

Public input/comments on *Draft PROPOSED* Assessment Reports



Glenda Rodgers
Project Manager
July 14, 2010

Overview of Presentation

Summary of participation

Public Meeting attendance/questions raised

Landowner responses to letters – changes to significant threat counts

General Comments from Landowner responses

Written Comments

Next Steps



Number of Participants in AR Review

Type of Contact	Total
Landowner phone calls	85
Landowner response forms	188
Written comments on AR*	10*
Attendees at Public Meetings	80
Total Response	363

Municipal/First Nation Comments

*Comments from Municipalities	4 of 10 from municipalities
*Comments from First Nations	0

Public Meetings – Attendance

DATE	LOCATION	ATTENDANCE*
June 23	Baltimore	9
June 24	Norland	11
June 28	Havelock	10
June 29	Peterborough	11
July 5	Blackstock	17
July 6	Stirling	22
	TOTAL	80

**not including staff and SPC members*

Public Meetings (Baltimore) – Questions/Comments

What is the relationship between ODWSP funding and the Environmental Farm Plan?

What are the potential impacts on agricultural land use due to risks associated with surface water systems?

What is the relationship between the Warkworth water supply and the local streams?

Public Meeting (Norland) – Questions/Comments

You mentioned there are 19 Source Protection Committees across the province. Do all SPCs have the same commitments?

With respect to Norland: how far up does the 2 hour travel time reach?

You mentioned that water quantity also has been assessed but is not a threat. Especially with the water level drop down at the feeder lakes it seems that we approach water shortage. Why is water quantity not a threat?

Will the power generation plant have an impact on water quantity?

Is the Assessment Report a document that will be renewed when new information is discovered?

You mentioned that two and ten year drought scenarios were simulated. How would a ten year drought impact the vulnerable areas?

Norland (cont'd)

If the TSW as a federal organization is controlling the water levels in this region versus the provincial legislated Clean Water Act how can we be assured that the outcomes of this assessment will be considered by TSW?

How are the concerns of landowners with dug wells considered?

If I received a letter – am I a potential threat or considered a significant threat already?

Do certificates of approvals exist for septic systems?

How does one know whether a septic system is failing?

Would there be funding available to upgrade septic systems?

Have municipalities been given more power by the Clean Water Act, 2006 to deal with contamination of waste disposal sites that are permitted by MOE?

Public Meeting (Havelock) – Questions/Comments

Will the ODWSP change in the way it is facilitated or the area affected?

My septic system is 300 ft from the water - why did my property get chosen and not cottagers on the river?

How many people replied to letters from Havelock?

If implementation is required, what should be included in the municipal official plan?
And at what level of detail?

What happened with cemeteries being listed as threats?

What about planning where there are shared municipal boundaries?

Havelock (cont'd)

What kind of comments are you looking for from farmers? Havelock has small family farms that may not be farming currently. Are you looking to hear if they still have a farm and how many animals the barn could house?

Want to make it known that MNR should be doing wetlands mapping for HBM; this would be a great time for the Ministry to be looking into this matter. Wetlands have not been mapped for HBM yet.

When will planners be involved in the process?

Are there still people on septic in Havelock? Will the stewardship program assist in having them connected to municipal services?

Public Meeting (Peterborough) – Questions/Comments

Why is snow storage a “threat”?

Will compensation be available should restricted use [policies] be put in place?

Have you considered the historical inventory of threats?

Have you considered toxic chemical transportation?

In preparing the water budgets, have well records been reviewed? Have water levels changed over time? Are there any trends over time?

How does the AR conclude that there are no water quantity threats?

What are the effects of climate change on available groundwater supplies?

Have you taken into consideration population projections?

Have you factored in safety, e.g. differences between hog manure & human sewage?

Are the ORM & TCC Source Protection water budgets in line?

Public Meeting (Blackstock) – Questions/Comments

Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program - is funding available for larger projects that involves more than one landowner?

How can threats be identified if the report is only draft (work in progress)?

How far is the vulnerable area away from the wellhead?

I think that municipalities should be doing this exercise. Are they at all involved?

You mentioned that you are assessing time of travel. How deep underground is time of travel measured?

What are the residential threats?

Explain further what a threat is and how this relates to agricultural activities around a well. Will you eliminate the use of pesticides even though the chemical was approved by the MOE?

Blackstock (cont'd)

I have not seen Pontypool on your list - basements are flooded and due to the high water tables, septic systems are not working. The foul odour of failing systems can be noticed everywhere. Does the plan not reach that far?

Shouldn't municipalities look out for their residents?

Once the plan is in place and a landowner is required to e.g. upgrade their oil tank, who will enforce the activities?

What are the next steps in terms of funding for this program?

