

Appendix J – Peer Review Record



CATARAQUI REGION
CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

CATARAQUI SOURCE
PROTECTION AREA



DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION
WATER BUDGET
CONCEPTUAL REPORT
PEER REVIEW RECORD

October 29, 2009

Peer Review Record

for the

First Draft

Submitted April 7, 2006

| COMMENT ID | SWP REGION | MEETING DATE | COMMENT DATE | SOURCE | OTHER | COMMENT | CATEGORY | APPLIES TO | PRIORITY | ACTION | ACTION DATE | ACTION DESCRIPTION |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|----------|---|---------------------|------------|----------|--------------------|-------------|--|
| 6 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | Use the Canadian Forest Service climate data mapping product across Eastern Ontario so consistency is maintained across the watersheds. This was mentioned at each of the first 3 meetings. | Climate | All | High | Completed | 6/1/2006 | Forestry Canada data has been obtained, and distributed for inclusion in the reports. This was completed and added to the report with the help of the new Hydrogeologist. |
| 7 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | More groundwater and hydrogeology information is needed in the report. | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 9/12/2006 | This estimate has been found, and is being used. |
| 8 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | At the conceptual stage, the water budget equation should be reconfigured as follows: Precipitation - Streamflow = Evapotranspiration, a basic equation, to see if it balances. This provides a very simple exploration of the data. | Water Use Hydrology | All | High | Completed | 3/19/2006 | The conceptual report will be restructured to take a step back from the draft document, which includes work that should be part of the Tier 1 document. |
| 9 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | While statistical analysis is useful, they are used here with too little data to make it appropriate, or in the wrong way. | Other | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 6/29/2006 | This will be considered in the next draft of the report. Perhaps the more detailed statistics are only pertinent in the Tier 1 report. Instead, non-parametric statistics were used. |
| 10 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | The definition of "Water Budget" should be found from a good text. | Other | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 6/29/2006 | Reference data for the uncertainty of various measurements used has been gathered for inclusion in the next version of the report. |
| 11 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | The uncertainty of precipitation data (5 to 10%) should be noted and accounted for. | Climate | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 7/20/2006 | Reference data for the uncertainty of various measurements used has been gathered for inclusion in the next version of the report. |
| 12 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | The term soil water holding capacity (SWHC) should be defined. | Hydrology | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 4/24/2006 | Reference data for the uncertainty of various measurements used has been gathered for inclusion in the next version of the report. |
| 13 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | A possible relation between groundwater well levels and climate data (precipitation and snowmelt) should be explored. Possibly the YHGLD Wilton Creek report deals with this. In addition the geometry of the wells and geology around wells should be described. Recharge events may be found through this method. | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 4/24/2006 | Reference data for the uncertainty of various measurements used has been gathered for inclusion in the next version of the report. |
| 14 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | Water course regulation does not factor into the annual water budget, as any recharge values would be expected to come later. | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 7/20/2006 | This is included in the next version of the report. |
| 15 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | At the conceptual budget stage, monthly values of data are not the goal, but rather annual values. The monthly values would be expected to come later. | Hydrology | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 7/14/2006 | These graphs will be modified to include some precipitation data, where available, as well as possible inclusion of older MOE groundwater monitoring well data. This is essentially how the work was written, but may need to be clarified in the introduction section. |
| 16 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | Plan evaporation data may be valuable to estimate lake evaporation and general ET values. | Hydrology | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 5/15/2006 | The analysis has been included in the report. |
| 17 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | ET numbers appear too high, as there is excess water accounted for with these numbers (100 mm of extra water above precipitation value). This could be taken into account via uncertainty of the data. | Climate | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 7/25/2006 | The uncertainty of the data has been estimated, which could explain the 100 mm of missing water. |
| 18 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | The precipitation values may be lower than actual due to underscatch at the gauges. For consideration of permitted (maximum) to actual ranges in P/ET, permitted values will give the worst case scenario. | Climate | All | High | Completed | 5/1/2006 | Reference data for the uncertainty of various measurements used has been gathered for inclusion in the next version of the report. |
| 19 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | More information is needed about groundwater. It is the largest source of water after the Great Lake system. | Water Use | All | Medium | No Action Required | 4/24/2006 | This work has been used in the report to this point. It may be changed for Tier 1 of 2, when more specific data is needed. |
| 20 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | The 2 CRCA groundwater studies do not mesh together. Work is needed to do this in Eastern Ontario. | Water Use | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 9/12/2006 | This was completed and added to the report with the help of the new Hydrogeologist. |
| 21 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | Field season measurements should include low flows and water temperature, to help identify groundwater recharge areas. | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 9/12/2006 | This was completed and added to the report with the help of the new Hydrogeologist. |
| 22 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | Are there data gasflags in the climate data? | Hydrogeology | All | High | To Be Completed | 9/12/2006 | This work is in progress for the Catarraqui SWP Region for the 2006 field season, with the hope to continue in the 2007 field season. The work is noted in the report. |
| 23 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | Are there data gasflags in the climate data? | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | No Action Required | 7/12/2006 | Yes, there are some. Essentially, any problems values from a monthly or annual perspective have been removed for the averaging analyses. The graphs are warranted, and the maps shows their locations. |
| 24 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | The groundwater well graphs should have an x-axis related to date or month rather than just day of the year (i.e. Sept. 1 rather than Day 240). | Climate | Catarraqui | Medium | Completed | 7/14/2006 | There are difficulties in graphing the data properly on a time scale perspective without using day of the year. SigmaPlot may allow the mapping of point daily data with proper space between data points. This was completed and added to the report with the help of the new Hydrogeologist. |
| 25 | | 4/21/2006 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Other | The objectives as listed are not met. | Climate | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 6/29/2006 | This will be included in the next version of the report. |
| 26 | | 4/19/2006 | 4/19/2006 | Other | D Burr | The MOE guidance should be followed specifically, with the creation of all 26 recommended maps. | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | Completed | 9/15/2006 | This is true, it is really part of the streamflow or groundwater flow term. The objectives were re-examined, and those that could be met at the scale of the Conceptual report were met, the others will need to work to be met. |
| 27 | | 4/19/2006 | 4/19/2006 | Other | D Burr | | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | Completed | 9/15/2006 | These graphs have been cleaned or either not worthwhile to create, or not capable of being created with the data as it exists. |
| 28 | | 5/2/2006 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | M. Robin | | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 7/5/2006 | |
| 29 | | 4/27/2006 | 4/27/2006 | D Burr | D Burr | | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | To Be Completed | 9/12/2006 | |
| 30 | | 5/2/2006 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | D Burr | | Climate | Catarraqui | Medium | Completed | 6/29/2006 | |
| 31 | | 5/2/2006 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | D Burr | | Other | Catarraqui | High | Completed | 9/15/2006 | |
| 32 | | 5/2/2006 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | D Burr | | Other | Catarraqui | Medium | To Be Completed | 9/15/2006 | |
| 33 | | 5/2/2006 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | D Burr | | Other | Catarraqui | Medium | To Be Completed | 9/15/2006 | |

