Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on January 16, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

Regarding your proposed Pump Station site on Erin Heights Sub-division directly in-front or adjacent-to lots 76 and 77. Can you clarify:

- *Pump station land imprint - above ground or vault type facility*
- *Noise impact - pumps working presumably 24/7 and subsequent effect on nearby residents*
- *Power failure event - integrated built-in stand-by generator?*

Erin Heights Sub-division features several right-of-ways, one of which should be considered as a pump station site. In your presentation you casually mentioned possible future development of adjacent lands which would further complicate your proposed pump station site and its ability to service developable lands. Therefore, I would appreciate a more detailed examination of alternative sites.

In your report you state that wastewater hook-up costs from the road to each residential unit will be the responsibility of individual homeowners. Your estimate of $5,000. plus/minus appears to be low, considering most septic systems in Erin are located at the rear of properties. A more realistic estimate should take into consideration the restoration of properties to their original, pristine and aesthetically pleasing appearance.

At the Special Council meeting, limited discussion took place on the possibility of a Wastewater Service Staging requirement. More details with regard to possible staging of such a system needs to be addressed. Will it be downtown Erin first, then further add-ons as the system becomes fully functional? While this may not have been determined, you must have a professional opinion which I feel should form part of your proposal. This would be beneficial for our present Council, as a whole, and future politicians in their decision making process.

It was stated at the Special Council meeting that the project could not go ahead without Provincial/Federal funding due to the Town's limited borrowing capability. Can C.N.Watson be asked to verify the amount of funding required. It should be noted that residents pay high-taxes and water-rates now, so any additional costs will not be accepted lightly by the population at-large. The Town's infrastructure is crumbling and will necessitate debt financing for present roads, bridges and buildings over the next 10-years, further exacerbating our efforts to move forward with

wastewater. Please include my name in any future correspondence with regard to the proposed Urban Centre Wastewater Servicing Proposal.

I look forward to receiving your response to my comments and concerns.

In our January 23, 2018 email we responded to your email as follows:

We understand the concerns you express regarding the proposed location of the Erin Heights Wastewater Pumping Station. The proposed location is at the natural low point in the subdivision to which all wastewater can drain by gravity. At this time, we are proposing that it would be located in the right of way between two homes, however we are most certainly open to other suggestions through the upcoming consultation process. This station would only service Erin Heights. We did examine locating the station behind the homes (next to a trail) however this is privately owned land and there may be environmental concerns. Additional information is welcome.

The station would be underground with a circular concrete structure about 18 inches above ground and also a control panel (similar to a ground mounted transformer or a Bell panel). It would be landscaped to minimise impact. Siting in the right of way will depend on constructability issues, creating access for maintenance, maintaining access through the right of way (though we are not sure if the footpath is a public footpath), and preserving mature trees. For this size of station we are not proposing fixed standby power. We are proposing that on loss of power the Town would bring a portable generator, however we are also open to suggestions on that.

The pumps would be submersible type and unless you were standing over the station with the hatches open, it is unlikely you would hear them in operation.

If you have other sites to suggest we would be glad to meet you and see if they are feasible and to look at siting options in the right of way.

The $5,000 hookup cost we mentioned is the average cost. Yes, there will be properties where it will cost more depending on elevations, however, typically gravity sewers are constructed deep enough to pick up the outlets from all properties by gravity. We did complete a more comprehensive survey and do have a range of costs for most areas. There are alternatives that could be considered during the detailed design stage and obviously there are advantages and disadvantages to each alternative.

We are now following up to check/confirm that you received our January 23, 2018 email regarding the above noted study. Please let us know if there are any remaining issues you would like us to address.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on January 22, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

I can attend the Liaison committee meeting Jan 24 and the Public meeting Feb 2

I reviewed some of the information you included in your email

I have some alternative for the wastewater, septage and the sludge treatment

The Organica wastewater treatment system which I introduced to you and Ainley last year will reduce the sludge production by +/- 30% and reduce the energy consumption about 40-50% septage can be directly be included with the sludge which reduces the size of the wastewater treatment plant

Sludge treatment will also be improved by the SUSTEC system which reduces the size by 30 to 40% and increases the Biogas production by +/- 40% and reduces the sludge volume after digestion by 30% and increases the sludge de-watering to 35% dry solids

Oganica

As described in the Technology Evaluation technical memorandum, in order for a technology to be carried forward into the evaluation, the technology needed to have a demonstrated history of being reliable and able to meet the performance requirements set out for Erin. The MOECC typically prefers a minimum of three successfully operating plants of similar size and capacity, located in a similar climate and with comparable effluent criteria in order to be considered for implementation in Erin. The Organica technology does not meet these requirements, as there are insufficient reference installations that were both of similar capacity and in a similar climate. The added operational complexity associated with horticulture was considered undesirable.

Sustec

The Sustec technology is a thermal hydrolysis technology that's used to optimize the solids treatment process. This system is installed upstream of a digester and enhances volatile solids reduction, increases biogas production, and improves post digestion dewaterability. Anaerobic digestion was eliminated from the long list of sludge stabilization technologies because this technology is not viable

for smaller plants, such as Erin, due to its complexity and capital costs. As such we do not believe that Sustec is applicable to our preferred solids train solution, however it may be possible that is becomes an add on process at a later stage in the plant's development.

This technology also does not meet the criteria for having three similar installations in a similar climate.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on January 24, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> ***Overview:*** *The Clearford system allows greater efficiency in designing treatment options. The ClearDigest tank and SBS collection network deliver a consistent flow of pre-treated wastewater to the treatment plant, with a significant reduction in peak flow relative to conventional gravity systems. Wet weather flows are effectively eliminated, resulting in savings to the design and long term operation of facilities. These features allow for efficiencies in the treatment process requirements and reductions to the size and footprint of treatment facilities and equipment, translating to upfront capital cost savings. Ongoing operating and maintenance costs of both the collection system and the treatment facilities are also reduced relative to conventional solutions.'*

We recognize that these comments primarily relate to selection of a specific vendor as the preferred alternative for the wastewater collection system. Ainley's Phase 3 work established a range of alternative solutions for the collection system and developed conceptual design solutions for each alternative and then costed and evaluated these alternatives based on a consistent set of evaluation criteria. The Clearford SBS solution falls under the STEP/STEG alternative category which was not selected as the preferred alternative for the reasons outlined in the Collection System Technical Memorandum.

> *Ainley's Phase 3 reports did not consider that the collection system and treatment plant are inextricably linked, that choosing a different collection system will have a significant economic effect on the cost of a proposed Sewage Treatment Plant (STP). The economic advantageous were confirmed recently in a Performance EA for Everett, ON with SBS being the selected and preferred technology by the Town's engineers. There are more suppliers of STEG systems (i,e. Orenco)*

We fully understand the linkages between the collection system and treatment system. While the alternative potentially reduces the liquid train capacity, it increases the solids train capacity. STEP/STEG also changes the quality of the wastewater arriving at the WWTP and potentially increases nitrogenous compounds that require additional air capacity to treat to the levels required for Erin. Our evaluation of the STEP/STEG system for Erin and Hillsburgh did not identify this system as having overall clear advantages over the other alternatives.

Request #1:

Re Table 11 Weighted Scoring of Short Listed Sewage Collection Alternatives (Collection Memorandum)

- We request the scoring be repeated in Table 11, in light of the added comments outlined in the attached in response to Ainley's "Advantageous and Disadvantageous" outlined in section 3.2, Table 4 in the Technical Memorandum –Wastewater Collection System Alternatives.

Request #2:

Re Table 45 Estimated Capital Construction of Erin WWTP

The economic benefits of a SBS collection system was not reflected in the costing model of $43M (to $61M – full build out) for the treatment plant. This costing outlined in the Technical Memorandum -Treatment Technology Alternatives is based on a Traditional Gravity Fed collection system.

- We request the calculation of the economic impact on the sewage treatment plant if SBS is employed as the preferred collection system, by considering the reduced inflow, the altered composition of the inflow and the subsequent cost reductions in capital, operational and maintenance (including lifecycle analysis) when compared to the use of a Traditional Gravity Fed collection system. The following are "The Advantageous/Disadvantageous of the STEG/STEP as outlined in Table 4 (page 15) of Ainley's Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Collection System Alternatives with Transition Erin's corresponding responses added in blue (and indented) with respect to a SBS collection system.

Table 4 - Advantages and Disadvantages of STEP (pressure) / STEG (gravity) System

Advantages:

- ***Potentially less excavation required for sewer pipes***

- *Little surface destruction since trenchless technology is an economical option if required (i.e. Horizontal Directional Drilling). The smaller pipe size allows for a much narrower trench (~12-24") to be excavated; eco-significant for installing pipes along the Elora Cataract Trail.*

Directional drilling is not necessarily less costly than open trench construction. Generally, trenchless technology is more expensive than open trench construction. Directional drilling still requires excavation for tunneling shafts and for every property connection including trenches to each property line. The location of other services makes it likely that the sewers will have to be in the street so there is little saving in terms of restoration as all of the tunnel shafts and service connection trenches will still necessitate the entire road to be paved.

- ***Where STEP or STEG used, pipes can be installed to follow the surface topography, remaining at a relatively constant depth below the surface***
- ***Minimal inflow and infiltration into the system so smaller pipes and lower flow to STP***
- ***Solids not pumped to STP so smaller pipes and less capital costs for pipes***

- ***Lower initial capital costs due to shallower placement and small size of pipes***
- ***Low pump maintenance compared to grinder pumps (low pressure system).***
  - *SBS is not a STEP. SBS is an enhanced modernized STEG.*

Based on the topography, our conceptual design for this alternative is a STEP/STEG system with a significant component being STEP. While we received a conceptual design solution from a vendor, we amended the design to ensure that it reflected a practical and constructible solution for the communities based on the actual topography. We also costed the solution using our own costing database. It is unclear how the claim can be made for the pipes following surface topography when they are proposed as gravity sewers.

Additional Advantages not identified in Ainley's Memorandum

1. *Sealed and flexible pipes are impervious to extraneous water Infiltration that dramatically reduces plant flows allowing for a reduction in the size of the treatment plant.*

We do not agree that, in a practical design solution for communities the size of Erin Village and Hillsburgh, infiltration can be completely eliminated.

2. *Wastewater is pretreated with 30% biological treatment reduction, reducing the treatment plant biological treatment tanks and blowers by 1/3rd.*

We agree that there is a potential to reduce the liquid train flows to the treatment plant in the STEP/STEG alternative, however, this does not take into account the need to deal with the solids from the septic tanks and overall this does not result in selection of STEP/STEG as the preferred alternative.

3. *Sludge also processed/digested in the home mixer/attenuator tank(digester) which reduces operating costs at plant related to sludge handling at the end of treatment at the ST*

The sludge product in the tanks is a septic sludge. It requires further treatment and must be hauled to a Municipal Wastewater treatment facility.

4. *80% reduction in solids to treatment plant that are now treated for free (a treatment plants largest expense).*

As noted, the sludge must still be pumped and hauled from each tank and treated at a Municipal wastewater treatment plant prior to disposal.

5. *Headworks system is no longer needed at treatment plant.*

The reduction of solids piped to the plant can reduce the preliminary treatment phase costs, however, the cost of pumping and hauling the solids to the plant must also be taken into consideration.

6. *Peaking factor reduced in half (from 4 to 2) compared to gravity resulting in less flow equalization at the plant and in the case of flow through plants reduces the membranes and blowers required in half.*

Flow equalization is not required at the treatment plant. Daily peaking factors will remain similar but with reduced flows. Peaking associated with inflow and infiltration will also be reduced but not eliminated.

In addition, peaking factors are a function of population, under the full build-out scenario described in the UCWS EA reports, a peak factor of 4 is not anticipated for a gravity based system.

7. *No manholes present in the system requiring annual servicing and cleaning.*

We do not agree. For a system the size of Erin and Hillsburgh, we believe the system still requires manholes for cleaning/flushing/system maintenance.

8. *Less pump stations required reducing annual servicing and cleaning costs.*

We do not agree. We believe the system still requires all of the main pumping stations though the flow could be reduced. Several small "local pumping stations" can be removed, however this requirement is replaced by the use of multiple small pumping systems (STEP) installed on private property.

9. *Fats, Greases and floatables captured at the tank eliminating plugging of pipelines, cleaning of manholes and separation requirements at the plant.*

We do not agree that the Clearford system eliminates all solids from the collection system. It is still possible that solids will enter the sewer. Gravity sewers represent the most cost effective solution from a maintenance point of view. They rarely plug and rarely require cleaning.

10. *Rags and fiberous materials trapped at the tank eliminating frequent pump station pump deragging.*

Pumps in Sewage Pumps Stations servicing gravity sewers rarely require "deragging".

11. *Inorganic solids settled out in the tank and collection network comprised of HDPE eliminating the need for grit removal systems at the treatment plant.*

We do not believe that infiltration water can be eliminated in a STEG system and would continue to recommend use of a grit removal stage.

12. *No mention of water table issues in areas of Erin that will cause large amounts of infiltration into a gravity system along with extensive dewatering costs during construction.*

The Geotechnical report indicates most areas with low groundwater levels except for areas close to river. Excessive infiltration is not anticipated.

13. *Fewer pumping stations required*

All main line pumping stations are still required. Elimination of smaller areas stations requires more STEP tanks to be used.

14. *An SBS system connecting the two villages will reduce the risk of effluent arriving 'septic' at the STP. Insufficient amount of whole sewage travelling in a TFG over too long a distance results in significant odour at manholes and upon arrival.*

The wastewater in a STEP/STEG system can still turn septic and in fact is septic as it is processed through the anaerobic septic tanks. The connection between the two communities is planned to be pumped. Main line SPSs can be equipped with odour control if required (applies to both gravity and STEP/STEG alternatives).

15. *Water lines and wastewater lines can be laid in the same narrow trench (1 -2') side by side while traditional Gravity Fed pipes need to be separated by several metres from water mains.*

We do not view this as an added advantage of STEP/STEG in these communities.

16. *Cost to hook up to the Homeowner; Negligible for SBS. (maintains cost of current pump if required. If a pump is required by the resident, the cost for a ½ hp is $200-$300 and less than $30/year in hydro. The pumps last 7-10 years at a total cost of under $73 per year. The Municipality would pay for the tanks and piping from the structure of the house. In Traditional Gravity Fed, the Municipality covers the cost to the home owner's property line*

In our STEP/STEG alternative we included the cost of the STEP pumps as Town costs in order to provide a similar level of service to all properties. The costs noted above are low, and neglect the costs associated with installing the proprietary STEP/STEG tanks required. A significant number of pumps would be required for Erin Village and Hillsburgh.

17. *Record of government funding in the past for SBS installations (i.e. Wardsville, ON 85% funding)*

Funding is not specific to the recommended design solution. Wardsville is a small, relatively flat community and the Wardsville wastewater system services around 150 properties. It is not comparable to Erin/Hillsburgh**.**

18. *No need for grinder pumps (as in low pressure system STEP currently in use in Wellington County with ongoing challenges as per Mayor Alls comments in Council re Maple/Drayton)*

STEP pumps suspended in the septic tanks may allow solids to be pumped into the sewer system. The Maple/Drayton system uses grinder pumps.

Disadvantages

- ***All private properties require a Digester Tank similar to a Septic Tank***
  - *replace Septic Tank at the residences with a new water tight tank equipped with flow mixer and flow attenuator (Digester) wherever possible.*

The replacement tank is essentially a septic tank.

- ***Small diameter pipes subject to blockage if Digester tanks do not function properly***
  - *No filter is required for SBS. The filter is used in traditional septic tanks because the assumption is that the effluent leaving the tank will end up in a tile bed on the property. The filter is recommended for that application to preserve the life of the tile bed. This is not the case with the SBS. There is a treatment plant at the end of the sealed pipe which can deal with the limited solids that leave the Digester tank. Sewer blockages more likely to occur with traditional gravity sewers. –because of insufficient flushing velocities due to low flow appliances and fixtures, fats, oil, grease grit, debris, diapers diaper wipes, rags, tree roots all of which create well documented blockages.in the pipes, pump stations and at the STP.*

We continue to view this alternative as presenting operational issues. There is no real provision to stop solids getting into the pipe or blocking the pump. While we understand that there are several vendors in this market, the Clearford tank appears to have a single chamber with a dip pipe at the outlet and this cannot prevent all solids from entering the sewer.

The scale of problems with gravity sewers mentioned in your comments is grossly exaggerated.

