

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Response To Public Comments – Everett Secondary Plan Master Servicing Plan	
<u>Settlement Boundary</u>	
<p>First, let us state that we do not believe that Everett should have its settlement boundaries enlarged further to accommodate future housing developments. The County of Simcoe Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement 2005, in particular, require a township to demonstrate that they have maximized the usage of their settlement areas before expanding them further. Our understanding is that the Loretto and Colgan settlement usage has not been maximized. The Township should ensure that they are maximized before further enlarging Everett's boundaries.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 1:</u> There are lots in Everett, Loretto and Colgan that have not been developed, however, there are issues with providing the required water and sewer services in a way that is cost effective <u>and</u> that meets County and Provincial requirements. There are also many other County Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement policies that are being addressed through the proposed Everett boundary expansion.</p>
<p>Enlarging Everett's boundaries is not the most efficient use of resources and we believe would negatively impact our environment. Some of the land on which future developments would be built is currently used for agriculture. It would be a shame to convert land that feeds our families into homes for more Toronto-bound commuters.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 2:</u> The Township feels that the proposal for Everett IS the most efficient use of resources, and allows for better protection of the environment. Some of the lands included are being used for agricultural purposes, however, restricting growth in one area of the Township will provide better protection for agricultural lands in other areas of the Township. It is intended that the new development in Everett will serve existing residents and their families (not just commuters)</p>
<p>There is no large increase in well-paid full-time jobs or increase in industrial activity projected in the Township or the area, therefore there is no need to build so many homes. Alliston has the Honda plant and its servicing companies, but to our knowledge these companies are not expected to grow further. Furthermore, New Tecumseth is a growth node for the County, while Everett is not.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 3:</u> The plan for Everett includes some commercial growth, and the Township is also working towards creating additional lands for jobs along the Highway 89 corridor. The growth that is anticipated is significant for our Township, but certainly not significant enough to create an urban node.</p>
<p>The town of Everett is already known as a "bedroom community". A great many of Everett's residents do the daily 1.25 hour commute to the north of Toronto. Increasing Everett's population will lead to increased traffic, increased road maintenance costs, and ultimately increased pollution.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 4:</u> Traffic increases are anticipated regardless of whether Everett grows or not. By encouraging growth in the Everett area, the Township will have a larger tax base to cover maintenance costs; measures are being taken to protect environmentally sensitive areas, reduce light pollution, and promote walking in the community. It is not clear what is meant by 'increased pollution'. Please also refer to responses 40 through 43 which provide further detail on Traffic Improvements proposed as part of the MSP.</p>
<p>Loretto and Colgan are also commuter communities, but by virtue of being closer to Toronto, the burden of traffic and pollution is somewhat lessened. It is also why we believe that the usage of their settlement areas should be prioritized.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 5:</u> See <u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 1</u> above. As noted in the 2012 Growth Management policy, Everett is to be the main location for growth, but growth is also anticipated in Colgan and Loretto (but to a lesser degree).</p>
<p>On page 28 of the <i>Class EA Study Report Volume 1</i> the Problem and Opportunity Statement reads as follows: "<i>The Objective of the Everett Secondary Plan Master Servicing Study Class EA is to identify and select a preferred alternative servicing strategy for the Everett Secondary Plan Area which minimizes impacts to both the natural and social environments and is both technically feasible and economically sensible.</i>" We believe that the expansion of Everett's settlement boundaries does not meet this objective:</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 6:</u> Please note that the expansion of the Everett settlement Boundary is being proposed through a Township initiated Official Plan Amendment under the Planning Act. The purpose of the <u>Master Servicing Plan Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA)</u> is to identify and select a preferred alternative servicing strategy for the Everett Secondary Plan Area as per the Class EA Problem and Opportunity Statement.</p>
