showing the S/G water demand in percent (%).	Through the WB Peer Review process it was determined that only the level of potential for stress should be indicated rather than specifying the percent water demand.
MOE	28	General comment on IPZ-2 delineations: For all intakes, from the maps, the text needs more clarifications on how the IPZ-2 was delineated accounting the storm sewer systems (SS) and transport pathways (TPW). There might be a mix-up of SS and TPW in the text. It is important to note that storm-sewer systems are not transport pathways. The technical rules require SPCs to include the storm-sewer systems in IPZ-2 within the time of travel chosen (in this case 2 hrs) if applicable, but it is up to SPC to extend the delineated IPZ-2 to include transport pathways (as per rule 72-75)	In Section 4, SS and TPW will be separated out in the text, for all IPZs.
MOE	29	Page 4-12: The vulnerability scores were estimated based on the factors mentioned in the text. However; more information on how those factors were considered to estimate the scores of IPZ-1 and IPZ-2 (brief description would be sufficient to reader).	More information on how the factors were considered will be added to Section 4
Member of Public	30	Compensation should be offered to cover any costs incurred	The Source Protection Committee is committed to developing policies which are fair and reasonable as indicated in Section 1 with reference to the Source Protection Committee's guiding principles.

General Description of Commenter	No.	Comment	Response
Member of Public	31	I own a lumberyard and was sent a significant threats letter; what does this mean to my business?	The landowner was given information on the types of activities that would be identified as significant threats, and the possible types of policies. Management of threats to help reduce the level of threats to moderate or low was discussed.
Member of Public	32	Need repair work on septic tank, what kind of grants are available?	Information on ODWSP was provided and the landowner encouraged to apply.
Member of Public	33	Need a well to be decommissioned; what kind of grants are available?	Information on ODWSP was provided and the landowner encouraged to apply.
Member of Public	34	Curious about the process and want to know more about the source protection program	Information on SWP, the Clean Water Act and work in the Lower Thames Valley SPA was provided.

**COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE COMMENT PERIOD ON THE PROPOSED LTV AR**

<b>Generic Description of Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Status</b>
Member of the public	1	This is a summary of her comment. Concerns are expressed about the threat posed to drinking water by proposed wind turbine projects in Lake Erie, and Lake St. Clair during and after construction.	The comment was received in the comment period on the proposed assessment report and was therefore forwarded to the MOE.	No action. It will be reviewed by the Source Protection Committee at a subsequent meeting for consideration in an amended assessment report.
Member of the public	2	Concerns are expressed about the contamination of raw water at the Erie Beach intake by suspected clandestine pesticide application at Rondeau Bay.	The comment was received in the comment period on the proposed assessment report and was therefore forwarded to the MOE.	No action. It will be reviewed by the Source Protection Committee at a subsequent meeting for consideration in an amended assessment report.
Water treatment plant operator	3	The new West Elgin water treatment plant capacity is 12,160 m <sup>3</sup> /day. This information should be updated in the assessment report as the old plant is now demolished.	The comment was received in the comment period on the proposed assessment report and was therefore forwarded to the MOE. MOE has directed, through its letter dated October 29, 2010, that this comment be addressed in an amended proposed assessment report.	Comment is addressed in the amended proposed assessment report.

**COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE COMMENT PERIOD ON THE PROPOSED LTV AR**

<b>Generic Description of Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Status</b>
Ministry of Natural Resources	1	Wheatley Harbour was delisting as an AOC in April 2010	The comment was received after the comment period on the proposed assessment report and was forwarded to the MOE. Based on discussion with MOE after submission of the proposed AR, these comments are addressed in the amended proposed AR.	The status of Wheatley Harbour is updated in the amended proposed assessment report in Sections 6 and 8.
Ministry of Natural Resources	2	Species at risk (SAR) list in Appendix 5 Addendum is not up-to-date with Federal Status and Provincial Status of SARO is not present.	The comment was received after the comment period on the proposed assessment report and was forwarded to the MOE. Based on discussion with MOE after submission of the proposed AR, these comments are addressed in the amended proposed AR.	The Species at Risk list in Appendix 5 Addendum is now updated to May 2010.