- ***On lot components require maintenance (Solids Removal, Pump Maintenance).***

- *Handling solids once every 8-10 years with the SBS from the Digester tank is far more economical vs handling them every day at the STP that is fed by a traditional gravity sewer. Sludge handling at source is a huge advantage of the system*

We do not agree. The STEP/STEG system will produce septic sludge that needs to be treated in exactly the same way as present septic systems. Wastewater solids can be more effectively handled within the liquid train at the wastewater treatment plant.

- ***If Digester tanks municipally owned, legal access agreement is needed for maintenance***
  - *Access to Tanks for cleaning is no different than obtaining access to any other utility – gas, hydro, water meter etc. Access is covered under Municipal Act. No municipality with a Clearford system has experienced any access issues.*
  - *An opportunity to confirm there is no illegal water diversion from downspouts/weeping tiles into the sewer system. (common place with Traditional Gravity fed .*

We view access to the back yards of private properties for pump maintenance, repair, replacement and for septic tank clean out likely every 3 – 8 years depending on property size, as presenting an issue with this alternative. In addition, any future issues with the pipe or tank could require the Municipality to excavate on private property. The location of a significant component of publically owned infrastructure on private property is not a desirable situation.

- ***Municipality may also be responsible for solids pump out if they own the tanks.***
  - *Municipality should own the digester tanks and be responsible for tank pump out to ensure cleanouts occur every 8 years (estimated at $100/tank/ 8 years); no different than servicing manholes in the traditional gravity system but performed each year.*

Tank pump out would be more frequent than 8 years and for some commercial establishments could be much more frequent. Likely the Municipality would have to contract out this service which would be a continuous operation for several tankers after the community achieves full build out. The cost would be much higher than $100 even assuming that sludge treatment and storage is provided at the Town owned WWTP.

- ***Property owners still have the restriction of having a septic tank system***
  - *Minimal restriction. The digester tank is 5x5x8 not much larger than the homeowner's original septic tank. There is no need for tile bed on the property (with new homes).*

As stated in our report, homeowners will still have the restriction of having a septic tank in their back yard.

- ***Power needs to be available all the time for STEP. Power failure results in properties having no wastewater outlet***
  - *STEG (SBS) requires no power. Digester Tanks operate on a 1/3 empty basis leaving 24 hours of storage in the event of power is off. Gravity systems rely on pump stations and their back-up generator fuel (diesel) tanks are sized for one day's storage.*

The drawing of the STEG Tank from Clearford shows a simple dip pipe at the outlet extending into the liquid. To operate, the liquid level in the tank must be at the outlet pipe level. An increase in liquid level would overtop the outlet pipe allowing solids to enter the sewer. As illustrated, the tank cannot operate 1/3 empty.

- *The SBS Digester tank has a hydraulic mixer propelled by water running through it to stir the tank gently. The attenuator is really just a stationary device that requires no power.*

Incoming wastewater flows from most houses are unlikely to promote much mixing and it is unclear what process effect this will have. It would appear that it could negatively affect the anaerobic digestion process.

- *A STEP system requires power as does the low pressure grinder pump system; both have pumps.*

A combination of a SBS AND a STEP could address where gravity can't be utilized. A cost decision then be made to either installing a full pumping station or merely individual pumps at each home

To adequately service Erin and Hillsburgh a substantial number of tanks must be STEP.

- ***Property owners will be required to supply and pay for power to the onsite pump at their property.***

  - *STEG (SBS) requires no power. If a pump is required by the resident, the cost for a ½ hp is $200-$300 and less than $30/year in hydro. The pumps last 7-10 years at a total cost of under $73 per year.*

In our opinion these costs are low. They would also result in a higher cost to some properties and so we have costed the STEP/STEG alternative on the basis of the Town owning the pumps.

- ***STEP/STEG is a proprietary technology which means maintenance and procurements of parts will be through the same supplier which could increase capital and maintenance costs***
  - *HDPE Pipe is an off-the-shelf product. HDPE pipe is the same pipe used to install natural gas lines and is very common. Tanks can be purchased at ~ $1500 through numerous suppliers. The proprietary features of the SBS are within the tank and are comprised of two items. A flow mixer – and a Flow attenuator. Total cost for both would be ~ $1,000. They add significant value to the efficiency of solids digestion in the tank and flow suppression. Total cost to the municipality ~$2500 - $3000.*

Our professional opinion is that the Clearford tank appears to operate as a septic tank. It is also our opinion that the cost of the tanks noted above is low, and appears to neglect the costs associated with installation.

- ***Existing Septic tanks will need to be decommissioned***
  - *The original septic tank would need to be decommissioned (emptied and collapsed in place) required even for a traditional gravity. In SBS, it is replaced with the Digester tank. Decommissioning means, drain it, break it up and fill it with sand then cover it up.*

Similar to gravity alternative.

- ***Tile bed decommissioned by the property owner.***
  - *This is actually an advantage since the property owner can actually use that part of their property. The Tile bed decommissioning is undertaken at the discretion of the home owner.*

Similar to gravity alternative.

- ***Not widely used in Canada and not on this*** *Scale*
  - *There are innumerable STEG Systems in use in Canada and around the world. There are numerous STEG systems in Ontario. Clearford's SBS is an advanced STEG system.*

However the basic design principles are the same. Solids removal and digestion at source and convey liquid fraction of waste to treatment via gravity…. savings in long term operations and capital costs. Clearford has over a dozen installations in Canada and South America dating back to 1990.

We are not aware of Clearford systems on a similar scale to the proposed Erin/Hillsburgh wastewater system.

- ***Developers for growth areas would be required to use the same system and this may affect house prices as the system does not provide a secure sewer outlet***
  - *Any developer would be interested in using the SBS since it would permit MORE development than servicing using the Traditional Gravity Sewer due to the ZERO INFILTRATION and 2X Peaking factor design advantages of the system. SBS does provide for a trunk connection to developers and are being chosen throughout Ontario*

We understand Clearford is being selected for individual subdivisions in rural areas, however we do not believe this is applicable to Erin and Hillsburgh.

- ***Production of odour is common from improper house ventilation, manholes and system vents.***
  - *A properly installed and vented SBS does not produce odours in the home, manhole or system vents. ANY Sewage conveyance system that is not properly constructed and installed produces odour.*

The retention of a septic tank on each property increases the risk for odours.

- ***Effluent tends to be corrosive due to the presence of hydrogen sulphide gas from septic sewage.***
  - *Treatment plant influent from a Clearford's collection system ranges from pH 7 to 8.5 which is within MOECC guidelines for discharge to rivers and lakes and is not corrosive.*

It is unclear how Transition Erin can make this claim.

- ***Odour control needed at all SPS's (Sewage Pump Stations).***
  - *Odour control is not necessarily an issue with SBS nor particularly expensive to mitigate; it could be as simple and inexpensive as a carbon filter over a vent stack.*

A carbon filter over a vent stack is also a typical solution for gravity based sewage pump station.

- *There are significant advantages of a pump station in an SBS system over a pump station in a traditional gravity system; in operation/maintenance, costing and environmental protection since SBS is free of any solids, fats oil grease etc. all of which is retained in the Digester tanks. Pump stations in a traditional gravity system require much higher maintenance since all solids, grit, fats oils grease travel thru the collection system, the pump stations and eventually to the STP*

We recognise that the Clearford system is proposing reduced flows at SPS's through elimination of infiltration flows. We also recognise that the Clearford system proposed a solids free system. We do not agree that it will be possible to eliminate all solids from the collection system and we believe the impact of solids on SPSs is exaggerated.

- *Re Bypass (where raw sewage is diverted into the river) Pump stations in Traditional Gravity Systems are subject to bypasses due to extraneous flows; rain events and*

seasonal snow melts etc often lead to bypasses, high level alarms at the plants that require emergency attention, MOECC reporting, etc. These bypassing events do not occur with SBS.

By-passing of Sewage Pump Stations is not permissible under any design scenario.

The conceptual design of a STEP/STEG system, as defined in the Collection System Technical Memorandum, takes account of the topography within Erin Village and Hillsburgh. A substantial proportion of the properties cannot be serviced by gravity using the smaller sewers at shallower depths. For these properties we assumed a STEP system. In developing the STEP/STEG solution we have been careful to identify a practical design solution and cost that design on the same basis as all other alternatives.

Within our terms of reference and as requested by the core management team, the Town required the Class EA to develop a reliable cost estimate to ensure that residents were presented with costs that would not escalate at subsequent stages. The preferred alternative has been identified on this basis. In addition:

The project is now fundamentally different from the SSMP which looked at the existing communities and a small amount of growth. The system as now presented could have greater than 5,000 properties including industrial, commercial, institutional (schools etc) and residential properties. Provision of a communal sewage system for the communities presents a significant opportunity for larger properties including condominium developments, seniors homes, combined commercial/residential developments and larger retail units. The collection of septic sludge from all of these properties would require a considerable ongoing operation and a significant solids processing facility at the WWTP.

We are confident that the collection system evaluation process was fair and balanced and that it identifies the best way forward for the Town.

The additional following comments provided prior to the January 24, 2018 PLC are provided below (in blue) along with our response comments:

TGF = Traditional Gravity Fed Collection System
SBS = Clearford's Small Bore System (a STEG derivative in use for 20+ years)
Clearford's Small Bore System referred to as "SBS" is a collection system where solids are removed and digested at source without the need for electricity (at the residence) and where the liquid fraction of waste is directed to a treatment facility via gravity.

The Clearford System cannot service all properties in Erin village and Hillsburgh by gravity. A substantial proportion of the properties require pumps powered from the property.

For existing community:

***SBS**: 225l/person/day (no infiltration) x 2.8 people/unit x 2672 EU =**1645 m3/day** (42% reduction) (based on average 0.63m3 of water usage in Erin/day/household and 0.56 m3/day (200l/day) for Hillsburgh per Water Superintendent - circa 2013)*

Excluding infiltration we have used a flow of 290 l/person/day. This provides a factor of safety over and above the present drinking water demand levels which is prudent due to the expected life of the pipes (more than 80 years). We do not agree that infiltration into a SBS pipe system will be zero. There will be thousands of connections onto private property and these have the potential to leak in future.

TGF:** 380l/person/day (includes 90L for infiltration) x 2.8 people/unit x 2672 EU = **2843 m3/day

1 *re Peaking (Hour) Factor - i.e. what time of day people use most of their water i.e. morning showers where more volumes is sent to the treatment plant.*

- *Does the 380 l/person/day include a peak factor? Ainley's reports a peak factor of 3.3. Is this number then multiplied by the 2843 m3/day?*

380 L/person/day is an "Average Daily Flow" (ADF) assumption – we use average daily flows for the design of secondary treatment processes. The ADF is multiplied by a peaking factor to determine "peak flow". Peak Flow is used for the design of pipes, pumping stations, preliminary wastewater treatment and for some tertiary wastewater treatment processes.

The MOECC design guidelines standardize the peaking factors assumed for wastewater design. The Harmon Peaking Factor equation is an industry standard that generates an assumed peak factor based on the population within a given catchment area.

$PF = 1 + \frac{14}{(4+(\frac{P}{1000})^{0.5})}$, where P = Population

The assumed peak factors in the Flows and Discharge Technical Memorandum are based on the existing populations within each Drainage Area as defined in the same report.

2 *Why was the already rehabilitated land of Halton Crushed Stone not considered as an viable alternative to Option 1 (Solmar land)?*

- *HCS would consider building a 10th Line by-pass during the time when 10th Line would be harvested in Phase 5 (in some 30+ years) (addressed already with HCS)*
- *If a STP located 2 m above the water table is not acceptable, why then did the study evaluate at length options 2a, or 2b or 2c if not viable options?*
- *If a STP is acceptable 2 m above the water table would the cost to dewater during construction not be extremely costly?*

The Study Area identified for a WWTP during the SSMP and in the UCWS Class EA was along County Road 52 and the site selection technical memorandum provides an overview of that area and establishes the alternative sites based on potential impacts to residences and environmentally sensitive lands. During the meeting that our team had with Halton Crushed Stone, we did not discuss the use of lands that had already been mined due to their location closer to an existing subdivision, their designation as compensatory bird habitat and issues surrounding access while the area was still being mined.

We have not stated that construction of the WWTP, 2 m above the water table is unacceptable. It is a factor that would need to be taken into consideration during design. There are design solutions that would minimise the requirements for groundwater dewatering during construction.

3 *Can Ainley confirm what municipalities have received 2/3 funding for a wastewater start-up venture in the last 5 years? (not for expansions/upgrades to existing facilities).*

Government funding agencies change their funding priorities and develop programs to achieve specific objectives. Within the Water and Wastewater sector recent programs have involved upgrading of water systems following Walkerton, upgrading wastewater systems to add at least secondary treatment to all facilities in Ontario and various other programs based on rehabilitation of existing systems. Notwithstanding recent past and current funding programs, a substantial percentage of

communities of similar size to Erin Village and Hillsburgh have received significant (greater than 60%) funding for their water and wastewater systems over the past several decades.
The Infrastructure Canada website lists the federal component of all grants provided since 2002.

4 *Just prior the completion of the SSMP in 2014, a water-deficit was identified and costed at $5-8 M (to reinstate BelErin wells and expanding Well H3) to accommodate the 1500 population growth. Ainley is independent of the water EA however going forward will Ainley be substantially more involved in the remainder of this EA?*

The Water System Class EA is being undertaken by Triton and Ainley is not involved.

5 *Reported that the effluent outflow at Winston Churchill would result in a "15% more assimilation flow". What is the impact of this re serviceable population?*

The Assimilative Capacity was completed based on CVC 7Q20 analysis at 10th Line. Effluent criteria and system capacity has been established on that basis. Increase in base flow between 10th Line and Winston Churchill improves flow assimilation but will not change capacity or effluent limits agreed to with MOECC/CVC.

6 *Re Costings:*

***From the Collection Memorandum**: (Appendix G)*
$50-56M Table 15 – Cost Comparison of Alternative Collection Technologies (existing) Page 10
$13.5M Table 16 – Collection System Trunk Components Affected by Growth Page 10
$25.5M Table 17 – Collection System Trunk Upgrades for Full Build-Out Page 11
From Treatment Memorandum
$43 M Table 45 – Estimated Capital Construction of Erin WWTP (Phase 1) page 63
$18M Table 45- (phase 2)
$61M Table 45- Total Build out)

	Treatment $	Collection $	Total $	Equivalent Units	inflow (m3/day, 380 L/P/D)	Population (in Erin + Hillsburgh)	# of homes (in Erin + Hillsburgh)	Cost/home
Phase 1	43M	(50 to 56M)	93M-99M	2672 EU	2843	4615	1775	$53,520
+ Growth	18M	(13.5 +25.5M)	57M	4068 EU	4328	9985	3439	$16,574
Build out	61M	(63.5 – 81.5M)	~150M	6740 EU	7172	14,600	5214	$28,768

*(380L/unit/day) x 2.8 people/unit = 1064L/unit /day x 4068 EU = 4,328,352 litres or **4328 m3/day** influent = new growth*

Appendix G: 1550 connections is used for all collection calculations for the existing community:

The above interpretation of the costs identified in the various reports is incorrect. It appears that the Phasing costs in the Treatment Plant evaluation memorandum have been confused with the existing versus development totals. The project team will issue a capital cost report and incorporate this into the Environmental Study Report.

7 *Unclear how to incorporate Table 16 ($13.5M) and Table 17 ($25.5M) above- are the costs additive or is the former incorporated in the latter?*

The $25.5 million represents a total cost (i.e. not "in addition") for the system aspects described in Table 17. As such, the cost calculations in the table above are incorrect.

8 *How many homes in Hillsburgh and in Erin today? How many homes in each will end up being serviced? (1800 or 1550 as per costing models.. does this include commercial, industry, infilling/intensification)*

5200 homes(~14,600/2.8) 1800 homes (~5040/2.8)

This information can be found in Appendix D and Appendix E of the Flows and Discharge Technical Memorandum for Erin and Hillsburgh respectively.

While the existing number of homes and published population are useful as a guide for the development of wastewater system capacity, they are not directly used to determine the capacity. The wastewater system should be sized to service all properties within the service area with due allowance for infill and intensification. Without an updated official plan review process that takes into account the communal wastewater system, it is not possible to define exactly how the existing communities will develop. A wastewater system will provide many opportunities for the existing communities to grow. Existing vacant lots and/or parcels can develop into town house developments, low rise apartments, seniors complexes, commercial/residential developments and existing homes and businesses can expand or change use. Prior to completion of the updated official plan it is advisable to retain as much flexibility in the system capacity to ensure that wastewater is no longer the limiting planning control.