| COMMENT ID | SWP REGION | MEETING DATE | COMMENT DATE | SOURCE | COMMENT | CATEGORY | APPLIES TO | PRIORITY | ACTION | ACTION DATE | ACTION DESCRIPTION |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---------|---|--------------|------------|----------|--------------------|-------------|---|
| 34 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | Urban areas have less evapotranspiration, therefore more precipitation is available for runoff, which helps to explain higher runoff values of the urban creeks. | Hydrology | Cataraq | Medium | Completed | 5/15/2006 | The reference in the text has been changed to reflect this comment. Previously no correlation had been seen. This will be checked again via the Systat analysis to be completed on the rest of the data. There was a strong correlation between flow and precipitation. |
| 35 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | One reviewer sees a correlation between high precipitation years and high flow runoff. I suggest that more precipitation means more streamflow, and needs to be checked. | Hydrology | Cataraq | High | Completed | 6/28/2006 | This has been noted in more detail in the minutes from the June 16 2006 meeting. The difference is more in the use of BFI itself, rather than the term "Baseflow". |
| 36 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | There is a difference between how a hydrologist and hydrogeologist defines baseflow, this should be noted. | Hydrology | All | Medium | Completed | 7/25/2006 | This work is ongoing for the 2006 field season, and hopefully for the 2007 season. There is little to no historical information. The work is ongoing. |
| 37 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | Low flow monitoring information should be included to identify losing and gaining For future conditions, full buildout according to the Official Plan could be assumed, and the water use could be recalculated. | Hydrology | Cataraq | High | No Action Required | 7/12/2006 | This may be completed for the Tier 1 or 2 analyses, but for worst case scenarios, the maximum taking is probably the best assumption, as it is possible that takers will reach maximum during times of scarce water. |
| 38 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | A survey of PTTW users can be used to quantify actual takings, as they may be much less than maximum permitted. | Water Use | Cataraq | Medium | No Action Required | | This work is ongoing for the 2006 field season, and hopefully for the 2007 season. There is little to no historical information. The work is ongoing. |
| 39 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | In communities with septic systems, that is water being added to the groundwater, especially important if the water came from a surface source. | Water Use | All | Medium | No Action Required | | This may be completed for the Tier 1 or 2 analyses, but for worst case scenarios, the maximum taking is probably the best assumption, as it is possible that takers will reach maximum during times of scarce water. |
| 40 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | MNR has agricultural water use data at the Township or smaller level, which is better than PTTW data. | Water Use | Cataraq | Medium | Completed | 7/25/2006 | This work is ongoing for the 2006 field season, and hopefully for the 2007 season. There is little to no historical information. The work is ongoing. |
| 41 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | One reviewer would rather see precipitation, evapotranspiration, infiltration and runoff mapped spatially across the watershed rather than an estimate of bulk use across the watershed. | Water Use | All | High | Completed | 9/12/2006 | This information has been added to the report. |
| 42 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | One reviewer would rather see precipitation, evapotranspiration, infiltration and runoff mapped spatially across the watershed rather than an estimate of bulk use across the watershed. | Other | Cataraq | Medium | No Action Required | | Detailed evaluation across the watershed is planned to be part of Tier 1 work, at the Conceptual stage, general full watershed. Annual numbers were set out as the goal in the objectives. |
| 43 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | One reviewer would rather see precipitation, evapotranspiration, infiltration and runoff mapped spatially across the watershed rather than an estimate of bulk use across the watershed. | Other | Cataraq | High | Completed | 7/29/2006 | This work is ongoing for the 2006 field season, and hopefully for the 2007 season. There is little to no historical information. The work is ongoing. |
| 44 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | D. Burr | The field work should include low flow monitoring, and monitoring for cold water streams. | Hydrology | Cataraq | High | No Action Required | 7/25/2006 | This is done in conjunction with looking at the relation of climate data to the water levels. |