<p>a) It maximizes the impact on the natural environment by converting land currently used for agriculture into housing for commuters to Toronto, and by releasing wastewater affluent into the Pine River. We have recently been told and read in the media that Landfill Site No. 13 should be closed soon. There is a continued concern from citizens that until the Landfill is closed and for years afterward, there could be pollutants released in our groundwater (for water quality data ref. <i>County of Simcoe Landfill Site 13. 2010 Monitoring Report</i>). The Township should require an environmental analysis of the impact (accepting more construction materials and of managing a population increase) it will have on the Landfill;</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 7:</u> The County deals with waste management, however, the proposed growth in Everett will not affect the timelines for closing Landfill Site No. 13.</p>

<p>b) It maximizes the impact on the social environment by artificially increasing the population from 1,929 to 10,669 in a relatively short time (20 year pass in a flash). The style of compact building expected, such as townhouses developments (as per p.15 of the <i>Everett Community Design Brief</i>), is very different than what is currently in Everett and will drastically change the 'feel' of our town. We do believe that the social environment cannot be considered improved or minimally impacted when you cram so many more people in such small spaces in such a short time. Our concerns, and the concerns of many amongst us, is that we will see a rise in crime, in pollution, in noise, and in congested roads. All the while this increase in people does not take into consideration that the nearest hospital is likely too small to accommodate the projected growth of both Alliston and Everett, and that with more people, more social services are needed, services which are already overburdened.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 8:</u> The growth in Everett is anticipated to extend beyond a 20 year time frame, and other policies are being put in place to address concerns related to crime, pollution, noise and congestion. While development will take place at a more intense level than recent development in Everett, most lots will be more the size of the older development along Main Street. Policies are being put in place to ensure that a diverse range of housing options are available, and so that only single family dwellings will abut existing single family dwellings. It is important to have a range of housing types (including rental units and homes that are affordable) to adequately accommodate the needs of both new and existing residents and their families well into the future.</p>
<p>Some of us also feel that this project will have significant social impact in that it will financially negatively affects Everett's current residents. The <i>Planning Justification Report</i>, Appendix II, 7.0 refers to the current Everett lot availability as having 'a negative impact on competition and affordability'. In this last year, the housing market has slowed to a point where homes in our neighborhoods seem to stay on the market much longer than before. We believe that increasing the availability of housing in the region will lower our current properties value for at least the 20 or so years when Everett would be 'in construction'.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 9:</u> Specific information has not been obtained on this aspect, however, property values typically increase in situations like this.</p>
<p>Even now while still at the planning stage, residents wishing to sell their properties must notify buyers of the possible costs involved in connecting their homes to the sewer system. In such circumstances, thousands of dollars can be deducted from the price of their homes. Many residents have reported being on an income for which such 'hook-up' expenses would simply be beyond their means.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 10:</u> Municipal water and sewer services are the preferred method of servicing settlements, according to the Province and is also important with regard to the protection of groundwater resources. While the "costs" of hooking up to the new sewer services have been estimated for your information, no decision has been made yet as to when it will be required or the costs that will be passed on to the homeowner. Council will be looking at alternate funding sources and other means of reducing the impact on homeowners (i.e. extended time lines for payments, exceptions in cases of hardship) in the future – you will be given another opportunity to provide input at that time. Please refer to Township Response 46 for additional details.</p>
<p>We also feel that the construction of so many homes, services, roads, etc. will be extremely stressful to residents of our community. Years of construction and service upgrades planned adjacent to several of our properties will certainly require easements, will cause noise, dust, road congestions, to name a few.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 11:</u> Easements are not anticipated, however, along with the interruptions will come additional services and facilities in your community. Construction will take place in segments, and will not affect the entire community for the entire time. In addition, all Construction activities will occur during prescribed working hours (e.g. 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM) in order to minimize inconvenience to residents.</p>