9 *If Town elected not to grow, is it correct that wastewater treatment will cost the existing urban us 43M and 55M (~100M)?*

This scenario was identified as part of the Phase 3 work. If the wastewater system is designed for a population of 6,000 as identified in the SSMP, then the anticipated cost for the existing residents would be $72 million in 2017 dollars. This compares with the cost estimate of $58.5 million in 2014 dollars in the SSMP**.**

10 *If the Town elected not to service the existing community, allowing only growth to fund servicing, would the cost remain $100M if the developer were to accept Ainley's Preferred Solutions?*

This scenario of servicing only future growth excluding existing has not been analyzed in the Class EA; therefore, we have not developed a cost for this scenario. Subsequent to completion of Phase 4, there are many implementation scenarios that could arise out of the Official Plan Review process and depending on project funding both from the Town and/or from the Development community. We are not in a position to address implementation scenarios other than is necessary to compare alternative solutions and to identify the recommended alternative.

Our opinion is that a wastewater treatment and collection system servicing both the existing communities and future development areas will yield the most cost effective solution.

11 *Would it be any less expensive for the existing population if the existing community would delay servicing until after the developers have completed i.e. that Existing be the Phase 2 group?*

Rearranging the phasing, such that the developers go first will not significantly reduce the costs to the existing residents, in fact the opposite could be realized as the developers would include any financing costs associated with infrastructure required for the existing community and their financing fees/rates may not be as favourable as the Town's. Regardless, of the phasing it will still be necessary for the Town to secure a government funding to make the project viable.

12 *Pump stations: Generators run on Diesel or Natural gas?*
Generators enclosed, above ground?

What is the approximate cost (capital cost operational costs) for a typical pump station in Phase 3?
Have the operational costing included the labour component to fill generator tanks every 24 hrs?

All Pump Stations would operate on hydro and have back up generators (either Gas or Diesel) in the event of a power failure. For the purpose of this Class EA it is assumed that the generators would be enclosed in buildings. It is premature to determine whether the standby generators would be diesel or natural gas. This would be determined on a case by case basis during detailed design. It is not meaningful to identify the operational cost for each station as operation and maintenance costs for systems are completely integrated into one cost control structure. Small Pumping Stations would not have permanent standby power as portable units would be trailered to the sites on an as-needed basis.

Re Capital Costs, Operational Costs and Maintenance Costs.
Over a 50 year period, the capital costs for infrastructure account for only 20% of all the money spent, 80% is equally divided amongst the Operational Costs and the Maintenance Costs. The capital cost for TGF and SBS is not significantly different however the Operational & Maintenance costs will be.

We have used an 80 year life cycle analysis for the cost evaluation and we have identified that the capital cost for the Gravity system is 88% of the life cycle cost and for the STEP/STEG system, the capital cost is 85% of the life cycle cost.

13 *Is the 80 year life cycle of gravity-fed sewers truly the same period of time as plastic piping in a SBS? Why would the O&M be virtually the same for both at ~$65K/year?*

We have costed on the basis of PVC pipe for the gravity system and Polyethylene (PE) pipe for the STEP STEG System. We believe the 80 years expected life of both these pipes is reasonable.

Based on our analysis the O&M costs for a STEP/STEG system are greater than that of a gravity system over the 80 year life cycle.

For a gravity system, we consider the replacement of pipes at 80 years and refurbishment/replacement of manholes at 50 years. We account for the operation and maintenance of all pumping stations including equipment refurbishment/ replacement. We also accounted for cleaning, CCTV inspection, and inflow and infiltration monitoring within this assessment.

Similarly, with the STEP/STEG system we consider the replacement of pipes and the operation and maintenance of the centralised pumping stations. For the gravity portions of the STEP/STEG system we accounted for cleaning, CCTV inspection, and inflow and infiltration monitoring. What largely differentiates the two systems is the refurbishment of the STEP/STEG tanks on private property; this is included since we have accounted for ownership of these tanks by the Town.

14 *Capital cost for STEG: 1550 hook ups, but 710 will require pumps… ~50% needs pumps? If it's because of topography, why not install community pumping stations? Why would it be any different than TFG/LPS that will require electrical grinder pumps at 53 connections (paid by the Municipality)?*

We have based the conceptual design of the STEP/STEG system on topography and recommendations from consultation with a STEP/STEG equipment supplier. We have used STEP on lots where it is not possible to go by gravity for the shallower STEP/STEG pipes. We could have

substituted STEP with a gravity system, however this would make the STEP/STEG pipes deeper. For all the alternatives we have conceptually designed pumping stations where necessary.

15 Please confirm the 80 year Summary Lifecycle analysis for the STP - no summary Lifecycle found. (Assume this is based on TGF/Low pressure grinder pumps).

The WWTP alternatives were analysed as different components including liquid train, solids train and septage. The WWTP Technology Selection Technical Memorandum includes life cycle cost spreadsheets and summary table for all of these components.

16 (minor) Effluent Pumping is $ 1,800,000 in Table 45 (but $1.6M estimated in the Outflow report) why the cost difference? Why would it cost another $900,000 in phase 2 for a total of $2,700,000?

The total full build out cost for the Effluent Pumping Station and Outfall is $2.7 million made up of $1.6 million for the outfall and $1.1 million for the pumping station. For the Phasing we included the effluent pumping station and one of the twin forcemains at Phase 1 and then additional pumps and second pipe at Phase 2.

17 (minor) Land Acquisition $500,000 but WWTP site report stated 785K and that the "Town may have to purchase more than 5 Ha as remaining lands may not be useful to the present Owner (Solmar)" Solmar paid some ~1.3M for the land. Should market value for all the land not be included?

The $500,000 is incorrect. The estimate is $785,000. We will correct in final reports. We do not believe that the Town would need to purchase all of the Solmar lands.

18 Hillsburgh new Library not hooked. What is the incremental cost increase to service this new building located on the other side of the Hillsburgh pond (west side)? (Appendix A Collection)

- Is the cost to connect the Library, located past the Station Street Dam/Bridge, included in all the collection costing scenarios?

The cost to connect the new library is not included, however we have made an allowance for infill and intensification in sizing the wastewater system. The area is also planned for development and it is likely that, depending on what lands are approved for development, there would be cost sharing available to connect the developments and library to the trunk sewer on Trafalgar. The actual connection cost to the sewer in the street would be a Library (Town) cost. It is premature to show actual sewer routes for these connections pending planning approvals.

19 Since electricity costs could well be significant, has Ainley determined the supply of electricity to the preferred location is sufficient to service the requirements of the STP?

The cost to supply all utilities to the WWTP site is included in the site development cost estimate.

20 RE the STP: Is the STP designed to be completely underground?

Typically, WWTP sites are partially buried to balance soil materials cut and fill on the site. Exact elevations would be determined during detailed design, however, the plant will be a combination of aboveground buildings and partially buried tanks with some open water surfaces.

If not, what is open to the air?

Based on the preferred technology alternative, only the aeration tanks would have open water surfaces. These tanks always have aerobic conditions and do not produce offensive odours.

Is rural septage received indoors?

Tankers delivering septage would discharge through a piped coupling into an underground tank below a building connected to the odour control system. No septage would be exposed to open air.

Will the STP design ensure 100% odour-free operations as some contractors do.

We are not aware of any wastewater treatment operations companies who would guarantee odour free operations. MOECC set odour limits and the Class EA will recommend that the plant meets these limits. It is anticipated that MOECC will require extensive odour mitigation measures and these have been provided for.

21 *In the capital cost calculation for STEG/STEP $9.25 M is included for the digester tanks but additional charges added: O/H & profits of 15% + Contingency of 15% + 10% Administration totalling $4 million more than TGF costing where the homeowners pay the $10.2M for connections to the curb. Is the STEP/STEG calculation inflated by $4M in making the paper comparison with TGF?*

The $10.2 M for private connection costs was developed through a separate analysis process and was therefore not subjected to the additional contingency and engineering fees. See the cost analysis for the connections in Appendix G of the Collection System Alternative Assessment Technical Memorandum. We believe our assessment of costs for each system was completed on equal terms.

Additional questions (post PLC Meeting of January 24,2018

22 *1550 connections is used to develop costing for all collection alternatives from $50M to 56M in Section 9.0 Table 15 of the Collection Memo:*

Please breakdown the1550 connections:

- *Confirm the number of existing homes in Hillsburgh and how many in Erin? (from Septic Survey Study report: Erin: 1204 Hillsburgh: 512)*

The project team will issue a capital cost report to clarify costs and this will be incorporated into the Environmental Study Report.

Confirm the number of existing homes in Hillsburgh and how many in Erin to be serviced? (from Septic Survey Study report: Erin: 1141 Hillsburgh: 466 Total: 1607)

The project team will issue a capital cost report to clarify costs and this will be incorporated into the Environmental Study Report.

- *What is the relationship between 1607 homes in need of servicing and the '1550 connections', - and infilling, intensification, existing industry, etc.*
- *Of the1550 connections, how many connections are not residential (schools, commercial, industry)?*

The project team will issue a capital cost report to clarify costs and this will be incorporated into the Environmental Study Report.

23 Is the cost of $3.4M for the inter-village pipe included in Collection Memo; Table 15?

Yes.

Treatment costs for Phase 1 is $43M in Table 45. Does this represent the 1550 connections used in the calculations of the collection costs of $50- 56M in Table 15? If not, explain exactly who is included in this Phase 1?

The phasing plan identified in our Technology Selection Technical Memorandum was developed as a scenario simply to allow us to develop a life cycle cost scenario. Phase 1 provides for all of the existing communities and a proportion of development flows. Refer to tables 1 and 2 in the Technology Selection technical memorandum for definition of Phases (see below). This represents one of many scenarios for Phasing depending on Planning and Financing.

Table 1 – Wastewater Treatment Plant Construction Phasing

Phase	Capacity (m^3/d)	Allocation to Existing Population	Allocation to Growth Population	Forecasted Year of Construction
Phase 1	4,780	60%	40%	2020 – 2022
Phase 2	2,390	0%	100%	2028 – 2030

Table 2 – WWTP Phases of Construction and Population Served

	Phase 1	Phase 2 / Full Buildout
Total WWTP Capacity (Average Day Flow)	4,780 m^3/d	7, 172 m^3/d
Residential Population Served	8,864	14,559
Equivalent Population* Served	12,893	18,873

*Equivalent population captures contributions from commercial, institutional, and industrial sources.

24 Re "Two Treatment Plants Alternative report" stated $30.9M capital cost for one plant. Is it then correct to add $52.2M for the Collection for a total for $83.1M? Similarly, the Full Build Out scenario one plant was costed at $60.6M (plus the $52.2M collection) for a total of $112.8M. Is this accurate?

The two treatment plants scenario represented a comparison between one plant and two plants and was completed prior to the more detailed assessment in the Class EA Phase 3 Technical Memorandums. The costs in the Phase 2 memorandum concerning the two plant scenario, should not be used in the Phase 3 analysis.

25 What is the approximate cost per existing property owner today to receive servicing, over and above the hook-up costs, and how much can each property owner expect to pay monthly thereafter for servicing?

We have identified a range of potential capital cost contributions from the existing community and the development community in the Phase 3 analysis. We have also identified an average connection cost and ongoing operation and maintenance costs. These are outlined in the PIC boards and PIC presentation.

As noted during the PIC, Council has stated that the project to service the existing community will not proceed unless a substantial grant is secured. In addition, the Town can only fund debt up to a debt

capacity that still allows it to fund other necessary works. The project team will issue a capital cost report to clarify costs and this will be incorporated into the Environmental Study Report.

*26 Cost per existing home owner as presented in council's presentation is $20-25K **for full build out** (14,400 people sometime in the distant future, without gov't funding). This is misleading.*

The cost to service the existing community is stated to be $50 - $60M. Does this mean for;

1550 connections would pay	*~$39,000/connection, or*
1800 units would pay	*~$33,000/unit, or*
2672 equivalent population	*~$22,500/equivalent*

The project team will issue a capital cost report to clarify costs and this will be incorporated into the Environmental Study Report.

27. Please outline the calculation for $20-25,000 per property in a full build out scenario of a 14,400 population?

While we refer to a residential population of 14,600± under the full build-out scenario, the cost will be further shared among industrial, commercial, and institutional properties. We have identified the equivalent population at full build-out would be approximately 18,880 which we equate to approximately 6,743 residential units (understanding that some units represent I/C/I properties)

The costs of the local collection system cannot be shared with new development, and can only be divided among existing/ infill lots (2672 units).

The costs are presented as a range due to a range of potential cost sharing opportunities between the existing community and developers. The extent of the "Collection System Trunk" may be negotiated with developers where opportunity to share infrastructure costs exists. i.e. cost sharing in system aspects with mutual benefit to the existing community and new development.

28. Joe Mullen's presentation to Council on January 26th stated the three main sources of incoming product to the STP is from Residential, Industrial and Infiltration.

- *Residential: Well covered in Ainley's reports*
- *Infiltration: Necessary in a TGF to ensure adequate mobility in the gravity pipes.*
- *Industrial: Not addressed in any of the reports. Impact on STP, MBR membranes, Should Industrial Wastewater be reviewed?*

Although the presentation did reference commercial/industrial flows, the technical memorandum does take these flows into account, though the estimate was based on industries that use nominal amounts of water or "dry industries." It is normal for municipal wastewater treatment plants to accept commercial/industrial flows. It should be noted that most municipalities pass sewer use bylaws that set guidelines on the quality of wastewater being discharged to the Municipal sewer system. Where industrial/commercial properties cannot meet the quality limits they must pre-treat their waste before discharge to the sewer.

30. No discussion in any of the reports on wastewater from Industry and the impact on the STP. How is the potential Full Build Out of 14,400 people affected by existing and future industry? Does it decrease the potential of the 14,400 population potential?

The 14,500± population identified in our technical memorandums is just the residential population. Flows from Industrial, Commercial and Institutional connections are provided for over and above the residential flows. Industrial flows have been provided for based on the lands zoned for industrial development in the present Town Official Plan as well as existing industrial areas.

Background notes

Re Population and Dwellings Census 2017

Based on 2016 Census, with an added 3% increase to accommodate any growth between 2016 and 2018, it appears Ainley reports 731 more in population (18%) and 261 more homes than what is reported in the Census. The # of people per dwelling is the same.

Incidentally the Final SSMP (table 2-1) in 2014 reports 1430 dwellings (in line with the census)

Assuming the Census report is correct: then Equivalent population units should be decreased by 731 (2672 -731 = 1941)?? therefore;

380L/dwelling/day x 2.60 people/dwelling x 1941 EU = 1917 m3/day as daily flow to STP (not 2842, a reduction of 32%)

Population and Dwellings 2016 Census

	Erin* + Hillsburgh*= Total		plus 3% growth	Ainley	Total
	Total	Villages	growth 2016-2018	Report	Town*	Rural
Population, 2016* 7668	2647	1124	3771	**3884**	**4615**	11,439
Population, 2011* 7182	2523	1065	3588	-	-	10,770
% Change 2011/2016*	4.9%	5.5%	5.1%		-	6.2%
(Population Growth) 516	124	59	183	113		699
Total Private Dwellings* 2808	1020	430	1450	**1493**	**1754**	4258
Population/Dwelling* 2.73	2.60	2.61	2.60	2.60	2.63	2.69
Population Density/Sq. Km* 26.4	656	384	544	-	-	38.4
Land area, Sq. km* 290.83	4.03	2.9	6.93		-	297.76

** as per 2016 Census reports:*

***Ainley's Septic System Survey Report** concluded that two districts; "South Erin" (partly outside of the urban core) and "Upper Canada Drive" (within the urban core), would not be serviced. These two districts represent ~143 homes*

Total homes in Urban as per this septic Survey:
Hillsburgh: 512 homes all in the Urban Core: 512 all Urban
Erin: 1339 (less 95 for NE Erin and ~100 in South E outside of Urban): 1204 in Urban
1716 in Urban

To be serviced as per this Septic Survey:
512 in Hillsburgh less 46 in Upper Canada = 466
1339 in Erin less 163 in South Erin less 95 in NE Erin = 1141
1607 ~ 109 won't be serviced

While we use the existing population as a guide, it is not the basis for determining potential wastewater flows from a community for infrastructure that will support the communities for many decades. We used mapping to identify properties that could generate wastewater flows.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on January 30, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

One question to be ready to answer on Friday may come from a few of my neighbours.

Does the estimated cost to homeowners to simply hook into the system once built include the needed costs associated with decommissioning their existing septic systems? An estimate of $6,000 to hook up is a bitter enough pill to swallow if any added costs are piled on top to cover removing of existing tanks and/or pipes.