| 45 | | 1 | 5/2/2006 | M. Robn | The water level trends at groundwater wells should be examined. | Hydrogeology | Cataraq | High | Completed | 7/14/2006 | This is done in conjunction with looking at the relation of climate data to the water levels. |
| 46 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | There is not enough information in order to recommend modeling software or methods. | Other | Cataraq | High | No Action Required | | For the conceptual model, it does not appear that enough analysis can be done to recommend modeling. This is expected to be a part of the Tier One work. |
| 47 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | The climate analysis is too detailed for the scope of the current objectives. | Climate | Cataraq | High | Completed | 7/14/2006 | The analysis as existed included work that would really be classified as Tier 1 work. The report will be worked to focus on the Conceptual work specifically, with the Tier 1 work being used in the Tier 1 report. |
| 48 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | Time series analysis of the climate data should be done to determine what time scale is best for the analysis. Systat can be used. | Climate | Cataraq | High | Undecided | | This could be completed through Systat analysis of the data, however more information is needed on the method and reasoning. This may really be more necessary for the Tier One work. |
| 49 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | An ANOVA analysis is not necessarily the best option for statistical analysis of the data when there is high variability of the data, time series analysis is better. | Climate | Cataraq | High | Completed | 8/15/2006 | These analyses were removed in favour of more practical methods. |
| 50 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | The confidence intervals, based on what spreadsheet shows, is not 95%, but 68%, that a spatial or temporal issue? | Other | Cataraq | High | Completed | 9/12/2006 | This has been checked and corrected. |
| 51 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | The correlation of rain to precipitation is spurious, as one is part of the other. | Other | Cataraq | Medium | No Action Required | 8/15/2006 | This statement, and the corresponding analyses have been removed. |
| 52 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | The correlation between rain and snow would be more interesting to see. | Climate | Cataraq | Medium | Completed | 6/28/2006 | This will be modified. |
| 53 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | There is also a small spurious correlation between snow and precipitation. | Climate | Cataraq | Medium | Completed | 6/28/2006 | This will be examined with the Systat analysis of the data. |
| 54 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | There is confusion with the statement of analysis of the temperature data using Anova analysis and standard error. | Climate | Cataraq | Medium | Completed | 6/28/2006 | The correlation will be examined, and hopefully quantified using Systat. |
| 55 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | The text refers to the tests done by the local health units in septic systems tests as a t-test. Is a percent-meant? | Other | Cataraq | Medium | Completed | 7/12/2006 | The paragraph itself will need to be rewritten to clear up the confusion. Yes, percent is what is meant. The t-test term is also a reference to the same test for the rate at which water enters the soil where a septic system is planned. |
| 56 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | An infiltrometer tests for hydraulic conductivity (K) vs. water content, but not necessarily the infiltration. It is better to measure the average moisture content, where the K value would be approximately the dairy flux in steady state vertical | Hydrology | Cataraq | Low | No Action Required | 6/15/2006 | Work relating to this comment may or may not need to be done, depending on whether it is decided to measure infiltration in the field or not. |
| 57 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | Regarding the correlation of precipitation to flow, it is recommended to show the correlation coefficients or regression data in order to test the hypothesis that they are not zero. | Hydrology | Cataraq | Medium | Completed | 7/25/2006 | This work will be done with Systat analysis, and included in the next report. |
| 58 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robn | Regarding the correlation of precipitation to flow, it is recommended to show the correlation coefficients or regression data in order to test the hypothesis that they are not zero. | Hydrology | Cataraq | Medium | Completed | 7/12/2006 | This work will be done with Systat analysis, and included in the next report. |

