

## Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).

Peer Evaluation Comment	TRCA Response	Revisions to Report
<b>Durham Region</b>		
1. <b>Section 3.0</b> - Should reference PWQO, not ODWS		
2. <b>Section 3.4.3, page 3-30</b> - Add "pH control" for sulphuric acid	Agreed.	Edit made
3. <b>Section 3.4.3, page 3-31</b> - Correct reference to Ajax raw water; not a well	Agreed	Edits made to Table 3-11
4. <b>Section 3.4.3, page 3-31</b> - Well is in Uxbridge Twp., not Scugog	Agreed	Edit made
5. <b>Section 3.4.5, page 3-36</b> (Table 3-20): Correct reference to water treatment plant; not a well; Reference to "Exceedance of Microbiological Parameters" is incorrect since this is not potable water.	Agreed	Table 3-20 revised: Reference to WTP corrected; "Exceedances" changed to "Concentrations"
<b>Peel Region - Public Works</b>		
10. <b>Section 1.1.6, page 1-9:</b> CAMC & YPDT listed in the Report as an Agency. Revise to reflect the fact that CAMC is an associative group of conservation authorities while YPDT is a collaborative project encompassing areas of York, Peel, Durham, and Toronto.	Agreed	Section title renamed from "Other Agencies" to "Other"; text modified to reflect staffing arrangements
11. <b>Section 3.4.1, page 3-25:</b> Palgrave well depths are listed as Pal1 48 m, Pal2 155m, Pal3 82m. Revise to reflect true well depths of Pal1 48m, Pal2 47m & Pal3 82.3m	Agreed	Edits made.
12. <b>Section 3.4.1, page 3-25:</b> CalEast well depth are listed as CE2 36m, CE3 53m & CE4 65m. Revise to reflect true well depths of CE2 31.4m, CE3 48.2m & CE4 56.7m.	Agreed	Edits made.
13. <b>Section 4.1.2, Existing Water Use, page 4-15, Table 4-4:</b> Revise to reflect that Caledon East Well #1 has not been in production since 1970; Revise to reflect that Caledon East Well #4 has been in production since 1990. Revise to reflect that Palgrave Well #1 is no longer an active municipal water supply.	Agreed	Edits made.
14. <b>Section 5.0, Well Head Protection Zones, page 5-4, Figure 5-1:</b> Revise to reflect that Centreville, Mono Mills & Skywood Park WHPAs are no longer part of OP as the wells are no longer municipal supply wells and most have been decommissioned.	Agreed	Figure 5-1 updated with correct WHPAs supplied by Peel.
<b>Peel Region - Planning</b>		
1. Please be advised that the Town of Caledon , at the request of the Region of Peel, has recently adopted Official Plan Amendment No. 199 to make the following amendments to wellhead protection areas identified on Schedule O to the Town of Caledon Official Plan : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Wellhead protection areas for Mono Mills Well #2, Well #3 and Well #4 are deleted.</li> <li>➤ Wellhead protection areas for Mono Mills Well #5, Well #6 and Well #7 are deleted.</li> <li>➤ Wellhead protection areas for Skywood Park Well #1, Well #2 and Well #3 are deleted,</li> <li>➤ 5 and 10 year wellhead protection areas for Inglewood Well #3 are added.</li> <li>➤ 5 and 10 year wellhead protection areas for Cheltenham Well PW1 and PW2 are added.</li> </ul>	Agreed. Inglewood is in CVC jurisdiction	Figure 5-1 updated with Peel's most recent WHPAs; OPA reference added to text.

## Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).