Municipalities are often expected to fund the implementation process and it is the taxpayer that pays for these new protection measures. Can you comment on this?

You mentioned funding available for landowners. How about compensation for farmers?

How powerful is the Clean Water Act?

What role does the Clean Water Act have with regards to wind turbines?

Public Meeting (Stirling) - Questions/Comments

What does XCG mean? What are their qualifications & what do they know about water quality?

Do you assume that everyone is online?

How did you get the information about my property?

Concerns over the quality of the information and data as well as process.

What about activities in town?

Who pays to 'fix' significant threats?

What was the cost of this project?

How were we identified as significant threats? No one talked to us.

Stirling (cont'd)

Why did I receive a letter saying I am a significant threat to the Stirling water supply when I was told a while ago that I had no impact to the well.

Why doesn't Stirling have a representative on the committee?

If I received a letter, does that mean I live in the area shown in pink on the map?

Are the significant threat counts for all the systems in the region?

Oil tanks- If you are doing everything by regulation how can you be a significant threat?

Why does the water budget show that there are no water quantity issues when we had water restrictions a few years ago?

Landowner Responses to Letters: Revisions to Threat Counts

- 85 phone calls
- 88 comment forms
- Summary of responses (handout)

RESULTS

- Increase in fuel storage count for Havelock (added 99, based on responses, instead of 1 for block of properties)
 - Decrease in fuel storage count for other areas (105 removed from original count, based on responses)
 - Consultants reviewing other comments (phone calls, site inspections)
 - Final threat count will be revised
-

General Comments (from Comment Forms/Phone calls)

File No.	Comment	Response/ Potential Action
tel-TR4	Concerned about soil contamination resulting from Frankford dump leachate	Check for documentation of a condition
tel-TR10	Concerned about contamination from water fowl (Norland)	?Request to add local threat (waterfowl)
tel-TR26	Concerned about runoff from a bridge near Norland intake (Norland)	?Request to add local threat (transportation corridors) or address as policy
tel-TR27	Concerned about contamination from water fowl at Riverside Park (Frankford) and Mill Pond	?Request to add local threat (waterfowl)
Tel-TR29	Concerned about pathogen contamination from geese (Norland)	?Request to add local threat (waterfowl)

File No.	Comment	Response/ Potential Action
Tel-TR42	Doesn't think that source protection work should be done for Batawa because WTP is closing	Awaiting official letter from Quinte West Re: Batawa WTP
TR-5	My concern is the Canada Geese who arrive in the hundreds on the river, staying for hours. Some land on my pasture. These are not migrating birds, they are fed at the Filtration Plant/Zoo all winter. Paths near the water at the zoo are too slimy to walk on (Peterborough)	Local threat already added for Peterborough
TR-18	The water control levels are not maintained in the area with any consideration of property owners, flooding, too low, this may be causing contamination!	?Request to add local threat (water quality problems arising from water quantity control)

File No.	Comment	Response/ Potential Action
TR-84	<p>[Our concession] has a high rate of illness and cancer. A property [location omitted] was used as a dump site ([name withheld] farm). I believe this site still may be affecting our water and the health and life of this community. This could drain into Mill creek and then to Warkworth municipal water.</p>	<p>Check for documentation of a condition</p>

File No.	Comment	Response/ Potential Action
TR-88	<p>The one thing that doesn't seem to be being recognized is that your mapping / your calculations are all being based on "the old location" of the well and not the new location as I tried to point out to you the last time. You see, I personally donated a piece of my property to the township for the new system to be constructed specifically to have it moved further away from my business and thereby eliminating any concerns with my operations. They in turn have severed themselves from the original well on my property which now has nothing to do with <u>Lutterworth Pines</u> community and is now mine and mine alone.</p>	<p>Delineate WHPA based on new well location (underway for updated AR)</p>

File No.	Comment	Response/ Potential Action
TR-104	The <u>Buckhorn Estates association</u> is taking care of the interests in this community, including all concerns about the water system. I therefore recommend that the executives of this association be contacted for all matters related to the water system. The association has a water committee which stays in touch with the Township of Galway-Cavendish & Harvey. The current president of the Buckhorn Lake Estates Association is [name and contact info omitted]	No action required for Assessment Report
TR-111	The <u>golf course</u> is immediately adjacent to the wellheads and their use of sprays or other applications could seep into the groundwater.	AR considered pesticide application threats (was it counted?)