| COMMENT ID | SWP REGION | MEETING DATE | COMMENT DATE | SOURCE | COMMENT | CATEGORY | APPLIES TO | PRIORITY | ACTION | ACTION DATE | ACTION DESCRIPTION |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--|----------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|--|
| 59 | | 1 | 4/27/2006 | M. Robin | Information on bedrock and surficial geology, soils and physiography are needed for the conceptual document. | Other | Gataraqui | Medium | Completed | 5/1/2006 | This work is part of the Watershed Characterization report, and will be referenced specifically in the water budget document, with some general descriptions as well. |
| 60 | | 1 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | At the conceptual water budget stage, there is probably no need to consider groundwater in and out of the watershed, as it should equal zero over the long term. | Other | All | High | Completed | 7/12/2006 | This is the way the work was intended to be written, and how the conceptual stage was considered. However, it did come to light during the review that the conceptual stage was not clearly structured to reflect this, with the additional work being transferred to the Tier 1 report. |
| 61 | | 1 | 4/21/2006 | Meeting Minutes | Once precipitation minus streamflow is calculated, which represents derived evapotranspiration, it should be compared with the calculated evapotranspiration from Environment Canada. The uncertainty of the data should also be considered. | Other | All | High | Completed | 5/1/2006 | The derived ET is smaller than the calculated ET, but the consideration of uncertainty in the data can account for this discrepancy. |