Peer Evaluation Comment	TRCA Response	Revisions to Report
<p>2. <b>Section 5.2.1, page 5-3:</b> The statement that the Region of Peel has developed preliminary WHPAs for each of the Region's wells is not correct. The Region of Peel has delineated 2 year, 5 year, 10 year, 25 year and zone of contribution capture zones for all of the Region's active municipal wells and has designated wellhead protection areas (WHPAs) for certain capture zones through policies adopted in the Town of Caledon Official Plan. Regional wells having adopted WHPAs in the Town of Caledon Official Plan within TRCA watersheds are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Palgrave Wells 1, 2, 3 &amp; 4 – 2 yr, 10 yr and 25 yr WHPAs (on ORM)</li> <li>➤ Caledon East Wells 2 &amp; 3 - 2 yr, 10 yr and 25 yr WHPAs (on ORM)</li> <li>➤ Caledon East Well 4 - 2 yr, 10 yr and 25 yr WHPAs (on ORM)</li> </ul> <p>Please update this description to indicate this distinction between delineated capture zones and adopted wellhead protection areas within the Region of Peel .</p>	<p>Provides further clarification of Peel Comment #1</p>	<p>Text Added as new Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Similar sections added for York and Durham.</p>
<p>3. <b>Figure 5-1 Wellhead Protection Zones (Well Capture Zones), page 5-4:</b> We recommend changing the title and legend of the map to indicate “ Well Capture Zones ” rather than “Wellhead Protection Zones ” if the intent is to include well capture zones that are not yet designated as “ wellhead protection areas ” (WHPAs) in Official Plans. We have no objection to the report mapping all of the existing well capture zones regardless of their OP status; however, in order to avoid confusion there should be supporting documentation or additional mapping (see recommendation below) to differentiate well capture zones that have no OP status from wellhead protection areas that are designated in an Official Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Delete the wellhead protection zones for the Centreville Wells 1, 2 and 3 as these wells have been decommissioned and are not in service.</li> <li>➤ Delete all of the Mono Mills and Skywood Park wellhead protection zones as these wells have been decommissioned and are not in service.</li> <li>➤ Add 2 yr, 5yr, 10 yr and 25 yr well capture zones for Palgrave Well 1 as this information is missing.</li> <li>➤ Revise the wellhead protection zones for Cheltenham Wells PW 1 &amp; 2 by adding 5 year and 10 year well capture zones. It appears that there is data is missing.</li> <li>➤ Add the 5 yr and 10 yr well capture zones for Inglewood Well 3 as this information is missing.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with WHPA/capture zone distinction. Cheltenham and Inglewood are in CVC jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Map 5-1 renamed as Wellhead Protection Areas; revised with most recent Peel WHPAs within TRCA's jurisdiction.</p>
<p>4. <b>Recommended New Figure 5-2 to Show Wellhead Protection Areas ( WHPAs) Designated in the Town of Caledon Official Plan.</b> Please transfer the existing data from Figure 5-1 with the following corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Delete the wellhead protection zones for the Centreville Wells 1, 2 and 3 as these wells have been decommissioned and are not in service.</li> <li>➤ Delete all of the Mono Mills and Skywood Park wellhead protection zones as these wells have been decommissioned and are not in service.</li> <li>➤ Add Wellhead Protection Areas (WHPAs) for Palgrave Well 1 for the 2 yr, 10 yr and 25 yr</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with additions/deletions of specified WHPAs and capture zones</p>	<p>Characterization Report updated with this information. Figure 5-1 updated. New Figure 5-2 deemed unnecessary at this time.</p>

## Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).