<p>In 2.3.3 of the <i>Class EA Study Report Volume 1</i>, it is written that 'the Community of Everett has the overall desire to preserve the rural community atmosphere while undergoing moderate growth'. I'm not sure who it was that expressed this 'overall desire', but it is not what we hear from the overwhelming majority of our friends and neighbors. The proposed plan will not preserve the community atmosphere Everett currently has. We also believe that this plan should not be referred to as 'moderate' growth.</p> <p>The citizens of Everett do not complain of living in a small rural community. On the contrary, people who live here do so because they love this size of community. Commonly heard is 'if I wanted to live in a town of 10K people, I'd have moved to Alliston, not Everett!' There might be some drawbacks to a smaller town (less services), but the benefits of more space, fresh air, plenty of nature, dark skies at night, quiet, and knowing your neighbors make up for it.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 12:</u> Alliston is currently almost double the size that Everett is intended to grow to in the next 30+ years, and policies are being put in place to ensure that the characteristics of a smaller town remain intact.</p>
<p>The <i>Class EA Study Report Volume 1</i> in 1.6 states that there has been 'extensive consultation with the affected public'. That is why we still speak with many of our neighbors who know nothing about the plan!</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 13:</u> The Everett MSP EA process has met all the notification requirements of the Municipal Class EA process. Further, two (2) additional meetings were held beyond that required to: extend public awareness of the project; engage the public and review agencies in the project and Class EA process; and, to garner comments and questions from the public to incorporate them into the final project and Class EA documentation.</p>
<p>Mailing a leaflet that can be mistaken for and quickly discarded as a store flyer is not the most efficient way to ensure the affected public knows. The way the notice is written, with the miniature map and font, is not conducive to being read. Many of our neighbors do not read <i>The Herald</i>.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 14:</u> In addition to newspaper advertisements and Township website notices, flyers were found to be the most effective way to provide public notice. Flyers were circulated to all residences and businesses in Everett. The Municipal Class EA guide provides templates for such notification which is ideal for a flyer type notice. Posting in the newspaper is a required step in the EA process. Furthermore, the Herald is a free paper delivered to all of the area residents. The approach of both flyers sent to every mailbox in the area and posting in the newspaper, for two weeks in a row, provides an acceptable method of notification.</p>

<p>There have been complaints that fees are levied to get copies of the plans.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 15:</u> The Township has provided hard copies of the Class EA documentation for the public to review at the Municipal Offices during the review period. In addition, the Township provided the entire MSP document on the Township website for review. As the document is extremely large, the Township does not have the ability to copy this in-house. As such, we are able to provide copies at the cost to those requested their own copy of the documentation at the cost it is provided to the Township.</p>
<p>Furthermore, many complain that information is sent to their bank without their knowledge</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 16:</u> The Township is unaware of any such information being forwarded to banks. Further to this point, the Township implemented mass mailing of flyers notifications as we do not have every resident's actual mailing address.</p>
<p>and that public openings are held at times that are not conducive to most residents (including many commuters) to show up. Some suspect that they are purposefully held at those times.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 17:</u> The Township is unaware of this concern as the meetings are held in the evenings. Furthermore, two (2) additional public information center's (open houses) were held beyond the required one (1) meeting under the Municipal Engineers Association (MEA) Class EA guidance document.</p>
<p>The documents posted on the web for review are not accessibly written. They are written by experts in their fields and their audience is not the citizens of this town. Although staff obliges us by answering questions, many questions are not clearly answered, are answered vaguely, or dodged. Summaries of all documents should be written in a manner which allow each citizen a clear understanding of the plan and allows one to create for him/her a well-informed opinion.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 18:</u> The Class EAs are generally required for water, wastewater and transportation projects. Therefore Class EA documentation is science and engineering based by the nature of the projects they are proposed to document. While the technical appendices of this Class EA (Volumes 2-4) are more technical and intended for review future use by the Township and for review by experts of the circulated agencies such as the NVCA and Ministry of Environment. the Summary Report (Volume 1) serves as a summary of all the documentation and a general review of alternative solutions identified and evaluated through propose. As such, Volume 1 is geared more for the typical reader to understand. Additionally, the Slides and discussion provided at the public meetings were also meant to assist in explanation of the EA process, problem statement, alternative solution identification, alternative solution evaluation, selection process and mitigation and monitoring measures where required. These slides are provided in the MSP Appendices.</p>