**Changes made to the Lower Thames Valley amended Proposed Assessment Report based on discussions with the MOE prior to receiving the Director's directions**

No.	Item	Change made	Section	Status
1	West Elgin emergency intake IPZ-2 vulnerability assessment	Vulnerability assessment and uncertainty discussion added for emergency intake. Maps related to West Elgin vulnerability are updated. Removed from data gaps. System summary updated for score and map, section summary 4 updated for score, section summary 9 updated for data gaps.	Section 4 and 9, Map 4-4 in Appendix 1, System Summary, Section Summary 4 and 9	Done
2	West Elgin emergency intake IPZ-2 threats	Text in threats section updated to include emergency intake IPZ-2 threats. Maps related to West Elgin threats are updated. System summary updated for threats map.	Section 7, Map 7-7 in Appendix 1, System Summary, Section Summary 7	Done
3	West Elgin emergency intake IPZ-2 managed lands, livestock density and percent impervious mapping	Livestock density, managed lands and percent impervious calculations are completed for West Elgin emergency intake IPZ-2. Related maps are updated. (primary and emergency intake IPZ-1 calculations are as before)	Map 7-1, 7-2a and 7-3a are updated	Done
4	West Elgin primary intake IPZ-2 vulnerability assessment	Map related to West Elgin primary intake IPZ-2 vulnerability are updated for revised IPZ-2 delineation. Revision is based on improved datasets related to drainage, reach lengths. System summary updated for map.	Map 4-4 in Appendix 1, System Summary	Done
5	West Elgin primary intake IPZ-2 threats	Maps related to West Elgin primary intake IPZ-2 threats are updated. System summary updated for threats map.	Map 7-7 in Appendix 1, System Summary	Done
6	HVA and SGRA livestock density, managed lands and percent impervious mapping	HVA and SGRA livestock density, managed lands and percent impervious calculations are completed. Related mapping products are created.	Maps 7-1, 7-2c,d and 7-3c,d	Done
7	WHPA significant threats related to livestock density, managed lands	WHPA significant threats location counts related to livestock density and managed lands to be updated in threats tables. Removed from data gaps.	Section 7 and 9, system summaries (Ridgetown and Highgate), section summaries 7 and 9	Done
8	Significant threats related to the use of land for pasture and outdoor confinement area	Significant threats assessment related to pasture and outdoor confinement area is completed, and only found to occur in the Ridgetown WHPA, which is in agreement with the consultants previous assessment. This does not affect significant location count. Text in section 7 to be added to describe the assessment.	Section 7	Done
9	Purpose of current report	Current amended AR fills in some data gaps identified in the proposed AR	Section 1, section summary 1	Done
10	Correct the totals in Table 3-1 of the Water Budget section.	The AR be revised to correct the rounding errors in the grand totals presented for each of the sub watersheds in table 3-1, as per discussion with MOE and as per Direction 9 received on the St. Clair Region Proposed AR.	Section 3 Table 3-1	Done

Directions received from Ian Smith, Director, Source Protection Programs Branch, Ministry of Environment, as per letter dated October 29, 2010