What will the Town requirements be for the septic systems?

The average cost quoted includes a cost to make the existing septic tank safe by filling it with sand. If the property owner wanted to remove the tank or existing pipes to reuse the area that would be at their additional cost. Ensuring that existing systems are made safe would be the only requirement of the Town.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on January 18, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

We have just learned that a proposed sewage pumping station is planned next door to our home on Waterford Dr. This location is a house-sized lot, immediately surrounded by about 7 homes on the street. While we realize this is a low elevation point in the neighborhood and a candidate from that perspective, we were stunned by the choice given the proximity.

My recent research on the subject shows that even modern and small-sized sewage pumping stations contribute to noise and odor from distances far further than this lot can accommodate.

Putting the potential noise and odor aside, there is a also a known, negative effect on property values in proximity to such stations. Even if it is working "perfectly", prospective buyers will avoid such homes. The loss in value is significant, based on the informal queries I have to agents in town thus far.

Question 1: Given the known impact on property values of nearby sewage pumping stations, has the town set aside funds to compensate current homeowners for the decline in value?

Question 2: It may be too early, but what expectations have Ainley given around sewage pumping station impact? Can we continue to have quiet enjoyment of our properties, or must we suffer through "occasional and moderate" odors deemed acceptable?

We LOVE living in Erin, and have chosen it as an ideal location to raise our children. We respectfully beg the council to reconsider the sewage pumping station location and/or consider an alternate method entirely, especially for homes with new septic systems.

On Jan 19, 2018 we provided the following response:

We will respond fully in writing as soon as we can and perhaps we can also meet either before or after the PIC or on site. There is some flexibility in the location but we would have to discuss this further with the Town so as to minimise interference with the stormwater pond.

Below is the conceptual drawing in our pumping stations report.

Further to this you provided additional comments as follows:

Thanks for the quick follow up Gary, it is much appreciated.

As per my initial mail to our council, the chief concern for nearby residents are odor and noise. I'm not clear on the noise piece, but I have seen several references to odor issues for such installations. I would welcome the opportunity to learn more about the station, how it operates, and what residents can expect.

On a related note, are there any published recommendations re the proximity of such stations to homes? I cannot find anything, and to be honest this placement seems very close.

Lastly, I think you can appreciate that this station won't exactly add value to the surrounding properties. That's outside the scope of the project as far as you're concerned, but I hope you can sympathize with our concern here.

Would it make sense to set up a time for a call? I'm around next week if that suits.

We understand the concerns you express regarding the proposed location of the Waterford Drive Wastewater Pumping Station. The proposed location is at the natural low point in the subdivision to which all wastewater can drain by gravity. At this time, we are proposing that it would be located in the road allowance next to the edge of the storm water management pond and approximately mid way between the two adjacent homes. This station would only service a limited number of houses and will be quite small.

The station would be underground with a circular concrete structure about 18 inches above ground and also a control panel (similar to a ground mounted transformer or a Bell panel). The appearance of the control panel can also be mitigated with architectural controls so that it blends in with the local environment. It would be landscaped to minimise impact. Exact siting will depend on constructability issues, creating access for maintenance, and preserving mature trees and streetscape, however we would envisage only a very small visual impact on adjacent homes. For this size of pumping station there would not be a standby generator, as the Town would plug a portable unit when needed.

Locating sewage pumping stations in subdivisions is very common. Many would be located far closer to houses than the one proposed for Waterford Drive. Odours are not common from sewage pumping stations and there are mitigation measures available to deal with potential odours such as carbon filters. The pumps would be submersible type and unless you were standing over the station with the hatches open, it is unlikely you would hear them in operation.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]
Trustee for Town of Erin, Guelph Eramosa and East Garafraxa

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

I am unable to attend the Town of Erin Waste Water Plan Meeting on Feb. 2nd. However, I would like to get out the following message. Please let me know where I might be able to publish it.

"As the School Board Trustee for the Town of Erin; and someone who wants to see our schools and community thrive, I firmly believe that we need sewage capacity that will enable growth – and from my perspective, the quicker, the better.

Without waste water treatment and vibrant growth, we leave 409 student places empty which very likely will result in the closure of a school. According to the Board's recent Long Term Accommodation Plan Review, the school aged population dropped by 500 students in the last 10 years and this decline is expected to continue.

Today the capacity of our three elementary schools is nearly 1200 student places; yet we only have 840 students. Without growth we can only expect further decline.

With waste water treatment and early growth, our schools can be saved. Population and student projections suggest that in 10 years all three schools could have healthy populations with 1,065 of the 1,180 pupil places full. And by the year 2036 additional school capacity might be required.

Right now, as we discuss if we want growth in our municipality, the Upper Grand District School Board is developing a Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP). It involves a strategic review of our schools, population projections and enrolment forecasts. It is an essential process in a commitment to fiscal responsibility to taxpayers and academic achievement and wellness for our students. I hope you attend the consultation meeting on Feb. 28th at Erin Public School at 7 pm to have your say on the future of schools in the Town of Erin.

In your discussion tonight, I hope my fellow citizens will chose to build a vibrant and growing community with the same small town, rural character we all want, rather than the status quo which can only lead to further decline. Families choose communities with vibrant flourishing schools. Choosing growth and thriving local schools can only lead to the kind of community we all want."

Thank you for your letter regarding the School Board situation in Erin. Your letter was read out by the Mayor at the Public Information Centre (PIC) on February 2, 2018 and will be included in the public contact materials within the Environmental Study Report. Our project team has consulted with the School Board and being part of the Agency distribution list, we have also sent all of our project materials to the School Board for comment.

Following completion of the Class EA, the Town intends to conduct an Official Plan Review process to address the issue of growth more specifically.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 2, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

As residents of the Erin Village, my wife and I are baffled as to the reason why this process is continuing to move forward.

Why spend such atrocious amounts of money, to be literately flushed down the drain, to replace a simple, working system with a huge, complex, expensive system.

Not to mention the environmental issues. A treatment plant will create tons of pollution, vs the absolute ZERO impact from individual septic disposal.

Other than future growth, I'll get to that in a sec, what is the actual reason to go off of individual septic?

For growth opportunity, no one wants the cookie cutter subdivisions in our community. Look at all the other areas around us, like Brampton and Orangeville. Its terrible.

To help grow the community, we should concentrate on the built up areas just south of town off of Armstrong. Medium lot homes, with septic. These not only have a smaller impact on the community, keeping the "CHARM" intact, but also, statistically, bring in a higher income group of home owners.

Are there any residents actually pushing for central disposal and treatment?

I heard there is pressure from the Province to make this change.

The need for Municipal wastewater servicing solution for Erin and Hillsburgh has been an issue for many years and has been the subject of past reports, many public meetings, and is driven by a number of things including, the limitations on the Town being able to prosper, without continued growth. In addition, existing septic systems can have a determinantal impact on the local environmental if not properly maintained and/or depending upon the local ground conditions. The Settlement and Servicing Master Plan (SSMP) completed in 2014 recommended a communal wastewater system for both Erin Village and Hillsburgh with a treatment plant and discharge of treated effluent to the West Credit River south of Erin Village. This Class EA study follows on from that recommendation and involved a more detailed evaluation of the existing septic systems and the proposed service area. This

work essentially confirmed the SSMP recommendation for a communal system servicing both communities. The evaluation of existing septic systems and recommendations for the service area are included in reports on the project website. The results of these studies were presented to the public at a Public Information Centre (PIC) in June 2017. Following on from this PIC, the study moved on to define the best technical solution for the communal system and this is what was presented at the February 2018 PIC. As a result of these studies and consultation with the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) as well as the Credit Valley Conservation (CVC), a very high quality of treated effluent is proposed for discharge to the river to minimise any negative impacts. We are confident that the recommended solution provides the best environmental solution for wastewater for the communities.

The Class EA study has also identified a wastewater treatment solution that provides the opportunity to service a residential population to just over 14,500 persons, which would allow servicing of all growth areas designated in the Town's present Official Plan while maintaining river water quality. If the Wastewater Class EA is successfully completed, it will remove wastewater as a restriction on community growth servicing lands delineated in the Town's Official Plan. At the present time the County of Wellington has not allocated this level of growth to Erin. In addition, a parallel Class EA is ongoing to identify potential water supply sources to support future community growth. When the servicing limits for water and wastewater are established, the Town intends to complete an Official Plan Review process in consultation with the County of Wellington, that will define community growth. The MOECC and CVC have both been consulted throughout the Class EA process and have indicated their support for the recommended solution. In addition, CVC have indicated that they are not in favour of further subdivision development using septic systems.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 3, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

If the town is concerned pump out the tank and fill it in with sand and gravel. That to me is enough extra cost.

Sent from my iPhone

Greetings All,

One question to be ready to answer on Friday may come from a few of my neighbours.

Does the estimated cost to homeowners to simply hook into the system once built include the needed costs associated with decommissioning their existing septic systems? An estimate of $6,000 to hook up is a bitter enough pill to swallow if any added costs are piled on top to cover removing of existing tanks and/or pipes.

What will the Town requirements be for the septic systems?

As a result of discussions with the Public Liaison Committee, the team increased the average cost of connecting the future wastewater system to $6,000 to provide for filling the existing septic tanks with sand to make then safe.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 2, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *1. Why is the Credit Valley Conservation Authority (CVCA) findings being ignored?*
> *In a previous EA the CVCA produced accurate findings that specifically stated limits for the number of homes allowed for growth. I recognize that it was based upon "septic system" residential units. However, one overflow or malfunction of the proposed sewage treatment facility would more than exceed any limit of contamination deemed acceptable by the CVCA.*

We are not familiar with growth limitations set by CVC. The Class EA team has been in constant contact with CVC throughout the study. Through communications with CVC, we do understand that they are not supportive of future subdivisions using septic systems within the study area due to the cumulative impact of the systems on the natural environment and are supportive of the communal solution recommended in the Servicing and Settlement Master Plan completed in 2014 and the work completed through this Class EA to date.

We recognize the concern over spills to the river and will address this issue in our Environmental Study Report.

> *2. Orangeville has experienced a number of "overflow" and "malfunctions" that resulted in raw sewage being dumped directly into the Credit River. This has all but destroyed that section of the Credit River. In the event of a dumping of raw sewage into the Credit River, who would be held liable for the action and all costs related to the conditions created? Who could be charged and fined? Are those probable costs being considered?*

Spills or by-passes from Wastewater treatment plants involving raw sewage and can occur for a variety of reasons including equipment or pipe failure, loss of power or during storm events, but are generally related to older collection systems and/or wastewater treatment facilities. In designing new wastewater systems today, we are more aware of the risks and impacts of spills and design to minimize these risks using a variety of design solutions. All systems are designed with back up equipment and power to prevent spills.

The wastewater system would operate under an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) issued to the Town by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change under the Ontario Water Resources

Act. This act provides for fines and charges for failure to meet the terms of the ECA. The Town will be responsible for the safe operation of the system in the same way as it is responsible for the supply of clean drinking water under their Water System Permit.

3. What measures will be taken to ensure the proposed treatment facility will be able to contain any malfunction or potential overflow situations? This is real possibility with the flooding that has been occurring in this area in the recent past.

The wastewater system will be completely separate from the storm water system. However, it is anticipated that there will be some inflow and infiltration into the wastewater system during rainfall and storm events and this is taken into consideration in the design of the system. Typically, wastewater systems are designed to handle peak flows. Pumps are designed with sufficient standby capacity at peak flows and provisions are made for operation under loss of the prime power supply using standby power.

4. All of this has come about due to Developers wishing to come in to the community, make a profit and leave the current and future residents contending with the residual operating costs, maintenance costs and problems that will arise. Their Building Permit fees will never come close to offsetting the costs incurred. Where is this being addressed in the costing for this undertaking?

The need for wastewater servicing for Erin and Hillsburgh has been an issue for many years and has been the subject of past reports and a number of public meetings. The Settlement and Servicing Master Plan (SSMP) completed in 2014 recommended a communal wastewater system for both Erin Village and Hillsburgh with a treatment plant and discharge of treated effluent to the West Credit River south of Erin Village servicing a population of 6,000. The intent of the project as outlined in the SSMP was primarily to solve the wastewater servicing issues in the existing communities. The present Class EA has identified an opportunity to service a residential population to over 14,500 while maintaining river water quality. As such, the study essentially removes the restriction on growth imposed by a lack of a wastewater solution. Subsequent to the Wastewater Class EA, the Town intends to conduct an Official Plan Review process to confirm the level of growth for each community. Based on the outcome of this process, a cost sharing plan would be developed between the Town and developers. Developers will be responsible for paying their full share for wastewater servicing. It is anticipated that this cost sharing plan would reduce the cost to existing residents. The Town will also collect development charges under the development charges act to ensure that developers pay for all growth-related costs of the overall project.

5. There does not seem to be a full disclosure of what the current property owners will be required to do with their existing septic systems and potential alterations as to be able to connect their property to the proposed system.

How do the elected politicians and those performing the EA expect a property owner to fund anything related to this proposed undertaking without those costs being investigated and reported?

Subsequently, how do they feel about spending such a large sum of other people's money without a mandate to do so?

The team has presented an average cost of $6,000 to connect to the proposed wastewater collection system on private property. This cost allows for filling the septic system with sand to make it safe. Should property owners wish to remove the tanks and/or tile bed pipes as part of future development of the property, this would be an additional cost to the property owners. It was also stressed that this is an average cost and that connection costs would vary depending on the size of the lot and site

elevations. As a result of comments received during the public consultation process, additional costing information will be included in the project financing report.

The Town has indicated that the project to service the existing community will not proceed without a substantial government grant and that the residual cost to the Town must be within the debt carrying capacity of the Town while considering all other debt requirements.

> *6. It was my understanding that this existing Mayor and Council had been mandated to move in a direction to operate with a balanced budget. This proposal will put the Town into a massive debt with no indication of what the "actual" costs will be and what the property owners can attempt to budget their money for. It has been stated that the Town will need to seek funding to proceed with the proposed project.*
>
> *Who will fund the property owners and at what cost? Keep in mind that no one can be forced to go into debt. This potentially involves the Charter of Human Rights.*

As noted above, the Town has indicated that the project to fully service the existing community will not proceed without a substantial government grant and that the residual cost to the Town must be within the debt carrying capacity of the Town while considering all other debt requirements. Based on comments received during the latest public consultation process, the project team will address the issue of potential costs in more detail through issuance of a project financing report.

> *7. Lastly, (for now as I need to get back to work to start making a lot more money to stay living in Erin) why has this whole issue not been put into a referendum vote?*
>
> *The Town of Erin may wish to start planning for an uprising and loud protesting that will also be heard through the walls of the Ontario Municipal Board and Queen's Park. I would like to believe that the current council can have the strength to stand up for the people that voted them into office and not be "bullied" by any outside sources such as the Developers and those mentioned above.*

Implementing Municipal Water and Wastewater Projects in Ontario is subject to compliance with the Environmental Assessment Act. Provided Municipalities comply with the Class Environmental Assessment process for Water and Wastewater, the project is considered approved and may move to the implementation phase. Compliance with this Act is necessary in order to apply for and secure government grants. As noted above, the Town has indicated that the project to fully service the existing community will not proceed without a substantial government grant and that the residual cost to the Town must be within the debt carrying capacity of the Town while considering all other debt requirements.

Further, we received the following additional comments on February 26, 2018

> *To the Elected Council of Erin, Ainley and Associates Ltd., and the Residents of Erin*
> *Re: Urban Center Wastewater EA - Class Environmental Assessment (Phases 3 & 4)*
> *This letter is being submitted to bring forth a number of concerns regarding the recent February 2nd, 2018 Public Information Centre #2.*
>
> *It is quite apparent that the firm Ainley and Associates Ltd. have taken great care in preparing a presentation for the residents and property owners within in this community.*
>
> *However, upon closer review of the presentation panels a number of concerns have been raised.*

1/ The manner and time in which the presentation was given for public review was not conducive to allowing the public adequate time to fully review and understand the content of each of the panels.

The content required close study and examination of the supposed facts being presented.

Information presented at the February 2, 2018 Public Information Centre (PIC) was based on background reports presented to Council on January 10, 2018 and made available on the project website from January 11, 2018. All of the materials from the PIC including the display boards and presentation, were made available on the Town's project website within two business days of the PIC and the public had until February 28, 2018 to provide comments.

a/ First, the "average cost" for a property owner to connect to the proposed wastewater system being averaged at approximately $6,000.00 is very misleading. There was no offering as to qualifying how this amount was determined.