Peer Review Record

for the

Second Draft

Submitted September 15, 2006

| COMMENT ID | SWP REGION | MEETING DATE | COMMENT DATE | SOURCE | COMMENT | CATEGORY | APPLIES TO | PRIORITY | ACTION | ACTION DATE | ACTION DESCRIPTION |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--------------|------------|----------|--------|-------------|---|
| 1 | Catarequi | 25-Sep-06 | 16-Oct-06 | L. Landrault, M. Other | Section 1.1: Page 1-5: the purpose of the Conceptual Guidance is not clearly stated | Other | Catarequi | High | | | Revise with reference to the Guidance |
| 2 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 16-Oct-06 | L. Landrault, M. Other | Section 1.1: Page 1-5: the purpose of the Conceptual Guidance is not clearly stated | Other | All | High | | | Revise intro and conclusions, what about Quinle? |
| 3 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 1.3: Page 45 – quote can be cut at detail of hydrologic circulation and | Hydrology | Catarequi | High | | | Reduce quote length |
| 4 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 1.3: Page 5 – quote too simplistic with regard to GW | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | High | | | Probably sufficient for conceptual budget, more detailed layout needed for Tier 1 work. Also depends on what is found with actual GW movement, whether it is GWin = GWowt or not. |
| 5 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 1.3: Page 5 – clarification to the GWin = GWowt statement | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | High | | | M. Robn gave suggested wording |
| 6 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 1.3: Page 5 – the ET should be estimated through other models as well to indicate the extent to which the assumptions are violated | Climate | Catarequi | Medium | | | Possible revision, if there is available data to support using other estimation techniques. |
| 7 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 13 – add “asymmetric” in front of mean | Climate | Catarequi | Medium | | | Revise this review accordingly |
| 8 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 16 – add “asymmetric” in front of mean | Climate | Catarequi | Medium | | | More detail on the test, and what it tests. Revise. Krukskai/Wallis is a non-parametric test to establish whether multiple samples are from the same population. |
| 9 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 16 – add “asymmetric” in front of mean | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Look at time series analysis of the data. Also explain Mann-Kendall (non-parametric test for trend) in more detail. |
| 10 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 17 – random sample tests are ill suited to time series data, should use time series tools | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Revise with suggested modifications. |
| 11 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 19 – add some text to sentence | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Add column for “# of samples” |
| 12 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 21 – Table 2.5 – include number of samples that went into | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Suggested change |
| 13 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 21 – Table 2.5 – change “interval” to “level” | Climate | Catarequi | Medium | | | Suggested change |
| 14 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 22 – spatial correlation of climate is larger than area of region, this is why all seem to rise and fall at same years | Climate | Catarequi | Medium | | | |
| 15 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.1: Page 22 – independence test better shown via time series analysis | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Revise, with consultation with M. Robn. |
| 16 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.2: Page 22 – independence test better shown via time series analysis | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Revise, with consultation with M. Robn. |
| 17 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.1.3: Page 22 – independence test better shown via time series analysis | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Revise, with consultation with M. Robn. |
| 18 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 21-Sep-06 | E. Watt | Section 2.1.1.3: Include info on snow course stations of CRCA (7) and Rideau Canal (7) | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Include a section on this data, how much, what is it good for, etc. |
| 19 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.3: Page 25 – more detail is needed on what data is missing for other methods | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Table of data needed and data not available? |
| 20 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | E. Watt | Section 2.1.3: Add info on fact that other, newer, better estimates of ET are available, but were not used here, but could be used for future work | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Revise as noted. |
| 21 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.1.3: Page 26 – bare rock should have low SWHC value | Hydrogeology | All | High | | | Use Quinle’s 25 mm? From Northern Ont HG report. HydroG’s prepare better estimation. |
| 22 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.1.3: Page 26 – add map of ET | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Add map – maybe use SWHC map, and estimates of ET from direct relationship to SWHC? Like QC and M-R |
| 23 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.3: Page 26 – more detail on MOE method, and where the numbers come from, how they are put together | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | Medium | | | Lock into original doc, and how it works. Possibly include methodology of method if it can be found. |
| 24 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.1.3: Add ET comparison maps and text about how they compare | Climate | Catarequi | Catarequi | High | | | Can we add soil thickness information? |
| 25 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.1.3: Change SWHC to County maps, redo calculations, add value for bare | Climate | Catarequi | Catarequi | High | | | Add info, and make mapping changes |
| 26 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 21-Sep-06 | E. Watt | Section 2.1.3: Page 28 – mention of sources of data – soil county maps, soil landscapes of Canada (SLC), change to county maps from SLC | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | High | | | |
| 27 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.1.3.1: Add Evap comparison maps and text about how they compare | Climate | Catarequi | Catarequi | High | | | |
| 28 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.1.3.1: Add Kempville and Ottawa data? | Climate | Catarequi | Catarequi | Medium | | | |
| 29 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 21-Sep-06 | E. Watt | Section 2.1.3.1: Page 32 – Use coefficients for pan evap to lake evap | Climate | Catarequi | High | | | Check and fix |
| 30 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.1.3.1: Page 32 – initiation detail of comparison with other methods | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | High | | | Revise text |
| 31 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.1.4: Page 32 – mention of sources of data – soil county maps, soil landscapes of Canada (SLC), change to county maps from SLC | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | Medium | | | Revisions for factors needed. Particularly bedrock. |
| 32 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt/PR Team | Section 2.1.4: Re-examine MOE method, and how it has been used here, as well as whether it really applies here or not | Hydrogeology | All | Medium | | | |
| 33 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 16-Oct-06 | L. Landrault, M. Gieraway, PR Team | Section 2.1.4: Page 35, Inf. Coeff. of 0.44 probably too high | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | High | | | Check factors to get to Inf. Coeff., make sure they are reasonable (bedrock in particular). Do back calculation from known numbers to get estimate for factors. Can we add soil thickness information? |
| 34 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.1.4: Page 33 – explain possible skew of data with classing data but much to one category, look for the general report use, and why, and whether it can actually be used the way we are using it. | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | High | | | Track down usage of report. |
| 35 | Catarequi | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.1.4: Page 34 – How sensitive to analysis are class breaks? Each of 3 regions is different, should be the same. | Hydrogeology | Catarequi | High | | | Look at different breakdowns, how sensitive, breakdown into many classes, and add different groupings. Not sure whether we should all use the same breakdown, as we have differing slope characteristics. Maybe use equation of line (slope factor relationship) to do each pixel of the map. |