<p>The best way to ensure 'extensive consultation' is to mail an addressed letter with a clear and accessibly written summary of the plan also detailing potential construction disruptions and costs.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 19:</u> The two (2) additional public information center's (open houses) were held through the Class EA process for this project which provided consultation over and above what is required public consultation. The Summary Report contained within Volume 1 is provided as a summary of the plan.</p>
<p>Furthermore, letters should be mailed to home owners living in the Township, not to the head-office of a bank somewhere in Toronto;</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 20:</u> Again, the Township is not aware of such letters. Please verify what letter was provided to your bank.)</p>
<p>Our understanding is that there has been no long-term financial forecast done to assess if this plan is 'economically sensible'. Such forecast might be forthcoming. If it is not, then it would be irresponsible of the Township to continue approvals on this plan. We believe that a conservative long-term financial forecast should be prepared for a best and worst case scenario, i.e. best case for maximum enlarged tax base with minimum construction, repair, and maintenance issues on all services, worse case for minimum tax base with maximum construction, repair, and maintenance issues on all services. Such forecasts should be made public with an analysis on the impact of the plan on tax levied.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 21:</u> A Financial Strategic Plan prepared in 2009 by the Township indicated that growth was needed to assist with the recovery of costs to operate the Municipality. The servicing option selected was the most economical to construct and operate, and the Township will require developers (not taxpayers) to pay for the new facilities that are being proposed. It is anticipated that the growth in Everett will reduce future Council requirements to increase tax levies.</p>
<p>We heard and read in the papers that the Township expects the developers to pick up the tab. If this approach is what is considered 'economically sensible' we beg to differ. Our experience with the New Horizon wastewater treatment plant clearly demonstrates that this approach might be more costly to the Township in the long run. An analysis of the maintenance and possible rebuilt of these 'developer built' services should be factored in all financial forecast. If developers are expected to pick up the tab, extended warranties applied to the companies, parents companies, and all subsidiaries as well as owners, should be considered (if banks can do it, we can do it).</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 22:</u> Traffic, water and stormwater management/drainage costs will be the responsibility of the developers as detailed in the Class EA documentation. Some of the costs for sanitary servicing may become the responsibility of property owners where they are serviced by the new system. As detailed in the Class EA documentation, a large portion of the sanitary infrastructure will be paid for by the developers as well.</p> <p>Opinions of probable capital cost were completed for all MSP servicing options and were considered during the preferred alternative selection process as presented in the Class EA documentation. Cost information for the assessed options and forecasted cost breakdowns for connection to services based on lot frontage were also provided at the public open houses. The alternative solutions for the various projects recommended as part of the MSP are at the concept stage, and opinions of probable capital costs have been developed on this basis. More detailed costs for the wastewater servicing alternative solutions will become available for various wastewater servicing elements of the MSP once the preliminary and detailed designs are completed and funding sources have been confirmed by the Municipal Council of the day.</p>

<p>These are some of the concerns that we would like answers for:</p> <p>How can the Township justify the increase of Everett's settlement area when they have not maximized the usage of other settlements already approved?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 23:</u> See <u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 1</u>, above.</p>																																		
<p>Please specify how increasing Everett's settlement area will be environmentally sound?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 24:</u> Currently, there are many environmentally sensitive areas that are not being protected. Part of the Secondary Plan includes requirements to protect and enhance those areas (i.e. no development permitted on or near them), as well as other policies meant to promote environmental stewardship (i.e. promoting energy efficient housing design, considering alternate methods of conserving water, designing municipal facilities with low impact designs).</p>																																		