Upon questioning the employee of the Ainley Group, Mr. Gary Scott, responsible for this aspect of the project and the presentation panel it was learned that a "drive about the town" was the approach used to develop estimations for existing septic system locations. A "database", of unknown origin, was then used to develop the figure presented. This does not provide and accurate assessment.

This aspect of the study needs to be completed in a manner that would require a minimum of 4 septic systems per 100 meters per side per street located to determine what would be required to connect to the that part of the proposed system. In addition, proper quotations from a qualified licensed sewer contractor would be required. This would then provide the Ainley Group with more accurate information that would ultimately be presented to all concerned. This is part of the project that should be completed and covered in the cost to produce a complete and thorough report.

As explained during the PIC, a detailed survey of the community was undertaken and connection costs established for a range of different lot sizes and landscaping scenarios. It would be unrealistic to obtain quotations from qualified contractors given the significant number of properties and the fact that each property is unique and different. However, it is recognized that the number reported is an average cost and that the costs to connect all the lots will vary. Information on the costing of connections was included in the Septic System Survey Technical Memorandum and will also be part of the project financing report. It should also be noted that the costs for the installation of each individual service lateral up to the municipal property line have been included in the overall Town construction costs.

b/ Second, the "full cost" of the proposed wastewater system was not presented in a format that showed the "actual initial/total cost". It has not been made clear as to how the proposed system is to be built and funded. Is there an intention to build a system that is capable of handling the existing as well as the "proposed" future development or is the intention to build a system that will accommodate only the current requirement and expand at as required in the future?

This leads to questions as to how can any projected costs be presented without adequate "proposal costs" and how can funding be even counted upon at this present time?
Have there been meetings with businesses that are interested in developing land with "our" decision makers outside of the proper protocols? If so, where can the details of these meetings be found and made transparent? If not, how did the Town Council determine that "developer participation" was something to be relied upon?

All of these questions need to be answered and disclosed in the proper manner.

To date the project has focused on identification of the recommended preferred technical solution. This was presented at the February 2, 2018 PIC. The Class EA is focused on presenting a technical solution based on full build out of the Town's Official Plan limits servicing a residential population of 14,600± persons. The $118 million total cost to achieve this was clearly presented by the project team. The scope of this servicing cost was also clearly presented and includes all costs to service the existing community and to service all developments excluding the cost of sewers on each developer's lands. Considering that the planning approvals for the potential developments are not yet in place and considering that potential government grants cannot be secured until the Class EA process is completed, it is not possible to identify an exact share of the total cost for the existing community. Given all of the many implementation scenarios, the project team identified a range of cost sharing between the Town and developers wherein the Town's cost share was estimated to be between $50 and $60 million and the developer's cost share was estimated to be between $58 and $68 million. In addition to this, the Town has indicated that they are not in a position to finance a project between $50 to $60 million and that a grant would be required to reduce the Town cost (and the cost to residents in the proposed service area) within the Town's debt carrying capacity.

Depending on financing, the first phase of the implementation may include all of the existing community or only a portion of the existing community. It may include a growth component based on the existing County growth limit or it may include an increased growth component if this has been approved through all of the required planning stages.

Based on comments received during the public process, the team intends to clarify costing in a project financing report.

There have been no meetings between developers and the project team during this Class EA except related to use of sites for potential facilities.

c/ Potential optional funding to property owners was not placed in an manner that would have been easily reviewed. The panel that did indicate that the "Town" could be able to offer a "loan" to property owners to assist with sewer connection costs was very difficult to find and understand. It did suggest that the Town could loan each property owner the funds needed to connect however, without adequate existing internal funding and without a more realistic assessment of actual connection costs and the number of property owners that would be obtaining the funding, the Town cannot have qualified information to determine just how much funding this Town would require. In addition, terms of such loans being available were not disclosed in any manner whatsoever.
Why Not?

Display materials and the presentation indicated what the cost elements would be and who would pay for each component. It was indicated that the Town would finance the construction of the system to the municipal property line of each property and that this could be paid by property owners to the Town either in a lump sum or through a loan paid over a number of years. It was also indicated that the connection cost from the municipal property to the buildings, on private property, would be paid directly by the Owner to the company they choose to make the connection.

Based on comments received during the public consultation process, the project team recognizes that a clearer picture of the potential costs to residents needs to be presented and this will be included in the project Financing Report.

2/ The lack of full disclosure of other options concerning a wastewater management system was not presented at all.

*In a brief discussion with the Town's Project Manager, it was disclosed that a presentation had been made by Simpson Environmental Corporation, http://www.senvc.com/. This business was **not** approached by Ainley to introduce their option for a "normal" wastewater treatment facility. Simpson Environmental approached our Town! The successful technology now exists for converting wastewater into energy and limiting - if not eliminating - effluent being dumped it our water resources - in this case the Credit River.*
Why was this state of the art technology dismissed? How much investigation into the true potential and limitations - if any - were made prior to just saying "no". Where is the documentation as to why this would not be feasible for Erin?

A comprehensive range of potential wastewater treatment solutions were identified and evaluated.

During Phase 2 of the study, members of the project team met with Transition Erin to discuss alternative solutions. Transition Erin brought Simpson Environmental to the meeting. Simpson Environmental discussed the use of several specific technologies during the meeting all of which were known to the project team. At the time of the meeting, Simpson Environmental were not aware of the effluent limits to be met by the proposed treatment system and did not appear to be aware of Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change regulations. Subsequent to this meeting, there was no discussion with Simpson Environmental. While a number of equipment supply vendors were consulted during the evaluation process, it is important to note that the recommended solution is not vendor specific and all of the components of the recommended solution can be supplied by a number of vendors in order to obtain competitive bids. The project team is confident that a comprehensive treatment technology evaluation has identified the best solution for Erin. The recommended solution utilizes the latest proven technology that will safeguard river water quality.

3/ Lack of funding available to the Town of Erin.
It is being made perfectly clear that nothing can move forward with the community having to convert to a sewage treatment system without major funding be secured from all levels of government and putting the community into using up most if not all of its debt carrying capacity. That is just for the sewage treatment aspect of this consideration. Where will the Town's funding come from to cover the costs for the property owner to connect? Refer to Item 1c. This will be over and above what outside funding would be available?
How can this entire project in every aspect of cost to the Town and to each property owner even be considered without knowing how it is to be financed ahead of spending any more of all of the tax payers of the Town of Erin? This includes both rural and potential "serviced" tax payers.

The Town will require a substantial level of funding before the project to service the existing community proceeds. In order to secure funding, it is necessary to complete the Environmental Assessment Process. Any government grant would help to pay for the cost of the treatment system and collection system up to the street line of each property.

As discussed during the PIC and as outlined above, the cost to connect to the communal system from the municipal property to the buildings, on private property, would be paid directly by the Owner, with no financing assistance from the Town.

4/ Lack of adequate time to allow the public to express their concerns at the February 2nd PIC.
The purpose of the PIC, as stated in the procedure outline, is to gather public comment and input to be used to make educated decisions. This meeting did not allow a "full public" forum for all voices to be heard. This is not acceptable. As many Council meetings run overtime, this important public meeting should have been allowed to continue on so as to provide the

opportunity to address the concerns of each of those persons that wished to do so and accomplish the goal of the actual and required intention of the public forum.

The moderator failed to provide the time necessary for all to be heard and did not offer a reasonable alternative to give everyone their right to speak in the venue at that time. This is a breach of protocol.

What is being done with the information and concerns that was stated and when can the public expect to have a reply to those that were allowed to speak and/or question the information being presented?

The meeting ran to schedule based on the published times, and in fact the project team continued to answer questions from members of the Public during the teardown of the room (proxy another 30 to 45 minutes). Time was provided before the presentation for one on one conversations with the project team and the presentation was kept as short as possible in order to maximize the time available for questions. Every effort was made by the moderator to give everyone a chance to ask their questions.

All of the written comments received will be responded to.

5/ Forced connection?
No one can be forced by any level of government into unwanted debt of any sort.
No level of Government (or Municipal Board) has the power to "force" any resident or home/business/property owner to go into debt or place a lien on a property for the adding of an unwanted or unwarranted service. Therefore, the Town would have to be prepared to bare the entire cost of a sewage treatment installation, property to service connection and the ongoing operating and maintenance costs without adding any costs to the property owner(s). This includes not increasing property taxes as a result of the unwanted service(s).

After the the Class EA is successfully completed and if the Town is able to get Provincial and/or Federal funding such that the remaining portions can be financed within the Town's debt capacity, then the Town would be in a position to proceed with the project and to pass a mandatory connection by-law for the intended service area. The Town does would have the authority, under the Municipal Act, to require properties to connect to a Municipal water/wastewater system within a specified period of time; however, the Town would host public meetings at that time in relation to the connection time frame and payment options available to and property owners.

Infrastructure projects of this nature can only be funded, completed and sustained over time if all benefiting properties pay their share of the project cost.

Furthermore, no developer should be able to come into a community, set up a sewage treatment plant - for their own profitable purposes - and walk away leaving behind a situation for the community to contend with. There needs to be safeguards put into place to ensure this scenario cannot happen - here or anywhere.

Unfortunately, this would become a class action legal battle that would devastate the entire community.

One of the important considerations for this Wastewater Class EA is that the Town is retaining control of the process. Subsequent to the Class EA, the Town intends to complete an Official Plan Review process that will define the limits and amount of growth. The wastewater system will likely be jointly funded by the Town and developers and it will be important to the Town that the developers pay their fair share. It should be noted that the average capital cost to each serviced property goes down as the number of properties increases. In addition, the operational cost of the system for each serviced

property goes down as the number of properties increases. Clearly the Town needs to take maximum benefit from sharing costs with developers.

6/ It would seem that the thought process for future development of the Town of Erin is flawed. Somehow the concept of having a sewage treatment facility would have businesses "consider" moving into the area and that would then entice more people to "consider" relocating to Erin is leaving too much to chance. We can examine a few current examples that show this thinking to be invalid.

a/ Georgetown RV recently relocated into Erin. This long existing business found their new location and based that decision upon many factors. However, upon arrival they were being denied an "occupancy permit" if they did not send over $30,000 to connect to the "town water". This was required even though the property has a fully functional and clean well. This business began facing challenges that were not expected and certainly seemed to be unnecessary.

b/ Within the recent past the Simms Corporation purchased and renovated and moved its entire manufacturing operation from Malton to Erin. This was done in spite of having a septic system and related costs.

c/ The Canada Wire building was on the market for less than a year and has now been sold and will be the home to another manufacturing business.

d/ A lot on Thompson Cres., is being prepared for a new business facility. This indicated yet another business is willing to come into this Town even with having to operate with a septic system.

All of the above is "fact" - not supposition.

It would be worth considering developing a "limited" housing development program that would provide for "affordable family housing" to bring folks into the community first, fill the job openings that are continuously being advertised within the area and potentially address the declining school enrolment issues.

As an alternative, it may be worth considering being "business friendly" and developing programs and tax reduction incentives to bring business into the Town that will cost far less than a sewage treatment plant and not have ongoing long term operating expenses.

These important considerations should be addressed during the Official Plan Review which will take place following completion of the Wastewater Class EA.

7/ The EA does not take into consideration or mention that 1 day of having the proposed sewage treatment plan malfunction, for whatever reason, that there would be more "raw sewage dumped" into the Credit River than the would be over the next 100 years by having the existing and plus another 300 septic systems maintained properly or upgraded as needed. The chance of a malfunction occurring is something that needs to be addressed. Orangeville has had numerous sewage overflows occur and huge costs related to those overflows. The damage to the river and its' inhabitants is done.
No where is the presentation was there any indication of how the inevitable overflow can be prevented. This needs to be addressed.
This leads to question as to why proceed with something that has more chance of issues and failure and costs than the current conditions have?

The wastewater system proposed for Erin will be a new system completely separate from any storm water system including roof drains or sump pumps. However, it is anticipated that there will be some inflow and infiltration into the wastewater system during rainfall and storm events and this will be fully taken into consideration in the design of the system. Overflows from wastewater systems that are separate from storm water systems are extremely rare. Overflows from older systems with interconnections to surface or storm water systems are more common. All wastewater systems are designed to convey peak flows and have reliability built in through spare pumping capacity and standby power. Storage capacity in the system can further enhance security. In designing new wastewater systems today, we are more aware of the risks and impacts of spills and design to minimize these risks using a variety of design solutions. The requirements for system security to prevent potential spills will be fully addressed in the Environmental Study Report.

> *8/ The presentation does not take into account the value of what this community has been built upon and what will happen to the way of life the residents and property owners have. There will be a substantial disruption to the community's day to day living throughout the entire process and ongoing operation of the wastewater system. There will be more trucks, more noise, more pollution, more taxes, higher housing costs and more problems related to finding funds to operate the Town. All of the estimates in the report are based upon supposition. No persons have been asked for their value of having to hear an exhaust system running 24/7 beside their home. No one has been asked if they believe the value of their decision to locate in Erin will be compromised by the development being proposed. Why not?*

In terms of growth, as noted, following the wastewater Class EA, the Town will undertake an Official Plan Review process and this public process will define how the communities will grow in the future. While the Wastewater Class EA will remove the restriction on growth up to the level in the present Official Plan, it is not about defining growth. It is an approach to community planning to define infrastructure servicing limitations before setting growth targets.

In terms of disruption during construction, it is recognized that there will be short term disruption on each serviced street and this will obviously need to be kept to a minimum in terms of residential and commercial activities. This disruption will be short lived and for any given street will involve work for only a few weeks. It is not anticipated that there would be any lasting impact on residents beyond the construction work.

> *9/ It appears that there has not been any true and qualified justification for this development of a sewage treatment system other than if the Town does not do it a "developer" will somehow force it upon the community.*
> *What is fact is that a number of developer businesses, that are interested in creating profits for themselves, started to buy up land in this area over 20 years ago and are now poised to reap the benefits of developing land for profit and leaving the community to live with the aftereffects and related costs in the following years.*

The project was initiated by the Town to address the issues within the existing community. The Settlement and Servicing Master Plan (SSMP) completed in 2014 addressed the servicing needs within the existing communities and based on an evaluation of existing septic systems, it recommended a communal wastewater system. Following the SSMP, this Class EA process commenced in 2016 and based on a more detailed assessment of existing septic systems, it confirmed the recommendation in the SSMP. The primary driver of this project has always been resolution of the wastewater servicing restrictions for the existing community while also facilitating needed growth. This Class EA process has also shown that it is possible to service all of the lands designated for development in the present Town Official Plan. This provides the opportunity to partner with developers to reduce the cost of the system to the existing community.

In closing, as part of your information gathering requirement and collection of public opinion I strongly suggest that the Ainley submission be considered incomplete at best, but more likely flawed in a number of ways as above and therefore ask for the Town to go back to the beginning and let the property owners decide how to proceed from this point on.

Based on the comments received during the Phase 3 public consultation process, the Class EA will proceed to document the entire process in an Environmental Study Report (ESR). Following approval of Council, the ESR will be subject to a formal 30-day Public Review Process.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your February 5, 2018 comments which were received by Council. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by the responses that were already provided by Councillor Brennan.

As a result of last Friday's Public meeting on sewage, could each of the Councillors respond to the below questions:

1. *The town will spend close to $2 million of taxpayer monies for the water and wastewater studies. For a small town, this is significant and could have gone to roads, recreational facilities etc. Why did we not have the developers cover the cost as I do recall that this was an option with Solmar back in 2014. Their participation would create risk for them but the reality is they will have the potential to walk away from our town making over $100 million (make about $50k per home). We are already a highly taxed jurisdiction, why add such high unnecessary costs?*

To date the actual spend is much closer to $1.35M. The EA will help Council to ultimately decide whether or not to proceed with the creation of a wastewater treatment system. It is impractical to expect a developer to be impartial in the process. A decision to not process with a waste treatment facility would mean that developers will not realize the full value of their developable land. It is important that the Town operates in the best interest of the community – and this is best achieved by retaining full control of the studies. Moreover, these studies are absolutely necessary to obtain any kind of funding to help pay for the facility. To stop now would be to throw away the investment already made.

2. *The SSMP stated that over 100 homes could be hooked up to water immediately and 100's more could in the future. Why has Council not made this happen as the cost of water in this Town is ridiculous*

It was the decision of a previous Council not to incur the significant costs related to ripping up our roadways twice; not to mention the inconvenience and disruption that residents would experience.