| COMMENT ID | SWP REGION | MEETING DATE | COMMENT DATE | SOURCE | COMMENT | CATEGORY | APPLIES TO | PRIORITY | ACTION | ACTION DATE | ACTION DESCRIPTION |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---------|---------|--------------|------------|----------|--------|-------------|--|
| 36 | Catarraqui | 25-Sep-06 | | S. Watt | Other | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | | | |
| 37 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | | S. Watt | Other | Hydrogeology | All | High | | | Re-examine method, and calculations, get copy of 1989 report, or what came before it. -- maybe look at M&R and Quarte modifications and refer to BFI section, or provide more here |
| 38 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | All | High | | | Not for Conceptual, but to be done for Tr1 |
| 39 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | All | Low | | | As suggested |
| 40 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Climate | All | None | | | |
| 41 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Low | | | |
| 42 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | | | Modify coefficients |
| 43 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Other | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | Revise map. |
| 44 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | |
| 45 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Low | | | Look at more gauge data. |
| 46 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Other | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Low | | | Lots of EO small streams seem about the same, 400 to 450 |
| 47 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Other | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Low | | | Run correlation and linear regression. |
| 48 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | May be more than is needed for conceptual, in that annual data is not related, but smaller scale may be. Can also be done and shown. |
| 49 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | Include cross-correlation work. |
| 50 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | Redo analysis. Add autocorrelation and cross-correlation information. |
| 51 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | Do analysis. Perhaps using auto-correlation function. |
| 52 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Other | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | | | Add information. |
| 53 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | |
| 54 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | But how do we get it? So far we have not been able to access it. |
| 55 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Other | Hydrogeology | All | High | | | Revise map. |
| 56 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | All | Medium | | | Do calculations. |
| 57 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | Move to appendix. But use for calculations for storage. |
| 58 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | | | Include this data, mostly completed. |
| 59 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | | | Revise text. This is a barometric correction needed because the logger is sealed to outside pressure. The data as used for the report are already corrected. |
| 60 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | S. Watt | Other | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | |
| 61 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | All | Medium | | | |
| 62 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Other | Catarraqui | Low | | | |
| 63 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | Li review. Look at vertical gradients in wells? Look at orientation of bedrock layers? Where is Li coming from, where does it go? Water table mapping? |
| 64 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | None | | | Revise. |
| 65 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robm | M Robm | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | High | | | |
| 66 | Catarraqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | D Burr | Hydrogeology | Catarraqui | Medium | | | As suggested |