No.	Direction	Response	Status	Section
1	The AR be revised to include the required technical work, mapping, and enumeration of significant drinking water threats associated with managed land, livestock density, and impervious surfaces that is consistent with the requirements of the technical rules.	See Items 3, 6, 7 and 8 of the attached table: Changes made to the Lower Thames Valley amended Proposed Assessment Report. Also references to the recent technical studies and technical memos are made in the sections and in the Appendix 12 (list of references)	Done	Maps 7-1, 7-2a, 7-2c,d, 7-3a and 7-3c,d, Section 7 and 9, system summaries (Ridgetown and Highgate), section summaries 7 and 9, Appendix 12
2	The AR be revised to include the technical work associated with the IPZ-2 delineation for the West Elgin emergency intake.	See Items 1 and 2 of the attached table: Changes made to the Lower Thames Valley amended Proposed Assessment Report. Since a more recent drainage layer was used for the delineation of the emergency intake IPZ-2, the primary intake IPZ-2 delineation was revised to also use a more recent drainage layer. See Items 4 and 5 of the attached table: Changes made to the Lower Thames Valley amended Proposed Assessment Report. Also references to the recent technical studies and technical memos are made in the sections and in the Appendix 12 (list of references). Appendix 9 (flagged parameters) notes that turbidity is flagged for the emergency intake but not identified as an issue (lack of data).	Done	Section 4, 7 and 9, Map 4-4 and Map 7-7 in Appendix 1, System Summary, Section Summary 4, 7 and 9, Appendix 12
3	The AR be revised to ensure that public is given the information needed to determine the areas where activities are or would be a significant, moderate and low drinking water threats and the circumstances that apply. (Additional context for this direction: the current report has a methodology section in an appendix but has maps and text in the report that is not clearly linked to the methodology. As a result, it is difficult to understand if and where an activity poses a risk).	Discussed with MOE. Add text to Maps 7-4 to 7-8 to point the reader to assessment report sections 7.2.3 to 7.2.8: "This map must be reviewed in conjunction with Section 7.2.X". Add text to Section 7.2.3 to 7.2.8 to describe what the threats maps 7-4 to 7-8 show, what the tables on the maps indicate, where to find the list of activities that are or would be significant, moderate or low threats for that specific vulnerable area and score, and where to find the circumstances for the threats.	Done	Appendix 1 Maps 7-4 to 7-8, and Section 7.2.3 to 7.2.8
4	The AR be revised to correct the reference to the provincial tables of circumstances, to reflect 76 tables, not 73.	Minor text revision made.	Done	Appendix 10 Threats and Circumstances Table
5	The discussion in the AR around issues and when activities become significant drinking water threats within a vulnerable area be revised to clearly describe that only activities documented through technical rule 115, pertaining to systems in the Terms of Reference, become significant drinking water threats within the delineated issue contributing area.	Text revised in Section 5.2 and 7.1.4 revised to indicate that issues identified through Rule 114 would be subject to Rule 115 (identification of issue contributing area and activities), for those systems listed in the Terms of Reference, and that activities identified in this manner would be significant threats within the delineated issues contributing area.	Done	Section 5.2 and 7.1.4, Section summary 5 and 7, all system summaries
6	The AR be revised to clarify that the SPC can only add local threats, other than the 21 prescribed drinking water threats, upon approval of the Director.	Minor text revision made.	Done	Section 7.1.2
7	The AR be revised to document issues that meet the tests in rule 114 in accordance with technical rule 115. (Additional context for this direction: Any issues that do not meet the test in rule 114 are documented as per technical rule 115.1. The rules do not allow that the AR include work plans to investigate issues. The only situation where a workplan is allowed in the technical rules related to issues is if an issue is documented as per rule 115, where the issue contributing area (technical rule 115(3)) and the identification of threats (technical rule 115 (4)) can not be completed, a work plan as per rule 116 is required).	Discussed with MOE. In Table 5-6 in Section 5.5, a note is added to state that all issues are identified as allowed under Rule 115.1. In Section 5.5 and 5.6, text is revised to state that some of the issues identified are naturally occurring, while the source of the rest of the issues is yet to be determined. Therefore all issues identified are as per Rule 115.1 and are currently not subject to Rules 115 and 116. If more information becomes available to the SPC to determine if an issue is wholly or partially due to anthropogenic sources, then work to satisfy Rule 115 or a work plan to satisfy rule 115 must be included in a subsequent AR. Table 5-7 is moved from Section 5.6 (Work Plan) to Section 5.7 (Data Gaps) to indicate that the source of some of the identified issues is a data gap and how to fill that data gap. Text in Section 5-7 is added to describe this data gap.	Done	Section 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7, Table 5-7, section summary 5, 9
8	The AR be revised to ensure correct references are made to rules that describe what are conditions throughout the report. (Additional context for this direction: The definition of condition should be amended in the report as per the technical rules as well as that there is more than one way that a condition could be identified as a significant drinking water threat including the event based approach where the condition has or could cause an issue at an intake).	Text throughout Section 6 is revised to ensure correct reference is made to the rules that describe what conditions are. Text in Section 6.1.3 below Table 6-2, and in Section 7.1.3 are revised to make reference to rule 68 (event based IPZ-3), 126 (identifying conditions), 140.1 and 141 (conditions that are significant threats). Further, in Section 6.2 and 8.2.1 the status of Wheatley Harbour is updated to indicate it is no longer an Area of Concern.	Done	Section 6 and Section 7.1.3, section summary 6 and 8, Section 8.2.1
9	The AR be revised to remove the work plan included to identify the WHPA E and F for the Highgate well. (Additional context for this direction: Since there are no issues identified for this well, there is no requirement in the technical rules to delineate WHPA F. In addition, since this system is being reclassified to no longer be GUDI the well does not meet the test in rule 49, which requires WHPA E to be delineated if the interaction of surface water and groundwater decreases the time of travel).	Discussed with MOE. The work plan to identify WHPA-E and F for Highgate system will be removed from the report. A statement will be added: The MOE directed that the workplans for WHPA-E and WHPA-F for the Highgate system not be included in the Assessment Report as information available at this time indicates that the system does not meet the test in Rule 49 (3) to revise any reference to the work plan in the report. The related data gap identified in Section 9 will be removed as well.	Done	Section 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.6 (Table 4-8), 7.1, 7.1.1, 7.4, 9.1 (Table 9-1), Section summary 4 and 7, System Summary
10	The AR should be revised to correctly reflect the issues or event based approaches of identifying threats. (Additional context for this direction: It is important for the AR to include an explanation that the vulnerability score is not the only method of identifying threats to Great Lakes systems).	Text will be revised to indicate that threats can be identified through the issues or event based approach.	Done	Sections 5.2, 6.1.3, 7.1.1, 7.1.3, 7.1.4, section summary 7
11	The AR be revised to include the correct design capacity of the West Elgin water treatment plant as per a public comment received during the 30-day consultation period.	The design capacity of the West Elgin water treatment plant will be corrected as per the plant operator's information (12,160 m3/day). See Appendix 4 of the LTVAR, item no. 34 (Summary of Comments and Responses).	Done	Section 4.2.2: Table 4-2 and West Elgin system summary