File No.	Comment	Response/ Potential Action
TR-139	(Excerpt from attachment) The Regional Municipality of Durham entered into a <u>covenant</u> [the property owner] "To not object to any normal farming operations carried out on the benefitting lands, even if such normal farming operations are found at any time to have any adverse impact on any wells on the burdened lands."	CWA may supersede this covenant
TR-140	(Excerpt from attachment) "We have had nothing but problems with the quality of our [private] water supply since the two [municipal] test wells were drilled on the adjoining lot by the township."	Related to quality of <u>private well</u>

File No.	Comment	Response/ Potential Action
TR-157	(Excerpt from attachment) “Make sure your records show a potential threat at the Elizabeth well pumping station, as there is a <u>new generator with a 900L diesel tank exposed to the elements.</u> Also make sure your records show a potential threat at the <u>Henry St. pumping house</u> where, when it floods the septic trucks are there for days.”	Confirm that these threats were counted (as appropriate)
TR-158	(Excerpt from attachment) The Regional Municipality of Durham entered into a <u>covenant</u> [the property owner] "To not object to any normal farming operations carried out on the benefitting lands, even if such normal farming operations are found at any time to have any adverse impact on any wells on the burdened lands."	CWA may supersede this covenant

Written Comments (copy provided to SPC)

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
AH (Cavan)	Concerned with potential for spills along transportation routes	Request to add local threat <u>or</u> address using policy approach in plan
	Hold meeting in Millbrook area for next round of public meetings	No AR action
	Should provide compensation for restrictions on agriculture	Outside scope of CWA
	Should have greater regard for climate change	Minimum standards met - insufficient data for further work
PS (Coe Hill)	SGRA/HVA –very broad, inaccurate; not sufficient density of records in upper reaches; Lack of info not adequately explained	Provide comment in 6.2.8 indicating that these are broad, regional level assessments and could be improved with additional data, as it becomes available. Add 6.1.6 (continual improvement & add similar statement)

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
Lake Ontario Water Keeper	Provide detailed info in the ARs on individual sites considered as potential threats to drinking water	Not practical; may contravene MFIPPA
	Provide detailed information for each potential site describing how it was evaluated, including how the precautionary principle was applied to its evaluation.	Methodology provided (applies to all sites); Not practical on a site by site basis.
	Provide information regarding the existing environmental laws that will be applied to set standards for the Plan, in the absence of specific targets for Great Lakes water set by the MOE	Outside scope of Assessment Report

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
JZ Campbellcroft	Allegations about possible contamination of land at site of former Millbrook Correctional Centre	Previously reviewed by consultant; no documented evidence
	Concerns with water quantity related to Fraserville development	Scale relevant to EA process, not CWA (water budget)
	Potential impacts of water taking on Baxter Creek, private wells	Scale relevant to EA process, not CWA (water budget)
	Two abandoned landfill sites near Millbrook	Only one site identified (located in WHPA-D, VS=4) Check for other landfill site
	May be underground gas tanks from a defunct service station	No documented evidence of a condition Check
	Underground reservoirs may be forming underground	No evidence
	Aluminum kitchenware factory was located in Millbrook	No documented evidence of a condition Check

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
JZ Campbellcroft	Toxic material (SoundSorb) used at Kawartha Downs	Not in vulnerable area
(cont'd)	Concerns with tritium levels at the Peterborough airport	Not in vulnerable area (IPZ1 and 2) Not an issue (with current standards)
	Planned system (Fraserville-Lansdowne Street) – concerns with impact on private wells (quantity, colour, odour) -proximity to golf course (herbicides, pesticides)	Impacts on private wells at scale relevant to EA process, not CWA (water budget) Golf courses considered in Threats Assessment (check for Fraserville)
	Concerned with lack of use of well records	Well records of sufficient locational quality were used
	Distribute survey to learn info about local water bodies	Not within scope of current work
	Next review should be no greater than 5 years	MOE will set review timelines

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
KB (Norland)	How does sewage sludge fit into Source Protection?	NASM
	How is buried scrap tires in recharge areas considered in Source Protection?	<p>Considered if there is documented evidence of contamination resulting in a condition;</p> <p>Considered if registered as a landfill;</p> <p>No significant threats in SGRA</p>
	How does actions/inactions of official agencies charged with protection of the environment fit in with Source Protection?	CWA provides additional tools to protect sources of water for municipal drinking water systems
		Respond to landowner

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
City of Kawartha Lakes	Plain language Executive Summary	ES written in language consistent with AR; communication piece could be prepared later for target audiences
	Page 2-4 –who prepared Watershed Characterization	Add source for all WCs
	<u>Surface Water Vulnerability</u> -TOT (drogues), abbreviation, storm sewer maps, uncertainty, more description for vulnerability scores/uncertainty rating	Review/Edit
	<u>Surface Water Issues</u> -weekly vs monthly typo, aluminum sampling, aluminum for Norland (data gap?)	Review/Edit Add section 4.3.3 (Continual Improvement)
	<u>Surface Water Threats</u> Table 4.4-4 –break into separate tables	Provided in addendum
	<u>Groundwater Vulnerability</u> Rename to “Woodfield” Confirm “uncertainty” ratings	TOR name (use both names at first occurrence)