3. *Taxes are a burden on our Town. Water rates are extremely high. Now you are thinking of piling on with wastewater costs to users. The Mayor stated that one of his primary goals was to increase the industrial and commercial tax base to help out residences. Has this happened?*

Town of Erin tax rates are actually lower than every municipality in Wellington except Guelph-Eramosa where they are almost the same. In fact, the 2018 Town budget was the lowest

throughout the County. Comparatively speaking, Erin ratepayers pay less tax either of the towns of Caledon and Orangeville. Obviously, the blended rate increases the final number beyond what is set by the Town, Where we have a higher total is when the blended rate is applied. Unfortunately, the Town does not benefit from a massive industrial/commercial base driving the budget of the upper-tier (like Caledon) which benefits the lower-tier. Additionally, the Dufferin load is much higher and Orangeville taxes are much higher than Erin. The goal of this Council is to increase the industrial/commercial ratio in Erin is largely dependent upon the ability to service new growth and development.

4. *I think it is important for residences to understand that a 0.50% town of Erin tax increase for 2018 is not real. It excludes property value increases by MPAC. So, to be clear, if my property value goes up 4%, the town of Erin will get increased taxes of the 4% and 0.59% totally 4.50%. Can you confirm this? I ask this as it will be incumbent on this Council and the next to ensure cost controls are in place and not just keep adding costs to residents like wastewater.*

I understand you point, however the MPAC value increases and decreases vary from property to property. Your value may go up 4%, someone else's may go up 2% or may even stay the same or decrease. The only constant we can refer to is the tax rate itself and over the past few years we have done a pretty good job of keeping that to reasonable increases. It is important to note that MPAC values are outside of the control of the municipality.

5. *The Mayor has been quoted as saying that wastewater is necessary for industrial growth. A couple of points here. Current industrial companies in our town have told me they do not care if they have wastewater or not. Why do you think that wastewater hookup will open us up to more industry , Erin is off the beaten path and there is huge capacity in the GTA?*

Economic development research indicates that the two main barriers we face are lack of servicing and unreliable highspeed internet. The wastewater EA addresses the servicing and we are working with Wellington County and the SWIFT network to address the reliable highspeed internet need. Diversifying our commercial industrial growth is not about business retention as much as it is about attracting new ones. We have data that suggests we are not competitive in attracting new businesses due to a lack of services. Our geographical location actually makes us more competitive as we are close to the GTA and transportation infrastructure, yet without the high real estate costs of major urban centres.

6. *Currently, our water bills are some of the highest in the province at 3.99 per cubic meter. Based on 225 litres per person per day, for a family of 4, that would mean a cost to that household would be about $1500 per year. By the way, the costs will keep going up to fix old infrastructure. Other municipalities generally show costs of wastewater to be higher than water but let's say it is equal. So you are saying a family home of 4 will pay about $3,000 per year?*

Much of the water infrastructure costs are fixed in the sense that adding users does not cause the same added cost therefore, as you pointed out in Question 2, more users will result in lower costs per user. With growth the per user water rate will decline. The wastewater operating costs researched by Ainley are quite solid and reliable.

7. *I understand why the Mayor has said that rural has to pay for the capital costs of about $55 million as well, as, without their financial help, it will be a huge burden on water ratepayers. Saying that it seems extremely unfair and unethical to have rural residents pay for something that they will not get a direct benefit from.*

Rural taxpayers have contributed to the EA costs as servicing will serve to benefit the town as a whole. Greater growth particularly improving the industrial/commercial will result in lower per capita tax costs. However, it is a well-established procedure that water and wastewater operating costs are charged to users only. That is why the financing of the water department is kept separate from the overall taxation. Where a rural contribution to operating costs would happen is in the ability to treat septage at the plant, charging a tipping fee. This tipping fee could be set higher that the tipping fees in Collingwood because local septic cleaning companies would no longer face the large cost of driving a full truck to Collingwood and coming back. At 3-4 loads a day capacity we could see close to a thousand loads a year, generating significant revenue for the municipality. Rural residents would see no difference in the amount they pay to have their septics cleaned out.

8. *Since they do not show total costs per household, then let's assume the cost to hook up is $10,000 for an estate home; annual cost is $1,000 as I think your estimates are low; and a resident has to pay $15,000 via a loan for capital cost. A 20-year loan at 3.5% would mean added annual cost of $1000. So that would mean that a resident could add to their water bill about $2,000 per year and come up with $10,000 up front. If someone borrowed that 10,000 hook up cost, a 20 year, 3.5% loan would add another $700 per year, leading to total additional costs of about $2700 per year. Our water is already expensive, how can you justify such costs to residents?*

Costs and the funding of those costs are a question for the next phase of the study. Without adequate funding partnerships from the provincial and federal governments the project is likely too costly to be undertaken.

We assume that the aforementioned information from Councillor Brennan provided the necessary answers to your questions.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 3, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

Given the intensity of the passionate opposition on display at Friday's PIC wastewater servicing meeting, I wonder whatever happened to the notion that the downtown core of Erin Village might best be served with a small-scale localized system that would address the acute needs (of the downtown) and leave the less urgent situation of the suburbs out of the equation.

I do understand that the small-scale alternative seems to have been disregarded by the recommendations of the SSMP study, but I also recognize the emergence of a significant political base that (apparently) wants no part of the recommendations of the SSMP study.

I wonder, for example, what sort of localized sewage treatment system has been approved for the Kensington Square Development on the grounds of the old Public School. I wonder, as well, why a localized system can be deemed workable for Kensington Square, but not for the downtown core.

I am reminded of a conversation I had with a "consultant" of some sort who happened to be caught in the act of surveying in my backyard, perhaps three (?) years ago, who assured me that a large-diameter gravity-fed sanitary pipe could never be installed on Main Street because the disruption to retail businesses in Erin had been severe at the time the road was last repaved, and that such a disruption could never be allowed a second time.

The "consultant" (as above) assured me that the preferred wastewater option (at that time) was a small-bore pipe that would remove fluids only. This seemed to make eminent sense, given that the effluent from the buildings on the Main Street drains to the back, away from the Main Street. In my particular case (68 Main Street) there is a good ten feet of grade separation between the top of my septic tank and the sidewalk beside Main Street; this leads me to wonder if the proposed large-diameter pipe will be sunk deep enough under Main Street to allow a gravity-fed hook-up, or am I facing (quite literally) an "uphill" battle.

I share the scepticism expressed at the PIC meeting with what appear to be optimistically low cost estimates of individual household hookups, particularly as I am facing the ten foot grade separation (above) as well as removing and replacing an asphalt driveway which cost $6,000 to install in 2008.

As it stands I am disappointed with the Ainley report, which seems to be recommending a 19th-century century solution to a 21st-century challenge, and I am particularly disappointed in what appears to be a significant oversight in that the report does not include an economic impact assessment of the retail losses (irrespective of capital or hook-up costs) which are to be borne by the merchants of Main Street.

We fully recognise your concern and we do fully understand that a wastewater solution that allows Main Street to prosper is an important and significant objective of this Class EA.

The SSMP study did identify issues with the septic systems over the entire communities of Erin village and Hillsburgh and this has been confirmed during this Class EA. As a result, the Town is looking for a comprehensive solution covering both communities. In addition, this Class EA has identified an opportunity to service additional growth up to a residential population of over 14,600± subject to completion of an Official Plan Review.

During Phase 2 of this Class EA we were asked to look at a solution based on multiple treatment plants servicing different areas of the communities. Unfortunately, the extent of wetland areas throughout the communities combined with the lack of suitable subsurface disposal lands made this solution non-viable. The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change and Credit Valley Conservation continue to support a single treatment plant servicing both communities with a discharge of treated effluent to the West Credit River south of Erin Village as the best environmental solution.

The Wastewater collection system alternatives review looked at a wide range of potential solutions and selected a gravity based solution as the best long-term solution for the communities. The solution recognises the potential need for a low-pressure sewer solution for some properties. We are confident that the gravity/Low pressure sewer solution is in the best long-term interest of the Town.

In recognising the sensitivity of constructing a collection system within the main commercial area of Main Street and also the difficulty of connecting to this sewer on Main Street for all of the low-lying properties on either side of the street, Ainley has proposed a solution that constructs sewers to the east and west of Main Street. One sewer would connect Church Boulevard with Charles Street along the river side to the rear of all the properties and another sewer would connect Daniel Street through to Water Street on the east side of Main Street. While easements will be required from several property owners, this solution is significantly better for property owners in terms of connection costs and elimination of disruption/retail loss to businesses by digging up Main Street. Although this was displayed at the Public Information Centre, we would be pleased to provide additional detail.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 3, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *1) At your Friday February 2, 2018 public meeting at Centre 2000, there were no display boards presenting capital costs, operating costs and carrying charges for the selected scenarios. This would have provided taxpayers with an indication of the estimated costs they will have to pay for their new sewage collection and treatment system. The Mayor and Council were told on January 9 that the capital cost for Phase 1, collection and treatment, will be in the range of $50,000,000 to $60,000,000. Yet, according to our reading of your numbers in the detailed collection system and treatment plant reports, the Phase 1 preferred option for the collection system is $52,206,000 (not including the operation and NPV) and the Phase 1 treatment plant cost is $43,052,500. Hence, is it not correct that the Phase 1 capital costs for the collection and treatment system could in fact be $95,258,500? Could you please identify how you arrived at the figure of $50-$60 million as presented January 9 at the Council meeting, and verbally reported on Friday evening? What does this $50-60 million include? Does it cover the operation and NVP of the collection system, life cycle costs and extras such as applicable taxes?*
>
> *The Phase 2 collection system expansion has an estimated cost of $39,039,000 and the treatment plant expansion is estimated to be an additional $18,044,000 for a Phase 2 cost of $57,083,000 and a total project cost of $152,341,500. If correct, why were these costs not presented at the meeting as a summary of your study conclusions?*

Display boards did address the capital cost of the system as well as the connection costs and operations costs. The capital cost of full build out was shown as $118 million. The cost share between the Town and Developers was identified as between $50 to $60 million for the Town and $58 to $68 million for the developers. We do understand that there was confusion at the PIC as some attendees were informed the Town cost would be $95 million and the total cost would be over $150 million. These costs are incorrect and arise out of a misinterpretation of the costs as presented in the Phase 3 background reports.

The project team is preparing a capital cost summary report and this will be included in the Environmental Study Report.

Connection costs were also shown as an average cost. Additional detail was included in the Septic Survey Technical Memorandum; however, this detail will also be included in the capital cost summary report.

It was further illustrated on the display boards and in the presentation that the Town could not finance a project between $50 to $60 million and that a government grant was needed to bring to Town cost share within their debt carrying capacity. Again, this will be explained in more detail in the cost report.

During the presentation it was explained that the cost sharing with developers would depend on the actual location of the developments and the extent of integration of the collection system as well as the implementation plan. This is the reason that the Town cost share was reported as a range. Notwithstanding, the Town cannot finance the Town share and will need to secure a grant.

> *2) We are still very concerned with the per person wastewater generation rates used in the project. In investigating this issue, we learned that in Victoria, Stantec is using a per capita design figure of 195 lpcd. There is an extensive database available in Victoria showing that, on average, each resident generates 145 lpcd; this includes the I&I contribution which in certain areas of Victoria is considerable. The additional 50 lpcd addresses the contribution of commercial, institutional and industrial contributors. There is also a City of Calgary report which addresses individual water consumption for water fixtures and appliances and its database shows that 100 lpcd is readily achievable if state-of-the-art water conservation devices are installed. This consumption rates drops to 75 lpcd if greywater recovery, treatment and reuse is applied. These are examples of designs accepted by consulting engineering firms. Why would an aggressive water conservation program not be considered as a top priority for a community like the Town of Erin, and especially for new developments in the Town?*
>
> *Since new development will represent 60% of the contributing flow to the treatment plant, an aggressive water conservation strategy could be implemented that would easily reduce water consumption and thus wastewater generation to less than 150 lpcd. For all existing residential homes and the commercial and institutional facilities, a water conservation program could be introduced whereby each homeowner who installs water conserving devices receives a rebate of up to 50% of the cost of fixtures. In addition to reducing wastewater flows to be treated, the program would have a significant impact on the cost of water supply for the communities. Your comments please.*

This issue has already been addressed by Council who requested Ainley to further investigate the recommended per capita flow rates contained in our Capacity Technical Memorandum. A letter report was considered and approved by Council and it was decided to retain the recommended per capita flow rate of 290 lpcd with an allowance for inflow and infiltration of 90 lpcd for a total of 380 lpcd. The contents of the letter report will form a part of the ESR. This per capita flow rate also allows for additional resiliency within the overall system for future adjustments such as climate change,

We fully understand the wide range of water consumption experienced across Canada and the trend to lower consumption as a result of conservation efforts and plumbing code revisions. We would sincerely hope that water consumption and wastewater flows are less than our recommended design flows, however these actual flows are distinctly different from design flows which are used to size pipes that will be in the ground for many decades. In most cases, the design number does not change the size of the sewer which is the minimum size allowed by MOECC. It should also be noted that Municipalities in Ontario must report the flows to their wastewater plants to MOECC on an annual basis. These flows are used to calculate plant reserve capacity and Municipalities can only allocate

growth up to the limit of this reserve capacity. In this way, the actual flow to the plant is taken into consideration in terms of the service population and in any future expansion.

> *3) The scheduling of activities on this project will be extremely complex. If the sewers are installed before the treatment plant is built, there will be sewage and no treatment, which will not be allowed. So, the treatment plant will have to be constructed before the collection system is operational. Because of the extremely restrictive receiving stream requirements, how will this be achieved? What is the penalty if the effluent limits presented in Table 5 of the Treatment Technology Alternatives report are exceeded? Are these never to exceed numbers or are they monthly averages for flow proportioned composite samples collected every day?*

This would be a typical project to service and existing community with sewers and a sewage treatment plant. It is actually easier to commission a new treatment plant connected to an existing community rather than a new community where it takes longer to generate flows. Typically, the wastewater treatment plant and collection system are built in parallel and when the treatment plant is functional and commissioned and ready to receive wastewater, property connections can start to be made to the sewers. The wastewater treatment plant would be tested using clean water after which, when ready the plant would be seeded with biological sludge from another plant. Most typically the lower initial flows will be easy to treat.

The extent of the monitoring program that will be issued by MOECC in the Environmental Compliance Certificate is not yet known. However, the plant must be operated in a manner that prevents any of the effluent limits from ever being exceeded.

> *4) There was reference made at the meeting to the Town's existing stormwater collection system. Where is the stormwater discharged? Is there any stormwater treatment prior to discharge? What are the water quality limits on the stormwater discharges?*

The reference to stormwater management at the recent PIC was in direct response to a question relating to existing sewer pipes within the municipal road allowance and in particular we advised that any of existing sewer pipes within the road allowance would be related to the existing stormwater collection system. Further to this, all of the existing roads throughout the Town would have stormwater collection and disposal systems in accordance with the measures that were constructed when the roads were originally built. The design and construction of a new wastewater collection system throughout the existing communities will not alter or impede any of the original stormwater collection and/or disposal systems.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 11, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

I am a resident of Hillsburgh. While I appreciate the work that has been done by your experienced company and I know that I do not have the knowledge to assess the why's and wherefores of the plan, I do know that it has major implications for the citizens of Hillsburgh and Erin.

It is my understanding that a plan to build a waste water facility and to connect the villages to it has been studied for years. At one level I can appreciate that with it in place businesses and new housing developments will be more interested in coming to our town, however to now expect residents to welcome and be required to foot the bill is unacceptable.

For instance, the cost and rationale of decommissioning perfectly functioning septic beds seems ludicrous. Can you imagine being a homeowner who has, in the past year or so, replaced theirs?

Will grants actually be forthcoming? Will they be just to offset the costs to the town and our taxes or will they be for residents? What would the likeliest timeframe be for finding this out?

We are being told that the plan is basically ready to begin despite the feelings and concerns of residents. We are being told that we will have to pay to hookup and to excavate our properties to make this happen. And then of course there will also be an increase to our water bill. What are the amounts likely to be?

Having an effective system in place to deal with our wastewater is essential in the long term and the most recent plan has been presented in detail. However there does not seem to have been a clear plan laid out for residents to know as accurately as possible what the actual costs will be for them and the various ways the town can support this. This may not be your responsibility but your costing of the plan and service is. The likelihood of having to pay thousands and thousands of dollars to hook up to the system is extremely concerning. No timeframe has yet been presented. Residents are left contemplating whether or not they will have to take out a second mortgage or borrow on their credit line.

I would appreciate a considered response that recognizes these concerns not just a pat answer.