| COMMENT ID | SWP REGION | MEETING DATE | COMMENT DATE | SOURCE | COMMENT | CATEGORY | APPLIES TO | PRIORITY | ACTION | ACTION DATE | ACTION DESCRIPTION |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|---|--------------|------------|----------|--------|-------------|--|
| 67 | Catarauqui | 25-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Meeting Minutes | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | Medium | | | |
| 68 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.6.1.3: Include information on possible recharge from surface into bedrock units (Nepan in particular) Qualitative for now, quantitative for Tier 1 | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | Medium | | | Check. Revise accordingly. |
| 69 | Catarauqui | 25-Sep-06 | 11-Oct-06 | C. Hammond | Section 2.6.1.3: Info on Transmissivity as it applies to domestic supply? | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | Medium | | | |
| 70 | Catarauqui | 25-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.6.2: Page 77 – Champain, Sea and Lake Inroads maps not needed | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | High | | | remove |
| 71 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.6.2: Page 78 – mapping areas of shallow rock into 2D could use some more detail. There is thin drift over rock, this can then be used for SWHC and infiltration estimates | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 72 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 21-Sep-06 | E. Watt | Section 2.6.4: Page 87/88/89 – mention of sources of data – soil county maps, soil landscapes of Canada | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | High | | | Add info |
| 73 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.7.1: Page 93 – reference to volume of water available for withdrawal | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | Change wording of sentence. It is misleading |
| 74 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 2.7.1: Page 93 – “regular” water well | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | Modify text |
| 75 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.7.1: Page 93 – mention of DU and other one time tests that are not included in analysis, but are shown | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 76 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Section 2.7.1: Shrink or Combine maps? Or move to appendix? | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 77 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.7.1: Page 97 – Figure 2.35c – change legend numbers to refer to m3/day as noted, rather than L/day, as numbers show | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | Revise. |
| 78 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.7.2: Page 98 – Table 2.23 – add Sandhurst lease data | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 79 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.7.2: Page 98 – return of water to GW is generally near shorelines (LOSLEY) | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 80 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Section 2.7.2.1: Combine water wells mapping? Or reduce size or number of maps? | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 81 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.7.2.1: Page 101 – how was number of wells estimated | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | That is number of wells in the database |
| 82 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.7.2.1: Page 101 – Add source data to first sentence (30,000 wells) and Table 2.24 | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 83 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.7.2.1: Page 101 – How was water use estimated – by number of wells, or by number of residences with a well? | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | By number of wells |
| 84 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.7.2.1: Page 101 – surface water withdrawals that are then discharged to surface water body, so only a minimal increase in water table levels would be expected | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | Elaboration in text, to the effect of the comment, as well as that even if discharge to surface water body, a significant increase in water table level is not likely to occur |
| 85 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.7.2.1: Page 102 – Figure 2.37 – are all dots a well? Are any missing? Note on map to confirm | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | Confirm |
| 86 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 2.7.2.1: Move Figures 2.38a and 2.38b to Appendix | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 87 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Section 2.7.3: Combine maps? | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | Check. |
| 88 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.7.3: Page 105 – are takings returned back to same water body? | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 89 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Section 2.7.4: Combine maps? | Water Use | Catarauqui | High | | | |
| 90 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Section 2.7.4: More detailed use data that was amalgamated for the report, could be used for Tier 1 | Water Use | Catarauqui | None | | | |
| 91 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 2.7.5: Page 109 – estimates on quaternary watershed basis? | Water Use | Catarauqui | Low | | | Uncertainty may actually be for individual sites, which has been extrapolated to watershed estimate. |
| 92 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 3.1: Page 111 – comparing of MAP uncertainty to individual stations – why? | Climate | Catarauqui | Low | | | |
| 93 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 3.1: Page 111 – same for flow as for precip | Hydrology | Catarauqui | Low | | | Check. Paper lists 0.5 to 1.5 degrees for temperature, and 20 to 40 % for precipitation |
| 94 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 3.1: Page 111 – land use and Physiography govern flow differences? | Hydrology | Catarauqui | Low | | | Check. Paper lists 0.5 to 1.5 degrees for temperature, and 20 to 40 % for precipitation |
| 95 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Section 3.1: Page 111 – Check McKinney paper for uncertainty | Climate | Catarauqui | Medium | | | Revise |
| 96 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Section 3.1: Page 111 – use the term “uncertainty” instead of “error” | Climate | Catarauqui | High | | | Include. |
| 97 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 3.1: Page 111 – comment on significance of correlation analysis | Other | Catarauqui | Low | | | Check. |
| 98 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 3.1: Page 111 – confidence interval for uncertainties? | Other | Catarauqui | Low | | | Revise text |
| 99 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 3.1: Page 111 – proper way to calc combined uncertainty – square root | Other | Catarauqui | Low | | | Revise text with more details. |
| 100 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 3.1: Page 112 – question about statement on uncertainty of other data | Other | Catarauqui | Low | | | |
| 101 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 3.1: Page 112 – infiltration and runoff are greatest uncertainties, as well as precipitation | Other | Catarauqui | Medium | | | |
| 102 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 3.2: Page 113 – problem with analysis, many have expected correlations, disagree with arbitrary cutoff of 0.85, smaller could be significant too, recommend regression analysis instead | Other | Catarauqui | Medium | | | Revise. Include better estimation, maybe cross-correlation function. |
| 103 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 4: Page 114 – term depth is misleading, perhaps use flux instead, then explain the terminology of flux as well, and units should be mm/y. | Other | Catarauqui | Medium | | | |
| 104 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 4: Page 114 – why does Lake Evap get own tier? Already accounted in derived ET? | Other | Catarauqui | Medium | | | Yes. It would be included in derived ET, but not necessarily in calculated ET |
| 105 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 4: Page 114 – where is GW discharge to streams in OUT table | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | Medium | | | It is included in runoff, which is what is measured at the gauge. |
| 106 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 4: Page 114 – GW out to Lake Ont and St. Lawrence can be estimated with hydraulic gradients and transmissivities | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | Medium | | | To do for Tier 1, as conceptual assumes GWIn = GWOut, and is therefore not needed for the equation. |
| 107 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 4: Page 114 – if SWHC is too high, ET will be too high, which may account for some discrepancy. | Hydrogeology | Catarauqui | Medium | | | Check. In particular, bare rock and bedrock SWHC, or areas where soil is so thick enough to hold amount of water estimated |
| 108 | Catarauqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | S. Watt | Section 4: Page 114 – if SWHC is too high, ET will be too high, which may account for some discrepancy. | Climate | Catarauqui | Medium | | | |