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
City of Kawartha Lakes	<u>Groundwater Issues</u> Reword sentence re WTP Operator Interviews	Reword
(cont'd)	<u>Groundwater Threats</u> Table 5.4-3 –break into separate tables	Provided in Addendum
	<u>Add definitions</u> for ASM, NonASM, GUDI, porosity, permeability, hydraulic conductivity	Add definitions
	<u>Other Drinking Water Systems</u> DWIS#s need to be updated to SDWS Additional facilities added/name corrections	Update

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
Durham	A number of suggestions for mapping	Review/Correct where possible
(GRCA)	What is % of GRCA that is SGRA?	Calculate and Respond to Durham
	Road salt clarification (watershed characterization)	Add emphasis on road development to text
	Referencing of report	Correct text
	More data for Wilmot Creek could be added	Add text
	Removal of line of text	Remove
	Clarification of Significant Threat for Clarington	Communicate with municipality
	Why only shallow wells used for HVA?	Provide explanation to Durham
	Reference correction	Correct error

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
--	---------	---------------------------

Smith-
Ennismore-
Lakefield

Municipality will provide information on additional storm drains to be identified as transport pathways.

Update maps where appropriate

Municipal Sewer Line and George Street Pumping station (Hague Street) should be identified as separate threats

Review with consultants

Why was the campground and beach on Hague Point not identified for waterfowl congregation?

Follow up with ORCA/Municipality for location/more information

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
MOE	Editorial/Administrative Comments	Revisions/clarification
<i>Legislative Requirements</i>	Maps – 2 or more on same page – change to 1 per page/resolution	Not proposing to change # of maps on page Will revisit resolution for printing
<i>Recommendations</i>	Maps – labelling	If time permits; otherwise could be in updated AR
<i>Suggestions</i>	Misc Map comments	Will be addressed, if possible
	<u>Trent surface water vulnerability</u> – Warkworth intake classification – Area vulnerability factors/source vulnerability factors for intakes	Text to be amended/expanded
	Trent Surface Water Maps	Additional features to be added for clarification Expand IPZ-2/3 for certain systems Batawa/Hastings – may affect SDWT counts

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
MOE Cont'd	Ganaraska <u>surface water</u> <u>vulnerability</u> – IPZ-2	To be reviewed/revise if possible
<i>Legislative Requirements</i>	SGRA – recharge rates	Explanation/clarification to be provided
<i>Recommendations</i>	Watershed Characterization	Discrepancies to be corrected
<i>Suggestions</i>	Cardiff – justification of method/further explanation	Consultant providing explanation
	Dyno Estates – justification of method/further explanation	Consultant providing explanation
	Lutterworth Pines – lack of 2 year TOT	Provide explanation (Should system be included?)
	Creighton Heights/Orono – pumping rates	Provide explanation
	Groundwater maps	Updated well locations being added to maps

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
MOE Cont'd	Trent Water Budget – additional features to be added to maps – Tier 2 stress assessment map to be added	Revisions to be made
<i>Legislative Requirements</i>	Trent Water Budget – reference to updated T2 SGRA	Included in SGRA section
<i>Recommendations</i>	Ganaraska Water Budget – revise groundwater supply estimation – provide further explanation on Orono stress level	Revisions to be made
<i>Suggestions</i>	Ganaraska Water Budget – revisions to stress maps	Revisions to be made
	Trent – list SDWT by SPA	Table to be added
	Trent – more explanation on local threats	Text to be added

	Comment	Response/Potential Action
MOE Cont'd	– clarification re “preliminary issue” vs “issue”	Text to be reviewed/revise
<i>Legislative Requirements</i>	– concern with 50 year trend analysis for issues – very long time horizon	Consultant used this time frame (not specified in TR) (precautionary)
<i>Recommendations</i>	Microcystin-LR – not a data gap under 115 as not an issue under 114	Follow up with MOE
<i>Suggestions</i>	Blackstock – concern with 50 year trend analysis (too long of period)	Note: Exceeds limit in approx. 10 years
	Conditions – explain methodology	Add text
	Livestock Density – more clarification on methodology	Follow up with MOE

Next Steps

- Edit threat counts (July)
- Revisions to reports (July)
- Revisions to maps (July – early August)
- Stage 2 of editing - cross-referencing tables & maps, numbering, etc. (late July – mid-August)
- Review changes with SPC (August 20th)
- Send to printers/upload to website (late August/early September)
- Reply to all individuals that submitted comments (late August/early September)
- 30 day public consultation period (September – early October)
- SPA meetings (October)
- Submit to Ministry (by October 29th)