Yes, this project has been on the go for many years culminating in the recommendation for a communal sewage system in the Settlement and Servicing Master Plan (SSMP) in 2014 and now continuing through this Wastewater Class EA which started in 2016. Whereas the SSMP indicated that the servicing population limit for wastewater was 6,000 persons, this Class EA has identified the opportunity to service 14,600± persons sufficient to service all the growth areas indicated in the Town's Official Plan. This provides the opportunity to share costs of the system with developers and potentially reduce the cost to the existing community. Developers would have to pay their full share of the cost and it is obviously desirable that any cost sharing arrangement would be to the benefit of the Town.

The septic system survey conducted as part of this project, has confirmed the age profile of the septic tanks and the small size of many of the lots and has recommended inclusion of most of the existing communities in the proposed communal system. We do understand that some septic systems were recently installed and it is likely that the Town will exercise some flexibility relating to when people with new septic systems would have to connect.

Until the Wastewater Class EA is completed, the Town cannot apply for a grant. There is also no way to know how long it will take to secure the grant and Council has stated that they cannot proceed without a grant. All of the grant money would be applied against the construction cost of the project which would be of direct benefit to the serviced properties in reducing their share of the project cost. This Class EA is not complete. The present objective is that an Environmental Study Report will be completed and approved by Council within April 2018. The report will then be placed on public record for public comment for 30 days after which the Town will need to address outstanding concerns. All being well, the Class EA could be completed this summer. It should also be noted that following the Class EA, the Town intends to commence an Official Plan Review to deal with the issue of growth and community planning. After completing all of the relevant studies and assuming Provincial and/or Federal funding is obtained, it would still take a number of years to complete the engineering design, have the construction completed and be ready for homeowner hook ups.

Through the public consultation process it has been recognised that additional detail needs to be conveyed to residents on the cost of this system and the project team is preparing this for release in the near future.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 10, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

First let me say as a resident of Hillsburgh I am totally opposed to the proposed new sewage treatment plans.
We all as residents of Erin/Hillsburgh currently have working sewage treatment on our properties. This arrangement is totally legal and has been in operation successfully for over 100 years.
The comment that we have a high tax base because of lack of growth is misleading. If the town spends 100 million dollars on the proposed system our taxes will skyrocket we will see an out of this world tax base increase.
Why do we need growth if it only leads to higher taxes....we don't!!!!
The community is a vibrant structure as it stands now we don't need huge growth which would be required to make the sewage system changes feasible.
A comment was made at the recent meeting that if we don't get growth schools will have to close. If there aren't enough students to justify a school let it close, this should not be a consideration on whether council spends millions of dollars they don't have.
Not only would this ill thought out plan hugely increase our annual taxes but it is set to burden each homeowner with tens of thousands of dollars in personal expenses to connect to this boondoggle.
Where as homeowners are we expected to find the extra tax dollars this plan will inflict on us? Where are we to find the thousands of dollars to get connected?
We are not like governments where we can just stick our hands into the public's pockets, we as families live on limited budgets, many of us live on fixed incomes where are we supposed to find these huge dollars.
We don't kid ourselves once our tax base skyrockets to encourage growth that tax base will never decrease regardless of how much growth is achieved. Once governments put their hands in your pockets they never take them out again.
As proof I refer you to our national tax system that was brought in as a temporary measure more years ago than I can remember.
We do not need growth at the cost of this project it is ill-conceived and unnecessary.
As far as I know the residents of Erin/Hillsburgh are happy to live in our town now as it stands or they would be moving out in droves.
If you bring this outrageous project on board you will be forcing residents to look at alternative places to live where the taxes are reasonable.

We do not need this plan, we don't want this plan, council has an obligation to follow the desires of the community and in my opinion those desires are opposed to this plan.
If developers want to cash in on building in our community let them pay for the infrastructure they need to do so.
Let us live our lives in peace at a cost we all have borne over the years.
Stop this nonsense!

This project has been on the go for many years culminating in the recommendation for a communal sewage system in the Settlement and Servicing Master Plan (SSMP) in 2014 and now continuing through this Wastewater Class EA which started in 2016. Whereas the SSMP indicated that the servicing population limit for wastewater was 6,000 persons, this Class EA has identified the opportunity to service over 14,500 persons sufficient to service all the growth areas indicated in the Town's Official Plan. This provides the opportunity to share costs of the system with developers and potentially reduce the cost to the existing community. Developers would have to pay their share of the cost and it is obviously desirable that any cost sharing arrangement would be to the benefit of the Town.

The septic system survey conducted within the SSMP and as part of this project, have both confirmed the age profile of the septic tanks and the small size of many of the lots and both studies have recommended inclusion of most of the existing communities in the proposed communal wastewater system. We do understand that some septic systems were recently installed and it is likely that the Town will exercise some flexibility in when people with new tanks have to connect. Both the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change and Credit Valley Conservation have been involved in the project and support the recommendations.

The project team have not indicated that the cost of the Town's share will be $100 million. We have identified a Town share of between $50 and $60 million depending on a cost sharing agreement with developers. The Town cannot finance this scale of project and Council has stated that they would require a government grant for the project to proceed. The grant would need to bring the cost down below the debt carrying capacity of the Town. The project team will be issuing a more detailed explanation of costs in the near future.

This Wastewater Class EA removes the restriction on community growth based on wastewater servicing. After it is completed, the Town intends to conduct an Official Plan Review to set the limits of growth. Your concerns in this regard may best be directed to that planning process.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 23, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *I am owner of 74 Main Street Erin. The store is rented but it's not financially sound to rent the 2 apartments and pay the sewage bill for trucking it to Collingwood.*
> *The septic system should of gone in when the water was put in but they had negative thinking with no foresight even at that time. If it wasn't for the water government would of demanded it long ago. Now we are behind the 8 ball.*
>
> *Hopefully some government funding can be found but it must be built in order for Erin to prosper. Nothing stays the same in today's world.*
>
> *I would be nice if the river wasn't used as a dumping ground for sewage too.*

In recognising the sensitivity of constructing a collection system within the main commercial area of Main Street and also the difficulty of connecting to this sewer on Main Street for all of the low-lying properties on either side of the street, we are proposing a solution that constructs sewers to the east and west of Main Street. One sewer would connect Church Boulevard with Charles Street along the river side to the rear of all the properties, including your property, and another sewer would connect Daniel Street through to Water Street on the east side of Main Street. While easements will be required from the property owners, this solution is significantly better for property owners in terms of connection costs and elimination of disruption/retail loss to businesses by digging up Main Street. Although this was displayed at the Public Information Centre, we would be pleased to provide additional detail to you.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 21, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

1. *As a tax payer what financial reward will we be provided for investing $30,000 of my money to put in a water treatment plant (taxes will be lowered by X $'s per year over a Z year period)?*

The Town has indicated that the project cannot proceed without a substantial Provincial and/or Federal government grant which would significantly reduce the Town share to an amount that is within their debt servicing capacity. Homeowners could therefore expect that their capital cost contribution would be significantly less than $30,000. However, the costs for the homeowners share of the infrastructure within the municipal road allowance will be dependent upon the actual amount of grants received.

2. *What is the cost (to me) of doing nothing (not putting in the treatment plant)? if we don't put in a water treatment plant what will the financial burden in terms of increased taxes be for the taxpayers (taxes will be increased by X $'s every year for Z years or something like that)?*

We are not aware of your property size or the age of your existing septic system or what costs you could expect to pay for your septic system in future.

Wastewater utility service charges are not part of municipal taxes. Water and wastewater are funded separately from taxes and are user pay services based on the actual operating costs for the system. Independent of a water/wastewater system, new development creates an increased tax base, which generally has the effect of reducing the taxes for individual properties.

3. *What will the impact on our businesses be when we rip up main street for the 2nd time in 20 years to put in sanitary sewers? How much support is council willing to give to these businesses?*

The recommended preferred alternative for the collection system avoids construction on Main Street through the main commercial area.

4. *What are the pros/cons of putting in a sewage treatment plant versus simply making large lot homes with septic systems?*

    a. *How much will my taxes be increased/decreased based on this approach? For example, if you put in 500 new large homes instead of 1500 new small homes how much will my taxes change and how does this compare to the sewage plant option?*

Credit Valley Conservation have indicated that they do not support continued subdivision development within Erin Village and Hillsburgh based on septic systems and their cumulative impact on the natural environment. The area already has a high concentration of septic systems.

Following completion of the Wastewater Class EA, the Town intends to conduct an Official Plan Review to confirm the way forward for both communities regarding growth. While generally, larger communities have a larger tax base, there are community planning issues that also need to be considered to attain the desired community mix.

5. *What are the pros/cons of having the developers put in localized treatment facilities?*

The alternative of multiple localized treatment facilities was explored during Phase 2 of the Class EA and the solution was confirmed as not viable. Refer to the Subsurface Disposal Technical Memorandum on the project website.

6. *Has the consultant evaluated the option of simply pumping Erin's sewage to an adjacent city with treatment capacity (like Guelph, Georgetown, Halton, Brampton)? Newmarket, Aurora, Markham pump to Durham. Halton and Mississauga share certain areas. Brampton pumps to Toronto in certain areas and some surrounding areas of Hamilton pump to Hamilton.*

We fully understand that GTA wastewater systems cover extensive areas. The issue of connecting to an adjacent system was considered during the Settlement and Servicing Master Plan (SSMP) and confirmed to be not viable. This general alternative would still include the cost of the local Erin/Hillsburgh sewage collection system as outlined in the collection system evaluation technical memorandum as well as the cost to pump the wastewater to the adjacent City. It would then require the Town to pay for a share of using the adjacent City's collection system all the way to their treatment plant and a share of their Wastewater Treatment Plant capacity. In addition, growth in the Town of Erin Urban Centres would be controlled and could be limited by the amount of treatment capacity provided by the adjacent municipality.

7. *What are the risks associated with operating a sewage treatment facility?*

The wastewater industry is very heavily regulated. Operation of communal wastewater systems is a normally accepted risk by most Towns and Cities across Canada. Wastewater utilities are well developed and generally operated in a safe and efficient manner. Through many ongoing initiatives management in the wastewater sector is continually improving efficiency and reducing risk.

a) *At the presentation I heard some talk about septic systems failing after 30 years but no mention of life cycle costs on the treatment plant. What is the life span of sewage grinders, pumps, chemical feeders, PLC controllers, sensors, HVAC equipment etc?*

The life span of the infrastructure associated with the Wastewater collection system and treatment plant varies significantly depending upon which components are being considered, such as pumps which have a relatively short lifespan versus tanks and concrete infrastructure which have a very long lifespan. The expected life span of all the main components of the Wastewater collection system and treatment Plant were accounted for within the Phase 3 technical memorandums and used in calculating the life cycle cost of the system.

b) *What will the replacement costs of these items be and when will those cost be incurred?*

Please refer to the lifecycle cost calculations outlined in the technical memorandums. We have indicated replacement years for all major equipment.

It should be noted that, in Ontario, wastewater utilities are required to provide for the full cost recovery of the system when determining user rates.

c) How well will the sewage plant work at partial capacity? For example, will what happened at the high school/community centre happen to this facility if the housing growth doesn't match expectations? What provisions are required to allow this plant to be brought online with varying capacities?

The issues experienced by the School/Community centre system cannot be compared to the proposed system for Erin/Hillsburgh. The proposed Wastewater Treatment Plant would be required to operate in accordance with strict Provincial regulations. To ensure that the Wastewater Treatment Plant would achieve these regulations a phasing plan would be developed and updated on a regular basis to ensure the timing and capacity of the Wastewater Treatment Plant is in relation to the wastewater needs of the community.

d) Who will run the plant and how much will it cost to run?

The Town has options to decide who will operate the system. The Town can develop its own wastewater staff or could retain a private sector Provincially approved company to operate the system on their behalf.

e) What is the additional burden on my taxes to: 1) Run the facility, 2) Treat my sewage?

Wastewater is funded as a user pay utility in the same way as municipal water supply. There is no impact on general municipal taxes.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]:

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 26, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *Let me tell you about the people who attended the presentation on Friday, February 2nd. Most importantly we are not people who came out to heckle, or cajole or negate the presentation. We were there fully well knowing that there would be a cost involved but what we were hoping to hear was that we could afford it. And if we couldn't right at this moment what thoughts you had given to assisting us to be more confident that we wouldn't have to sell our homes because we could no longer afford to live here. You see, we are family people – we have an emotional connection to this town and our lives in this community and what we were desperate to affirm was that we could trust you, that you felt the same as we do and that was included in your decision making. If anything, you demonstrated that you didn't. You talked about locations, and specs, and costs and construction, etc but not once did you address what your audience was thinking and more importantly feeling. Yes, you said we need sustainable growth, but you didn't take the time to show us how we can do that and still be the town we want. and that we are. And when we tried to let you know; you bullied us, called us hecklers, naysayers and non-visionaries. When Mayor Als announced that he wasn't even sure if he would be around and that he was thinking of moving down south to do some golfing, he left us feeling that we were right, this council, isn't committed to this town. He left us feeling that the very people who ran on platforms of being part of this community and caring about it, lied to us. We don't want to go anywhere; we love our homes; we love our life here in Erin; and for as long as we can handle it we want to stay here. Obviously this is not part of your thinking.*
>
> *You need to know that many of us moved her for a certain quality of life and yes we are willing to pay for it. But we are hard working, tax paying, in many cases middle class well educated family people but people nonetheless who still need to live within their means; and that our greatest fear is having to leave our homes not because we want to but because we are being forced out. Many of us are children of immigrants who came from countries who fled for their lives, who were seeking a better quality of life for their families and who sacrificed everything to do that. Like them, our homes are where we brought our children home from the hospital, where we celebrate our family milestones, where we go to find peace, and strength and fortitude to face a sometimes cruel world. It's where our children play street hockey, where we gather with our neighbours for summer street parties and where at the end of the day we sit around our dinner tables debriefing our days with one another. It's about sitting on our porch swings and greeting our neighbours; it's about sitting in our back yards and enjoying our hard*

work to make them our sanctuaries. It's where we help out our neighbours who find themselves in need of our charity; our good deeds whether it's shoveling their driveways; walking their dogs when they can't; bringing over a casserole when they receive crippling news or just lending our ears, when perhaps our wisdom or experience would be beneficial. There is nothing as precious to us as our homes because they shelter our families when we're home; allow us to regroup when we need to; to live, love and laugh and if need be cry, because it's ours and there we are safe.

Instead you treated us as the enemy. It was you the council up there (even though you stood at the sides and back) with the engineers, the specialists, the environmentalists against the stupid people of Erin. You forgot that we too are engineers, architects, farmers, business owners, project managers, home makers, teachers, nurses, doctors, skilled trades people to name a few. But most importantly you forgot that we are good people who pay our taxes and honour our commitments. And we don't take risks we don't believe we can handle. We elected you to make informed decisions because you have the expertise we may lack in terms of public service; that calling to do work for the common good, but most importantly because you convinced us that you share the same values and morals as we do. We left that meeting, very dejected, feeling that maybe our only hope is to leave and maybe be lucky enough to find another place where we will feel at home.

Next time, come to the table keeping in mind your audience – number one rule of presenters – know who you are presenting to and make sure that your presentation addresses their concerns.

Re: newspaper article that was in Erin Banner, Feb 22nd

This is a response to the article in which the Mayor was quoted regarding the town meeting on February 2nd. I read it expecting to read something very different from what I did read. I was reading about a town that is not in existence yet. It addressed issues of no senior living; that we felt that our children could not afford to live in this town; that schools would close because we are refusing to go ahead with the town council's supported presentation for the sewage treatment plan. The headline "Mayor issues wastewater warning" and his prediction of "dire consequences if the Erin community fails to deal with the need for sewage treatment" are once again, bullying tactics and fear mongering. As a resident of Erin, I am not thinking of the future of Erin and those residents, I speak for and care about those of us who live here right now. First issue – the schools. I came from a small town, and in my experience a small town that has five schools is ludicrous. There are all kinds of ways of accommodating Roman Catholic, secular, and French Immersion choices without each one being given a school. Secondly the children I raised are now in their 30's and they don't want to live in Erin because that's not where the jobs are that they are searching for and if anyone will be relocating it will be us to be nearer our children and grandchildren not the other way around. Besides if we can't afford our homes especially with the additional charges to be assumed with the sewage system, our children won't even have a chance. Thirdly I am in my 60's and when I can no longer live in my home, there are plenty of choices for me in the surrounding areas; thanks, but you don't need to build me a seniors' home or a nursing home. Fourthly, at a meeting a while back last year we voiced our concerns very clearly that our desire was not to become a bedroom community of Mississauga, Brampton, or Toronto but a destination on its own; the quaint historic and touristy village of Erin. So where did all this talk of growth, and a sewage system come from. I think Ed Delaporte was right you are more concerned with the developers who already bought the land than us.