<p>Will the Township requires an environmental assessment with regards to the Landfill in Tioga?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 25:</u> The Landfill is outside of the Everett Settlement Area and was not a component of the MSP. See also <u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 7</u>, above:</p>																																		
<p>How is this plan not competing with New Tecumseth's, Alliston as a growth node?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 26:</u> Growth in Everett is intended to fill a different need – it is intended to grow as a rural settlement (not an urban area) and to be complementary to the existing development in Alliston.</p>																																		
<p>Has there been an analysis of the impact of increasing Everett's population on Stevenson's Hospital and on other social services?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 27:</u> Stevenson Hospital has been circulated the information about the proposal for Everett, as have other agencies that might have an interest in the proposed growth (such as the School Boards); no concerns have been noted.</p>																																		
<p>When will a long-term financial forecast inclusive of a tax levy analysis be available? How can the Council justify making decisions without it?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 28:</u> Taxes are based on several factors; the growth in Everett is intended to offset any 'new' costs and to increase the overall tax base.</p>																																		
<table border="1" data-bbox="205 836 1181 983"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="9">Table 1. 1 SECONDARY PLAN AREA POPULATION BY PARCEL</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3">In Process Population</th> <th colspan="4">Future Development Population</th> <th rowspan="2">Existing</th> <th rowspan="2">Total</th> </tr> <tr> <th>R&M Homes</th> <th>Walton</th> <th>Barzo</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1,466</td> <td>684</td> <td>1,357</td> <td>2,681</td> <td>1,127</td> <td>341</td> <td>1,084</td> <td>1,929</td> <td>10,669</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In the above table, 'Future Development Population' shows 4 areas with very clearly defined number of people. Who are the developers slated to construct these areas? If none are currently in discussion with the Township, how these numbers were arrived at?</p>	Table 1. 1 SECONDARY PLAN AREA POPULATION BY PARCEL									In Process Population			Future Development Population				Existing	Total	R&M Homes	Walton	Barzo	1	2	3	4	1,466	684	1,357	2,681	1,127	341	1,084	1,929	10,669	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 29:</u> These numbers are being refined and will be revised in the final Planning documents. The properties that have been identified as 'in process' currently have active applications for their future development, so we have an accurate account of how many homes can be anticipated. The numbers were arrived at by using a gross density of 32 persons and jobs per hectare, which is the density the Province is now requiring for development in our area. Equivalent population calculations and the values used in the Class EA assessments are included in Appendix WS-B of Volume 3, Part 3 of the Class EA documentation.</p>
Table 1. 1 SECONDARY PLAN AREA POPULATION BY PARCEL																																			
In Process Population			Future Development Population				Existing	Total																											
R&M Homes	Walton	Barzo	1	2	3	4																													
1,466	684	1,357	2,681	1,127	341	1,084	1,929	10,669																											
<p>Who paid for the studies currently used to approve this plan?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 30:</u> Our consultants fees were paid by the Township to be recovered initially through charge back to participating developers and ultimately through development charges.</p>																																		
<p>a) We are concerned that the Everett Secondary Plan expansion is partially a reaction to financing the required upgrades to the New Horizons' sewer plant (this information is implied in various documents, but clearly stated by Jacquie Tschekalin in her email of December 18, 2012 to Ray Bateman).</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 31:</u> This is one component of the proposal, however, in the email to Mr. Bateman it was also noted that beyond the upgrades currently required for the New Horizon plant, due to changes in MOE requirements the plant will no longer be able to accommodate the number of homes it was originally designed to service (thus the operating and maintenance costs are being covered by around 100 homeowners instead of the originally anticipated 300). The New Horizons sewage plant recently underwent replacement of all primary, secondary and Anaerobic rotating biological discs and shafts. This replacement was costly, however, the project did not require financing and was covered under capital works. The septic beds are also slated to be replaced this summer at an additional cost which is included in the 2013 capital works budget.</p>																																		
<p>b) What would be the costs of fixing this plant without expanding the boundaries of Everett settlement and drastically increasing the population?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 32:</u> The existing sewage plant undergoes regular maintenance and upgrades. The components in a sewage plant are constantly working and eventually wear out requiring replacement. The problem with the existing sewage plant is that there are too few users on the system to be financially sustainable. User fees are high and do not currently cover the cost of operation, maintenance and major repairs. More users on a system spread the cost over a larger population providing for lower user fees and greater efficiency.</p>																																		