Peer Evaluation Comment	TRCA Response	Revisions to Report
<p>well capture zones. Please note that the 5 yr well capture zone is not designated as it is a well located on the Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Delete the 5 year wellhead protection zones for the Caledon East Wells 2 , 3 and 4 and the Palgrave Wells 2, 3 and 4 as these are ORM wells that do not have their 5 year well capture zones designated as wellhead protection areas (WHPAs).</li> <li>➤ Include only the 5 yr and 10 yr well capture zones for Cheltenham Wells PW 1 &amp; 2 as these are wells that are not located on the ORM and as such only have 5 and 10 year WHPAs designated in the Caledon Official Plan (i.e., they do not have their 2 or 25 year well capture zones designated as WHPAs ).</li> <li>➤ Delete the 2 yr and 25 year wellhead capture zones for Inglewood Wells 1 &amp; 2. These are wells not on the ORM and as such only have 5 and 10 year WHPAs designated in the Caledon OP.</li> <li>➤ Delete and replace the 2 yr and 25 year wellhead capture zones for Inglewood Well 3 with 5 yr and 50 yr well capture zones. Inglewood Well 3 is not located on the ORM and as such only has 5 and 10 year WHPAs designated in the Caledon OP.</li> </ul>		
<p>5. <b>Figure 7-1 Potential Concerns for Water Quality and Quantity (page 7-3):</b> Ensure that the mapping of wellhead protection zones (i.e., well capture zones) is consistent with the corrections that are recommended for Figure 5-1.</p>	Agreed	Figure 7-1 updated to conform with Figure 5-1.
<b>Town of Ajax</b>		
<p>1. <b>Executive Summary, Page ii:</b> City of Ajax should be revised to Town of Ajax.</p>	Agreed	All references to City of Ajax changed to Town of Ajax.
<p>2. <b>Page 2-86, Table 2-16:</b> Population projections should be revised to population forecasts and the numbers for Durham should be 960,000 for population and 350,000 for employment.</p>	Agreed	Revisions made.
<p>3. <b>Page 3-31:</b> Section dealing with Uxville has an incorrect reference to Scugog.</p>	Agreed - same comment as Durham	Revision made.
<p>4. <b>Page 5-1:</b> The report should note that Ammendment 114 to the ROP designates wellhead protection areas. The designated wellhead protection areas identify different protection zones.</p>		Revisions made; same done to Peel and York as well.
<p>5. <b>Page 7-1:</b> Should the Nuclear Station be listed as a Threat or an Issue?</p>	This should be a "threat" to surface water quality	Nuclear station added as a threat to surface water quality. Preliminary feedback on Lake Ontario project provided by City of Toronto.
<b>York Region</b>		
<p>1. <b>General Comment #1:</b> Alphabetical list of technical terms needed.</p>	Agreed	Glossary added to report.
<p>2. <b>General Comment #2:</b> Section on Methodology needed.</p>	Agreed	Section 1.3 added.
<p>3. <b>General Comment #3:</b> A general description of the QA/QC approach undertaken is missing</p>	Agreed	Section 1.4 added.

## Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).

Peer Evaluation Comment	TRCA Response	Revisions to Report
4. <b>General Comment #4:</b> A section "purpose" should be added at the beginning of each section to assist readers	Agreed	Introductory paragraph added to each Level 1 heading (i.e., Section 1.0)
1. <b>Executive Summary - page vii</b> - Need to clarify York's sampling protocol	Agreed	Text added on page vii
2. <b>Table A-1: Threats Inventory Data Gaps:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road Salt Usage is provided by the Towns as a bulk calculation for the whole area. We need to evaluate the amount of salt deposition in the wellhead protection areas (tonnes per km of roadway) as chlorides tend to show up in our shallow wells.</li> <li>• Storm Water Management Ponds – a map of all in wellhead protection areas, who owns them, what maintenance is done, age of infrastructure, etc</li> <li>• Spills database – York Region (Sewer Bylaw Enforcement) maintains a spills database and a detail review should be done in the wellhead protection areas, in particular the shallow production wells</li> <li>• Delineation of abandoned wells – we don't know where they are and have no problem to address in TRCA or York Region.</li> <li>• Preferential pathway study needs to be completed. Areas to focus on would be WHPAs and sensitive areas (i.e. areas of high aquifer vulnerability).</li> <li>• Develop a database to keep track of biosolids generation and spreading across the Region</li> <li>• Review of historical information for industrial and commercial land uses in areas of interest (i.e. WHPAs)</li> <li>• Improve the location information of contaminant databases in the contaminant inventory report specifically in WHPAs, areas of high aquifer vulnerability and private well use. Need to also develop a list of priority areas and/or sites for further investigation.</li> </ul>	Agreed	Table A-1 updated with York's Threats Inventory Data Gap issues (wording changed slightly to reflect entire watershed area, not just York Region).
3. <b>Table A-1: Water Quantity Data Gaps:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Level Monitoring – there is a need to review the strategic placement of monitoring points to ensure we have adequate coverage across the Region. There are wide areas where there are gaps or lack of accumulation of data for interpretation. A significant amount of effort needs to be undertaken to bring all the various data sets from Class EAs, Private PTTW Monitoring (Ross Hodgins, MOE), Municipal Monitoring, Landfills and PGMNs into 1 data set. [CRA tried to do this for Lemonville and it was huge undertaking]</li> <li>• Flowing Wells – do we know where they all exist and can we target areas to do education, restoration and improvements?</li> <li>• Kleinburg is spelled in correctly (see identified concerns)</li> </ul>	Agreed	Table A-1 updated with York's Water Quality Data Gap issues (wording changed slightly to reflect entire watershed area, not just York Region). Spelling of Kleinburg corrected
4. <b>Table A-1: Water Quantity Data Gaps:</b> Strategic Placement of Sentry wells – once the water quality assessment is complete, there may be a need to have a program to review installation and sampling protocols for monitoring wells.	Agreed	Table A-1 updated with York's Water Quantity Data Gap issues (wording changed slightly to reflect entire watershed area, not just York Region).

## Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).

Peer Evaluation Comment	TRCA Response	Revisions to Report
5. <b>Introduction, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph:</b> Since this report will be made available to the general public, we recommend that the link to the MOE guidance modules be provided, just in case somebody would like to take a look at them.	Agreed	References to the guidance modules added.
6. <b>Introduction, 7<sup>th</sup> Paragraph:</b> It is stated that the report will be “complementary to TRCA’s watershed planning process for Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan”. Would it be possible to provide some discussion as to how the two reports complement each other so it is clear that there is no duplication of efforts?	Agreed	
7. <b>Introduction:</b> Purpose of the report should be placed as a separate section within the introduction so it is easy to find	Agreed	Subsection 1.2 added to increase clarity
8. <b>Introduction:</b> Another objective of the report (very important one) to identify data and knowledge gaps (perhaps prioritize these gaps) so effort is directed to collect missing information.	Agreed	Objective added
9. <b>Before Section 1.1:</b> Provide a description of the methodology followed to accomplish the study objectives. This will also provide a link to the next data sources section.	Agreed	Subsection 1.3 added for methodology.
10. <b>Section 1.1 Data Sources:</b> Municipalities have provided or will be providing information for the preparation of the report (i.e. Contaminant Source Inventory Report, Water Quality Data available for production wells, etc). Why municipalities (and information provided) are not included in the list?	Agreed	Municipalities added as data sources (new Section 1.5.2 added, subsequent sections renumbered.
11. <b>Section 1.2 - Knowledge and Data Gaps:</b> Placement of this information in the intro section is very confusing, it draws conclusions without analysis or background information and it does[t] make the document flow nicely. Please remove this info and add the details in the appropriate sections and probably in a conclusion/ recommendation section at the end of the report.	Although TRCA agrees with this comment, we are working with a prescribed document format. Data gaps are also summarized at the end of each section.	No changes made.
12. <b>Section 1.2.4 - Water Quality – Knowledge Gaps:</b> It is unclear what it’s meant by ‘There is also a significant municipal partner knowledge gap.’ It’s very odd have these statements in the intro.	This gap references the extensive data collected and stored by our regional partners, but not yet shared with the CAs (as of June 30, 2006).	Wording in report clarified.
13. <b>Section 2.1.3 Watersheds:</b> What about subwatersheds? They were not listed.	Subwatersheds	None. Subwatersheds will be added to

## Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).