No.	Direction	Response	Status	Section
12	Once the AR is revised based on these directions, the Source Protection Authority shall consult with the Source Protection Committee and with those persons or bodies impacted by the changes in an appropriate manner before resubmitting the amended AR in accordance with the Act and provide proof thereof with the resubmitted AR.	Discussed with MOE. Notice will be posted on the website as well as in local newspapers, and sent to affected property owners and municipalities. The notice will indicate in a general sense the amendments made to the report. The report will be posted for a 30 day comment period on the website, and hard copies made available at the LTVCA, West elgin municipal office. There will be no public meeting. At the West Elgin IPZ, 10 new parcels are now included in the IPZ of which none have significant threats occurring. Individual contact will be made via letters to these property owners in the West Elgin IPZ. At the Highgate WHPA, 1 new parcel and at the Ridgetown WHPA, 5 new parcels are now identified as locations where significant threats are or could occur. Individual contact will be made via significant threat letters to these property owners. All contacted property owners will be invited to call or visit the LTVCA to discuss concerns or questions.		NA
13	The SPA shall include with the resubmitted AR a memo or document outlining the changes made to the AR, as per these directions, including chapter references in the AR where the changes were made.	This document outlining the changes made to the AR as per the MOE directions will be sent to the MOE with the amended proposed AR. Also see Item 9 of the attached table: Section 1 has been updated to reflect this amended proposed AR. Also included text in section 1 to indicate that the terms updated or amended AR used throughout the report refers to a future version following approval of this amended proposed AR.	Done	Cover letter, Appendix 4 along with MOE directions letter, Section 1, section summary 1.
14	The SPA shall submit the revised AR to the ministry in the form of both a hard copy and electronic version for the ministry's review.	Hard and electronic copies will be submitted to the MOE by January 15, 2011.		NA