<p>c) What options have been reviewed to correct this sewage system, and why were they rejected?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 33:</u> We have recently explored a few options of improving the sewage system such as using spray irrigation to dispose of the effluent, upgrading and changing the location of the current septic beds, and dosing the septic beds rather than gravity flow. All options would require an amendment to our Certificate of Approval which would further impose updated requirements on our system, as well as require commissioning of full engineering designs. As the system is currently not financially sustainable, it did not make financial sense to proceed further at this time.</p>																																		

<p>We would like to know if any environmental analysis has been done on the impact of the New Horizon subdivision sewer problem for the local residents.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 34:</u> The design of the system required full engineering design, including hydrogeological analysis. These designs were peer reviewed by our consulting engineers and Ministry of Environment in order to obtain a Certificate of Approval.</p>
<p>We would like to know how much it will cost to fix this subdivision's sewer problem in the future (we understand that upgrades are due this spring?).</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 35:</u> The 2013 capital works budget for this project is \$60,000 to cover the cost of replacing the septic beds.</p>
<p>We would like to know if the Township is considering taking legal actions to recoup some of the money needed to fix this problem, and if not, why?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 36:</u> There is no plan in place to proceed with any legal actions to recoup any costs. The recent costly projects are all maintenance items on parts over 10 years old which are constantly turning and moving. Though it was anticipated that certain parts would last longer than they did, such components eventually wear out and need replacing.</p>
<p>In the future, if the Township is prepared to rely on developers to build some of the most important community infrastructures (such as sewer treatment plants), what guarantee will the Township want to ensure it is not left with defective services or sub-par construction?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 37:</u> For wastewater infrastructure, the Township plans to have the facility design(s) peer reviewed by our consulting engineers and our contracted wastewater operator, Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA), not only for performance requirements, but also incorporate design efficiencies to reduce operations and maintenance costs. Design of the wastewater infrastructure projects identified in this Class EA will also need to meet stringent requirements set out by the MOE and where applicable the NVCA, to secure approvals for the construction of these works. In some cases, additional Class EA studies (Schedule C projects) will need to be completed prior to the commencement of design and implementation of the works. These projects have been identified in Volume 1 of the Class EA documentation.</p>
<p>What tests will the Township give these developers to ensure that they will build the most environmentally friendly services? We noted that monitoring is required by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) (ref. <i>email from the MOE to K. Korpela, June 7, 2012</i>).</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 38:</u> Protecting the environment has been a major focus of the MSP. Where a developer is undertaking the design and construction of works that will eventually become municipal infrastructure, the Township will enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the developer. As with all Subdivision Agreements, the agreement will reference design drawings which the Township will review prior to MOE approval. As part of the design drawings and studies, there will be requirements for the construction of the works to meet municipal standards, including environmental standards such as erosion and sediment control during construction. All constructed systems must be constantly monitored for performance to ensure limits are maintained in accordance with Township, NVCA and MOE approvals.</p>
<p>How will the Township answer Simcoe County questions listed in their memo of October 30, 2012?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 39:</u> Many of the questions from the County comments have already been answered, as they were related to information that had not been completed at that time (mainly related to the Master Servicing Plan). We are confident that all of the County concerns will be addressed with the final planning documents.</p>

<u>Transportation</u>	
