

Consultation Comments Received from Members of the Public

Comment	Response	Action
<p>Though a large emphasis is generally placed on farm run off and generally involving the use of pesticides and fertilizer, my personal concerns generally lean towards the heavy metals and phosphates etc. that are found in municipal sewage.</p> <p>We are all aware of the fact that the city of London does these so called bypasses on a regular basis.</p> <p>The dumping of raw sewage into the Thames river is something that should be dealt with altogether.</p> <p>I feel that the cities should be made to put in larger lagoons, that are meant to hold these so called bypasses when needed.</p> <p>My guess is that not much has been done with the sewage treatment systems for the city of London over the past 10 years or so as the dumping of raw sewage has become more frequent instead of less frequent.</p> <p>This can no longer be blamed on the old parts of the city having the storm water tied in with the sewage.</p> <p>The city has been growing and storm water if any getting into the sewage system should be only that from the older parts of the city.</p> <p>A number of years ago I was told that this fell outside of your jurisdiction and I strongly feel that this should be your highest priority</p>	<p>The Source Protection Plan does deal with this activity but only where it is or would be a significant drinking water threat. Sewage treatment and related bypasses continue to be regulated by the MOECC.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>I would like to provide the following comment for the Source Protection Committee's consideration.</p> <p>I reviewed a portion of the documents on line. The proposed plan documents provided are very thorough and lengthy. A great deal of work and expertise has been invested in this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. I don't feel qualified to criticize the contents of the documents, and I am not sure what type of feedback you are looking for on this highly technical document. (although it is written quite well for a layperson to understand). b. The process seems to be at the early risk assessment stage. The documents seem to focus on the assessment process. I assume the authors are experts on the risk assessment process. Consequently, I have little feedback to offer on this stage of the process. c. As mentioned above, the documents seem to focus on the assessment process and not on the risk mitigation requirements or the actions required. If I had a better idea of how this will impact us, our land, and our normal living activities, then I would be better able to provide feedback. 	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>The letter listed two potential threat activities that may be taking place on our property. The two activities are:</p>	<p>At this time a very conservative approach has been applied to identifying activities that could</p>	<p>None</p>

Comment	Response	Action
<p>A. <i>The establishment, operations or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage.</i></p> <p>B. <i>The handling and storage of fuel.</i></p> <p>I appreciate that the identified threat activities were created from a desk-top assessment. This is a good place to start. However, they are too vague for me to provide you with feedback. I think we are too early in the process for me to give you valuable feedback.</p> <p>a. The identified threats are a little too general for me to understand what threat you have identified. Is Threat “A”, listed above, simply my household septic tank and weeping bed? Is threat “B”, listed above, simply the gas tank in my car in the garage and the jerry can for my lawn mower?</p> <p>b. What risk mitigation steps do you propose? It may be too early in the process for you to provide more specific details to this - and consequently too early for me to provide feedback.</p>	<p>possibly be occurring on properties within the delineated vulnerable areas around the wells. Based on your letter activity A does refer to the assumption that there is a septic system on your property. This was based on asking municipalities where they have servicing within their jurisdictions. For residential properties activity B is often linked to the potential for a house to be heated using fuel oil. This was based on contacting Union Gas and/or local fuel suppliers to determine if Union Gas services the area and if local fuel suppliers provide fuel to houses in the area. During the next stages of activity assessment local Risk Management Officials or Inspectors (RMO/RMI) will be contacting individual property owners to confirm what activities are indeed being undertaken on properties.</p>	
<p>At the end of the day actions require funding. Ultimately my question will be who is paying for the required actions.</p> <p>a. We have lived on this property for over 20 years, drawing household water from our well, and safely discharging sewage through our ministry inspected weeping bed. During this time the water level in our well has dropped as the municipality has drawn more water from the nearby well field.</p> <p>b. I fully support the need to protect our water supply, including the supply for my family. We all have to pay our fair share of public goods like safe drinking water. However, if I lived on the next concession, I would likely be outside the water protection zone and not be subject to the inevitable extra costs and inconvenience associated with extra limitations to protect the municipality’s drinking water. The process and funding needs to consider that land owners like me and my family, who live and participate in normal residential activities, should not be unreasonably subject to the costs that may result from the committee’s recommended actions.</p> <p>Thanks you for the opportunity to provide our feedback. What is the next step in this discussion? Regarding the points and questions I raised in this note, you advice and feedback is appreciated.</p>	<p>All comments that have been received will be included in the SPP documents that are submitted to MOE for final approval. The SPC/SPA may wish to draw the ministry’s attention to this comment in submitting the SPP for approval</p>	<p>Include in cover letter</p>
<p>The Municipality of Thames Centre has probably sent you a report regarding an EA done for the South Dorchester Stormwater Drainage. It appears that they have done a commendable job in developing the report, although it fails to address that area of most concern to me; the leaching of groundwater in the current pond location.</p> <p>As we covered in a letter of April 27, 2012, in response to a letter from Mr. Whitehead from Stantec on April 25th; groundwater leaching has been a severe problem for us since 2007. The current stormwater pond was not lined even though the developer and the Municipality were both aware, or should have been aware, of the sandy soil composition. Ground water infiltration has now affected</p>	<p>Not regulated under the Clean Water Act.</p>	<p>Passed the letter on to the UTRCA department that is involved with EA reviews, they have followed up with the municipality to determine if the municipality is aware of the concern.</p>

Comment	Response	Action
<p>other neighbours' as they to battle high ground water levels in this area that may be compromising their septic system, and the quality of water going into the storage tanks.</p> <p>As a result, we have pumped “Millions of Gallons” of water from our sump hole in our home starting in 2007. One session lasted from November 2010 until the end of May 2012; non-stop and we are currently pumping sine November 2012. In March of 2010 we were pumping 4,000 gallons an hour for a couple of weeks, non-stop. If we had not made the decision to hook-up to the new storm & septic sewers in 2008-2009, our old septic system would have been “severely” compromised. Prior to this ponds creation, we did not pump a single drop of water from when we bought the home in 1998 to 2007! This situation is not rain water driven, except when it enters the pond to leech.</p> <p>We like the proposed recommendation of moving and decommissioning the current pond I do have concerns about the ending of the project. We would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Oakwood Street pond not just decommissioned, but to be filled-in as well and returned to nature as a stagnant pond serves only as a mosquito breeding ground. Please note, that the West Nile Virus was found a few hundred metres from the ponds location • The Municipality will take the proper steps to “ensure” that leaching of the groundwater doesn't affect the residents in the proposed area of the new pond. <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>		