Let's go in the direction that you supposedly supported last year. A tourist destination, let's get the trucks off our main road and celebrate the idyllic, small town life of a town that right now is being misrepresented by a council which has lost our confidence.

We do fully understand your comments and regret that our team were not able to clearly convey what you were hoping to see and hear at the Public Information Centre (PIC). As we are sure you appreciate, a lot of work was required to complete all of the technical studies leading up to the PIC. All of the technical work had to be communicated to the public and we did our best to minimise this technical work and focus on what we believed most residents would want to hear. Most certainly, the project team respects and supports existing community values and is focused on reinforcing these values through this project. This wastewater Class EA project has identified the opportunity to grow the community beyond the 6,000-population level identified in the Settlement and Servicing Master Plan (SSMP) completed in 2014, up to a level of 14,600± population.

Subsequent to the completion of this Class EA, the Town intends to conduct an Official Plan Review to establish the level of growth in the community. Achieving consensus through the Official Plan process will be an important and necessary prerequisite to the implementation of the wastewater servicing project.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on March 6, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *I just have a few questions I hope you can answer regarding the sewer issue:*
>
> *The vote is in April to decide whether or not we are getting sewers, correct?*
>
> *If it's a yes, what is the timeline?*
>
> *When is the cost to the homeowner decided and then it has to be put into any real estate deal, is that correct? How soon after the vote does this happen?*
>
> *Is it just the town people only that are paying for the sewers?*

Based on the present project schedule, we anticipate that Council will be discussing the Environmental Study Report (ESR) towards the end of April 2018. Subsequent to this Council meeting and assuming we receive Council's blessing to finalize the Class EA, the ESR would be finalized and published for the formal 30-day Public Review period

Following the completion of the Class EA process, including the resolution of any Part II Orders received, the Town would be in a position to proceed with the implementation of the proposed wastewater treatment plant and collection system. However, as has been noted a number of times, the Town will not be financially able to proceed with the proposed works without receiving significant Provincial and/or Federal grants. Further until the amount of these grants are known the Town can only advise the residents of the "estimated" costs for the proposed works.

The project team will shortly be issuing a financing report to better define the potential cost to property owners.

We do not believe there is any Realty implications until Council pass the necessary by laws initiating construction of the project in the future.

Finally, only properties within the planned wastewater service areas (generally the Communities of Erin & Hillsburgh) will be required to connect to the wastewater system and to pay their share.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on March 6, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *I'm writing to ask if a further meeting will be held for Erin residents on the topic of the planned wastewater treatment plant. There was a meeting held earlier in February I understand, but it would be great to have another opportunity for us to ask questions and fully understand this plan, our options, and what it means for everyone. In particular, understanding how this plant will be paid for is a concern for many.*

There are no further meetings planned within this Class EA process.

Based on the present project schedule, we anticipate that Council will be discussing the Environmental Study Report (ESR) later in April 2018. Subsequent to this Council meeting and assuming we receive Council's blessing to finalize the Class EA, the ESR would be finalized and published for the formal 30-day Public Review period

Following the completion of the Class EA process, including the resolution of any Part II Orders received, the Town would be in a position to proceed with the implementation of the proposed wastewater treatment plant and collection system. However, as has been noted a number of times Town will not be financially able to proceed with the proposed works without receiving significant Provincial and/or Federal grants. Further until the amount of these grants are known the Town only advise of the residents of the "estimated" costs for the proposed works.

The project team will shortly be issuing a financing report to better define the potential cost to property owners.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 3, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 27, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

The waste water meeting on Friday night (Feb.2nd) was very well attended. Most of the people that spoke in my opinion were not in favour of giving the town a blank cheque so they can move forward with this project, and how can you blame them because lately it has become the norm for any projects that any government does never comes in on time and is always well over budget and there is never any accountability. The amounts of taxpayer's money that they are talking about is a huge number for people to commit to, and the people in Erin are already paying higher than average taxes. This mistrust is not our fault but theirs, but we are the one that gets stuck with the final bill.

I admit that I don't know what the percentage is of rural owners to people that live in the town but there are lots of people that are stretched out for miles between the south boundary of Erin and Hillsburgh and we will never have any use for this system. Don't get me wrong I think that it's a good idea to develop parts of the town because without going forward you will go backwards. We defiantly need some help to pay for some of the other improvements the town will require in the future. The mayor read a message from the school trustee that we have to have more kids to attend the schools or some may have to be closed. I don't blame families for wanting to come here, I encourage it every chance I get, but I don't want high density houses in town. Single family homes are much closer together when there is sewers available which is ok as long as they are good quality. I know that they cost more than town homes but to me it's a privilege to live in Erin make people pay for it.

The developers should be paying a bigger piece of the cost for the waste water facility. They can recoup their cost when they sell the houses, the taxpayers of Erin can't do this the developers should be paying at least 75% of these costs.
Time is money but this project is a big one for a small town like Erin and if we make a mistake here we could be paying for it for many years to come.

I like living in Erin with the small-town atmosphere, great place to raise kids. You can walk down town and most of the people that you meet are friendly and say hello, the barber knows everybody that comes in, it's a feeling that you don't see in bigger towns around us. I always tell people that I live 20 mins. from everywhere which is the way I like it. Please move forward with a great deal of caution.

By way of clarifications:

- Only those properties who are in the planned wastewater service area (generally within Erin Village & Hillsburgh) will be required to connect to the sewer system and to pay for the project. Rural residents will not have to pay for the construction or operation of the system which will be a user pay system similar to the water system.

- The Town will only proceed with their component of the project when they have secured Provincial and/or Federal grants and can finance the balance of the project within their debt carrying capacity.

- After the Class EA is completed, the Town intends to move forward with an Official Plan Review that will examine and address the issue of growth.

- The intention of the Town is to make sure that developers pay their fair share and that developments reduce the cost of the wastewater system for existing residents.

- The project team will shortly be issuing a financing report to better define the potential cost to property owners.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

TOWN OF ERIN

Town of Erin – Urban Centre
Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre

Friday, February 2, 2018

Comment Form

Name: _____

Email: _____

Given what you have heard tonight, do you have any thoughts or comments that you would like to share with the Project Team about the Study?

50-60 million People 58-68 million

128,000,000 ÷ 20,000 per septic to replace

- MANY HOUSE HOLDS CAN HAVE THEIR SEPTICS REPLACED FOR MUCH LOWER COST THAN PAYING FOR SEWAGE.

For more information on the *Town of Erin Urban Centre Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment*, please visit: www.erin.ca/town-hall/wastewater-ea

Comments and questions can also be submitted directly to the Project email at: erin.urban.classea@ainleygroup.com

TOWN OF ERIN

Town of Erin – Urban Centre
Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre

Friday, February 2, 2018

Comment Form

Name: _____

Email: _____

Given what you have heard tonight, do you have any thoughts or comments that you would like to share with the Project Team about the Study?

I live on a relatively new home on Waterford drive. I see in the planning you have excluded the new homes of main St. and home on pine ridge & delambro. If your going to push this on the residents your need to do it for all, because we need to share this cost. Not selectively pick areas to apply it to. I cannot support a segregation of resident all within proximity of the plant.

For more information on the *Town of Erin Urban Centre Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment*, please visit: www.erin.ca/town-hall/wastewater-ea

Comments and questions can also be submitted directly to the Project email at: erin.urban.classea@ainleygroup.com

TOWN OF ERIN

Town of Erin – Urban Centre
Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre

Friday, February 2, 2018

Comment Form

Name: ___ ___

Email: ___ ___

Given what you have heard tonight, do you have any thoughts or comments that you would like to share with the Project Team about the Study?

Opposed to plan for Pumping Station on Waterford Drive

When I bought my property at 40 Waterford Dr. we were told nothing could EVER be built in the overflow lot across from my house. So we went ahead + purchased the lot with the TOWN'S confirmation that the lot would remain empty.

Also residents at 49 Waterford confirmed through their realtor that nothing →

For more information on the *Town of Erin Urban Centre Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment*, please visit: www.erin.ca/town-hall/wastewater-ea

Comments and questions can also be submitted directly to the Project email at: erin.urban.classea@ainleygroup.com

would or could EVER be
put in that location.

Thus, how can the TOWN
revoke their previous stance.

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 4, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 2, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *50-60 million people, 58-68 million [dollars]*
> *128,000,000 ÷ 20,000 per septic to replace*
> *Many households can have their septic's replaced for much lower cost than paying for [centralised] sewage [management].*

We understand your concern over costs for the proposed system as compared to the cost of replacing a septic system. Previous studies on the septic systems in Erin Village and Hillsburgh, as well as this Class EA study, have all indicated that many of the lots in the communities are too small to accommodate septic system replacement. Additional details on our seeptic system survey can be found in our survey report which is on the project website.

During the PIC, our team indicated that the Town share of the project would be between $50 and $60 million. We also pointed out that the Town cannot finance this level of debt and that a government grant would be required for the project to proceed. This grant would have to bring the cost to the Town down under their debt carrying capacity and this would obviously reduce the cost to residents connected to the new system. To clarify the potential costs to residents the team will be posting a financing report on the project website and the Town will be releasing a fact sheet on costs to further explain the costs associated with the wastewater system.

> *I live in a relatively new home on Waterford Drive. I see in the planning you have excluded the new homes of Main St. and homes on Pine Ridge and Delarmbro Dr. If you're going to push this on the residents you need to do it for all, because we need to share this cost. Not selectively picking areas to apply it to. I cannot support a segregation of residents all within proximity of the plant.*

We understand your concern regarding the proposed servicing limits for the proposed communal wastewater system and in particular, that specific subdivisions are not proposed to be connected. This matter was addressed in our Septic Survey Technical Memorandum wherein we looked at lot sizes, age profile and location in suggesting a service area. We would refer you to this Memorandum which is on the project website, for additional information concerning the establishment of the service area.

> *Opposed to plan for pumping station on Waterford Drive. When I bought my property at 40 Waterford Dr. we were told nothing could **ever** be built in the overflow lot across from my*

*house. So we went ahead and purchased the lot with the **Town's** confirmation on that the lot would remain empty. Also residents at 49 Waterford confirmed through their realtor that nothing would or could **ever** be put in that location. Thus, how can the **Town** revoke their previous stance?*

We understand your concern regarding the location of the proposed sewage pumping station on Waterford Drive. The proposed location of the pumping station is at a low point in the subdivision allowing adjacent homes to drain to the station by gravity. There is some flexibility in the location of the station within the low-lying area most of which is occupied by an existing Storm Water Management Pond (SWMP) and road allowance. The Town rightly pointed out that the SWMP could not be developed as a building lot and in fact the design capacity of the pond cannot be compromised without risking flooding. The proposed station will be small, servicing only a part of the subdivision. It will be completely buried except for a concrete pad about 18 inches above ground. There will be a control panel similar to a bell panel located adjacent to the station. There will be no building above ground. The area around the small station would be landscaped to minimise/eliminate any impact on the aesthesis. The station can be accommodated between the road and the fence surrounding the SWMP; however, during detailed design in the future, it would be investigated if the station could be accommodated within the SWMP area, which would make it blend-in even more.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

TOWN OF ERIN

Town of Erin – Urban Centre
Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre

Friday, February 2, 2018

Comment Form

Name: _____

Email: _____

Given what you have heard tonight, do you have any thoughts or comments that you would like to share with the Project Team about the Study?

When we purchased our home in 2003 at 49 Waterford Dr we were told by our realator (who asked the town) that nothing could be built ~~at~~ on water table beside us as it was a flooding area. We have seen it filled with 4 feet of water on various occassions. Pls advise?

For more information on the *Town of Erin Urban Centre Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment*, please visit: www.erin.ca/town-hall/wastewater-ea

Comments and questions can also be submitted directly to the Project email at: erin.urban.classea@ainleygroup.com

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 4, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were received on February 2, 2018. For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *When we purchased our home in 2003 at 49 Waterford Dr we were told by our realtor (who asked the Town) that nothing could be built on the water table beside us as it was a flooding area. We have seen it filled with 4 feet of water on various occasions. Please advise?*

We understand your concern regarding the location of the proposed sewage pumping station on Waterford Drive. The proposed location of the pumping station is at a low point in the subdivision allowing adjacent homes to drain to the station by gravity. There is some flexibility in the location of the station within the low-lying area most of which is occupied by an existing Storm Water Management Pond (SWMP) and road allowance. The Town rightly pointed out that the SWMP could not be developed as a building lot and in fact the design capacity of the pond cannot be compromised without risking flooding. The proposed station will be small, servicing only a part of the subdivision. It will be completely buried except for a concrete pad about 18 inches above ground. There will be a control panel similar to a bell panel located adjacent to the station. There will be no building above ground. The area around the small station would be landscaped to minimize/eliminate any impact on the aesthesis. The station can be accommodated between the road and the fence surrounding the SWMP; however, during detailed design in the future, it would be investigated if the station could be accommodated within the SWMP area, which would make it blend-in even more.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

TOWN OF ERIN

Town of Erin – Urban Centre
Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre

Friday, February 2, 2018

Comment Form

Name:

Email:

Given what you have heard tonight, do you have any thoughts or comments that you would like to share with the Project Team about the Study?

-JUST HAD NEW SEPTIC SYSTEM INSTALLED JULY/2017. NO REASON TO HOOK UP INTO PROPOSED SEWAGE SYSTEM THAT WOULD DUMP HAZZARDOUS/CHEMICALS OR MATERIALS INTO THE RIVER. (PULL SEWAGE IN FROM PEEL REGION THRU BALFOUR AIN).

-AS PER TOWN WATER NO THANK YOU THAT WHY WE MOVED FROM THE CITY WITH CHLORINATED ~~[illegible]~~ TREATED WATER TO DRINK + WASH NO THANK YOU

- WE HAVE OUR WELL WATER TESTED ALL THE TIME AND ENJOY IT VERY MUCH -

For more information on the *Town of Erin Urban Centre Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment*, please visit: www.erin.ca/town-hall/wastewater-ea

Comments and questions can also be submitted directly to the Project email at: erin.urban.classea@ainleygroup.com

Ainley & Associates Limited
195 County Crt Blvd, Suite 300, Brampton, ON L6W 4P7
Tel: (905) 452-5172
E-mail brampton@ainleygroup.com

April 4, 2018

[redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Ref: **Corporation of the Town of Erin**
Urban Centre Wastewater Services
Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Dear [redacted]

On behalf of the Town of Erin, we wish to thank you for your interest in the above-mentioned Class EA. We have reviewed your comments which were left at the February 2, 2018 Public Information Centre (PIC). For convenience we have provided your comments, in blue, followed by our responses.

> *[We] just had new septic system installed in July 2017. [There is] no reason to hook up [the] proposed sewage system that would dump hazardous chemicals or materials into the river (Pull sewage in from peel region [other] than Belfountain).*
>
> *As [for] town water, no thank you. That's why we moved from the city with treated chlorinated water to drink and wash - no thank you.*
>
> *We have our well water tested all the time and enjoy it very much.*

We understand your concern over the potential for contamination of the river. The effluent limits for the Wastewater Treatment Plant which have been agreed with the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) and Credit Valley Conservation (CVC) are strict and recognise the sensitivity of the aquatic environment and the need to protect water quality. As such the proposed Wastewater Treatment Plant will use membrane treatment technology that will achieve a very high-quality effluent, which will ensure the river is not contaminated.

To clarify the costs and issues related to hooking up to the system that were raised at the PIC, the Town will be releasing a fact sheet shortly.

Thank you again for your interest in this Class EA.

Yours truly,

AINLEY & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

J. A. Mullan, P.Eng.
Project Manager

TOWN OF ERIN

Town of Erin – Urban Centre
Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre

Friday, February 2, 2018

Comment Form

Name: _____

Email: _____

Given what you have heard tonight, do you have any thoughts or comments that you would like to share with the Project Team about the Study? Elora Cataract

A potential break of pipe on the trail is a concern.

The last talk I thought you said the sludge had to be trucked out of town - Why did you change this or remove this item

Will my taxes go up if I am a rural area finances/cost.

feb 28th meeting on schools / Kids

For more information on the *Town of Erin Urban Centre Wastewater Municipal Class Environmental Assessment*, please visit: www.erin.ca/town-hall/wastewater-ea

Comments and questions can also be submitted directly to the Project email at: erin.urban.classea@ainleygroup.com