| COMMENT ID | SWP REGION | MEETING DATE | COMMENT DATE | SOURCE | COMMENT | CATEGORY | APPLIES TO | PRIORITY | ACTION | ACTION DATE | ACTION DESCRIPTION |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|------------|----------|--------|-------------|---|
| 109 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 4: Page 116 – Fig 4.1 – modify to 2 pieces, SW and GW, also make size of arrows correspond to volume of parameter, possibly include the figure (with no numbers) in Chapter 2 to show relations of parameters | Other | Catawaqui | Medium | | | Revise |
| 110 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 4.1: Page 117 – important to note that GW storage is small, which is important to short term drought events, and could easily result in problems, and the area is high stress, and loading | Hydrogeology | Catawaqui | Medium | | | |
| 111 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 4.1: Page 117 – where does supply for GW come from? Not listed in Table 4.2 | Hydrogeology | Catawaqui | High | | | It comes from the recharge estimates (average of the 3) from section 2.1.4, page 35, converted to a watershed wide volume. Add info for where it comes from. |
| 112 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 4.1: Page 117 – include comment about GW returned after use | Hydrogeology | Catawaqui | High | | | Add info |
| 113 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 4.1: Page 117 – ZK PTTV estimate is worst case scenario, could be left out | Water Use | Catawaqui | High | | | Yes, this is a worst case estimate. |
| 114 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 4.1: Page 117 – 1.1% vs. 1.3% | Water Use | Catawaqui | High | | | Typo, 1.1% is used for the 1X estimate of the previous draft, 1.3% is used for the 1X estimate of this draft. The 1.1% represents the demand used to solve the existing problem under worst case, while the 1.3% represents the single value, and it should be revised to be 2.1% |
| 115 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 5: More empirical information on areas of stress should be included – municipalities, well drillers, water haulers, look at newspaper articles? | Hydrogeology | Catawaqui | High | | | Phone surveys – Steph or Bitama? For Tier 1 work. |
| 116 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 16-Oct-06 | L. Landraut, M. Garraway | Section 6: Page 119/120, tie section on areas that may need more modeling to screening questions in guidance modules | Other | All | Medium | | | Revise to reflect specific guidance questions. |
| 117 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 7: Page 122 - Good to estimate gaining and losing streams with measurements | Water Use | Catawaqui | Medium | | | |
| 118 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 7: Page 122 - Good to estimate gaining and losing streams with measurements | Hydrogeology | Catawaqui | Medium | | | |
| 119 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | | S. Watt | Section 7: Add info about streams, dry, flowing, etc. which can be used to infer GW discharge. | Hydrogeology | Catawaqui | High | | | Add info. |
| 120 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 10-Oct-06 | D. Burr | Section 9: Page 125 – VB impacts from land use etc. can't be met until better understanding of GW/SW interactions | Other | Catawaqui | Medium | | | |
| 121 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 9: Page 125 – mention vulnerable aquifers as a problem due to low storage – conceptual analysis | Hydrogeology | Catawaqui | Medium | | | Revise. |
| 122 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 25-Sep-06 | M. Robn | Section 9: Page 125 – sentence about model choice does not make sense | Other | Catawaqui | Medium | | | Revise. |
| 123 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 26-Sep-06 | PR Team | Section 9: Better wrap-up structure, perhaps M-R type | Other | All | High | | | Revise with reference to other reports, what about Quinter? |
| 124 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 16-Oct-06 | L. Landraut, M. Garraway | Section 9: MNR would like to see similar front and back end sections of the report in the Mississippi-Rideau and Catawaqui reports | Other | All | High | | | All watersheds will be done. Map is shown as Figure 1.1. Include map again here with specific reference, or refer back to original map. |
| 125 | Catawaqui | 26-Sep-06 | 16-Oct-06 | L. Landraut, M. Garraway | Section 9: Provide Map of subwatersheds that will be evaluated in Tier 1 | Other | All | Low | | | |