Peer Evaluation Comment	TRCA Response	Revisions to Report
	have not yet been delineated for source water protection	assessment report once the subwatershed delineation process is complete.
14. Isn't the first paragraph of page 2-4 more related to Section 2.1.6 – Other Partnerships?	Agreed	Moved paragraph to Section 2.1.6
15. <b>Section 2.1.6. Other partnerships:</b> Need to provide a list of stakeholders that have already been engaged in watershed planning activities. Any partnership with First Nations Groups?	Stakeholder list needed, no consultation with First Nations	List of stakeholders added to Section 2.1.6.
16. <b>Section 2.2.5 - Summary:</b> It should be emphasized the lack of data in the deeper zones and the ability to identify potential aquifers for future municipal supplies.	Agreed	New text added to note lack of deep borehole data
17. <b>Section 2.3.1 Climate:</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph may not be required as they relate to the climate of Ontario and the report is focussed on the TRCA watersheds.	Paragraphs provide context, as suggested by the MOE guidance	None
18. <b>Section 2.3.2 Precipitation:</b> Recommend a brief discussion about what types of soils are present in the watershed and what their role is in the quality and quantity of water (i.e., explain the map).	Agreed	Text enhanced relative to the importance of soil types and their role in the water budget. Further discussion is provided in the Conceptual Water Budget Report.
19. <b>Section 2.3.2 – Evapotranspiration:</b> Please elaborate. We understand this key component of the hydrologic cycle will be discussed in detail in the water budget report but it is important to at least indicate what the numbers provided mean (i.e. is it good or bad?, do we need more accurate measurements), what the role of evapotranspiration is in source water protection, etc.	Agreed	Additional information added to this section to explain the importance of evapotranspiration
20. <b>Section 2.3.3 - Watersheds:</b> This section is a little confusing as it discusses too many things. Why are the physical layout, description of land uses and stream networks of watersheds described in hydrology section? The section starts with strong statements, while the objective of the section is placed in the second paragraph. Please reorganize.	Agreed	Section reorganized
21. <b>Section 2.6.1 Population Distribution and Density:</b> What about population of lower-tier municipalities?	Agreed	This data source does not provide information for the lower tiers. Information on the lower tier municipalities on groundwater is provided in the water use section.
22. <b>Section 2.6.2 Brownfields:</b> The last paragraph is not correct. York Region has completed a Potential Contaminant Source Inventory and Initial Threat Assessment Study at a regional scale as part of the 2001 groundwater studies funded by MOE. No more funds have been allocated to update this inventory.	Agreed	Edit made - Peel is only municipality updating their inventory.

## Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).

Peer Evaluation Comment	TRCA Response	Revisions to Report
23. <b>Section 2.6.2 Wastewater treatment:</b> Has there any inventory of septic system locations been conducted in TRCA watershed? If not, need to include this inventory as data gap where necessary.	No inventory available	
24. <b>Section 2.7 Water Uses:</b> As written, this section provides a summary of water uses within TRCA's watershed. However drinking water systems are not included (i.e. municipal wells, domestic wells). The information in Section 4.0 is related to water takings/withdrawals.	Agreed	Section 2.7.1 added with summary of municipal, communal, and private drinking water use.
25. <b>Section 2.8.6. Water users:</b> Do we know what other CAs are doing to define the relationship between groundwater extraction and surface water flow? Is the methodology to determine this relationship going to be consistent among the various CAs? Please clarify	The methodology is still being refined but will be consistent across Ontario	None. The assessment of stress from groundwater use will be assessed at a Tier 1 level through the water budget analysis program.
26. <b>Section 3.1 Selecting Indicator Variables:</b> Pesticides and organics are monitored in York Region production wells. This information will be made available to TRCA.	None	This information will be incorporated, once supplied by York Region.
27. <b>Section 3.3 Groundwater Quality Data Analysis:</b> 10 <sup>th</sup> Paragraph – Isn't methane also encountered in the Thorncliffe aquifer? Water quality data will be provided to TRCA so it is incorporated in the report.	Agreed	Reference to natural methane in Thorncliffe and Scarborough Aquifers noted.
28. <b>Section 3.4.2 York Drinking Water Supply:</b> For this report, you will find peak instantaneous flow (by the line you can approximate the average flow L/s). Stouffville 5 and 6 are in-situ GUDI wells and have UV treatment. Tables – How important is the column on number of samples? it doesn't seem to add any value to the discussion and the information is not correct. Should be 4 samples per year. Please remove the column or provide some discussion and revise the information as necessary.  Need to re-write this entire section using appropriate information from <a href="http://www.region.york.on.ca/Regional+Government/Agendas+Minutes+and+Reports/_2006/TWC+rpt+3+2006.htm">http://www.region.york.on.ca/Regional+Government/Agendas+Minutes+and+Reports/_2006/TWC+rpt+3+2006.htm</a> See report number 4, { Attachment1 } Schedule 22 Report.	Agreed	York report, combined with forthcoming water quality assessment will be used to revise this section for the final watershed characterization report.
29. <b>Section 4.0</b> - It may be worth to note that a detailed water budget is being prepared in accordance to guidance module 2.	Agreed	Note added at beginning of Section 4.0
30. <b>Section 4.1.3 Water Use Trends:</b> Need to highlight that there is a transition thru the Class EAs to select surface water as the drinking water supply with a blend of groundwater. This is true for Stouffville and most likely the preferred option for King City and Kleinburg	Agreed	Note added regarding anticipated future groundwater use.
31. <b>Section 4.1.4 Municipal GW Use:</b> Needs to be updated as the data is from 2001 (MMM, 2006). We will provide you with production data.	None	TRCA will incorporate this information, once received.
32. <b>Section 5.0 Last paragraph of page 5-3:</b> The new WHPA mapping will be available in the fall of 2007 (not 2006).	Agreed	Section rewritten to reflect OP status, and indicate that work is ongoing.
33. <b>Section 5.2.2 Aquifer Vulnerability Mapping:</b> Not so sure if this section is clear enough. Why	Agreed	Section rewritten to increase clarity.

## Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).

Peer Evaluation Comment	TRCA Response	Revisions to Report
was ISI selected as a method to map the aquifer vulnerability? What are the limitations of this method? Is the new methodology going to be included in next versions of the report?	This is the methodology we have now	
34. <b>Section 5.0, Figure 5.4:</b> We should be thinking in another way to map this information. The current figure is very difficult to read.	TRCA is looking at a discharge per unit length methodology, but we don't have the data yet for our whole jurisdiction	No changes - will be done for assessment report with consistent methodology across TRCA's jurisdiction.
35. <b>Section 5.4.1 Data Gaps:</b> There may be also a need to determine vertical travel times for existing WHPAs where information is readily available to do so. What about incorporating hydrochemistry into the aquifer vulnerability assessment? Delineation of recharge areas is missing	Vertical travel times may be done by municipalities Recharge areas are part of the water budget	Hydrochemistry added as data gap
29. <b>Section 6.0 Data Gaps (Please see comment #2):</b> Need to improve the road salt inventory and to develop a municipal salt management plan. Investigate and document septic system locations. Update the current Contaminant inventory to identify potential contaminants within WHPAs. A preferential pathway study needs to be completed to map sewer network, locate abandoned wells, etc	Agreed	Data Gaps added as per this comment and Comment #2
30. <b>Section 7.0:</b> Just a reminder to add definitions of “issues” and “concerns” in the text and in the tables and figures.	Agreed	Definitions added
31. <b>Section 7.2, Table 7.1:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The identified concerns aren't targeted accurately. We recognized that the 16th Ave Dewatering project was an MAJOR issue, however not every YDSS project is a MAJOR issue (i.e. 19th Ave is doing it differently).</li> <li>• Need to steer the YDSS well issue in Lemonville to the flowing wells issue. CRA just finished their report (York Region will be sharing this info once legal allows to do so). This report explicitly states the flowing wells and ponds are a major local issue. In 1977, the MOE (Sibul et al, 1977) stated the Lemonville area would experience water shortages if they didn't address the flowing well issue. We need to map flowing wells and target it for education, restoration and improvements.</li> <li>• Stouffville Well 3 – installation of a sanitary pump station 150 m from the well...need to improve communications regarding wellhead protection areas</li> <li>• Road Salt - a very gradual rise in chlorides is found in some wells and we need to investigate the sources of them (i.e. Road Salt vs. natural geochemical evolution).</li> </ul>	Agreed	Concerns added to Table - will add information on Lemonville, once report from CRA is available. The information is deliberately vague for now, since TRCA does not have the documentation to review.  Aging infrastructure and climate change are beyond the scope of this project, but still have to be covered by York Region as part of due diligence.



**Response to Peer Evaluation of TRCA's Preliminary Watershed Characterization Report (June 2006 version).**

<b>Peer Evaluation Comment</b>	<b>TRCA Response</b>	<b>Revisions to Report</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landfills in York Region and proximity of the production wells (i.e. Stouffville, Ballantrae)</li> <li>• Nobleton – within the wellhead area is a large car wrecker operation. The potential migration off site should be investigated further</li> <li>• Identification of future groundwater supplies have not been determined or investigated. Currently program looks only at the immediate need and there may be a need to delineate these sources sooner rather than later.</li> <li>• Other concerns that need to be investigated are aging of infrastructure and climate change.</li> </ul>		