Why was a 2% per annum assumption used considering that households generally have more than one vehicle, that cars are absolutely required to travel around, and that the end planned increase in population is closer to 600%?	<p>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 40: The background growth rate of two percent per annum accounts for general growth on the major roadways outside of (irrespective of) planned development.</p> <p>To obtain traffic volume estimates for single family homes for the planned development, trip rates of 0.71 vehicles per unit in the AM peak hour and 0.82 vehicles per unit in the PM peak hour were applied to each household. These are standard trip rate estimates obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation manuals. Details for trip generation are provided in Section 3 of the Transportation Study (Volume 3, Part 4 of the MSP).</p>
How can an increase in population to 10,669 will not demand a widening of the 13th or the 5th? What are the plans for coming in and out of Everett?	<p>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 41: Looking at the weekday PM peak hour, both County Road 13 and County Road 5 currently have traffic volumes of about 300 vehicles per hour (vph) in the peak direction. After development, traffic volumes on both roadways are projected to increase to about 600 vph per peak direction. Major roads typically carry up to 800 to 900 vph per lane, meaning that the existing roadways should have sufficient capacity to handle the increased traffic without the need for road widening. The majority of the traffic entering/exiting the study area was assigned to / from the east via County Road 5 and to / from the south via County Road 13</p>
Will some properties be required to submit part of their frontage to accommodate enlarged lanes?	<p>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 42: The locations where additional turn lanes are recommended, such as the County Road 13 and County Road 5 intersection, will need to be reviewed in more detail at the detailed design stage to determine property impacts. At this time, property acquisition outside the existing municipal right of ways (ROWs) is not expected.</p>
Who will pay and how much will it costs for the enlarged lanes, extra lights, sidewalks, etc?	<p>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 43: Any enlargement of lanes, extra lights, and sidewalks required as a result of development is paid for by development. Developers will install their own infrastructure within their developments and anything outside their developments will be covered by developer through securities and/or development charges. Development charges are paid every time a lot is developed to cover increased costs to the Fire Department, Roads, Parks, Recreation, etc.</p>
<u>Water</u>	
Will the Township ensure that no privately-owned well is damaged by the Township drilling its own? We noted that such evaluation is required by the MOE. (ref. <i>email from the MOE to K. Korpela, June 7, 2012</i>).	<p>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 44: The installation of a new municipal well and connection of this well to the municipal water system is a project which will be subject to MOE approvals, including (including the issuance of a Permit to Take Water - PTTW). Hydrogeologic investigations to ensure no impact or mitigated impact to localized groundwater conditions will be required as part of this approval process.</p>
Will the Township yield to the recommendations of the NVCA on all future hydrological investigation?	<p>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 45: Hydrological investigations are required as part of stormwater management and drainage assessments. A complete existing and proposed hydrological investigation (modeling and assessment has been completed as part of the Master Drainage Plan for this Class EA Volume 3, Part 1). With respect to potable water servicing, the NVCA will be involved in the approvals process as developments come online and require permits. The Township will work with the NVCA and developers throughout the approvals process to satisfy any requirements or concerns they may have.</p>

Wastewater

<p>Many people are concerned with the costs of 'hooking-up' to the sewer treatment line. Numbers are floating around: \$560/meter + \$150/hook-up in 2012 \$, \$13K to \$25K. This is a very stressful point for many Everett citizens. Too little is still known: when will they be required us to hook-up? How much will it costs? Will we be forced to empty and fill our septic tank too? Will there be rebates or grants to help pay for this costs? Will the costs be amortized over several years, if so, how many? What if one is simply incapable of taking on this costs?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 46:</u> Opinions of probable capital costs presented at the public open house and in the Class EA documentation represent the <u>total construction cost</u> to complete all work associated with the sanitary sewer system, including items such as road and boulevard restoration. These costs are also based on a concept level design which does not maximize any of the potential efficiencies, and subsequent potential for cost reductions which can be realized during the detailed design stage. It should be noted that many other factors (such as alternative funding sources, grants, municipal budget allocations etc.) which could potentially result in cost reduction for individuals are unknown at this time but will be fully investigated by the Township prior to implementation. The opinions of probable cost provided in this assessment are for the purposes of assessment of alternative solutions, and as such, the individual costs cannot be answered in a "general" fashion as final costs will be assessed on an individual, property specific basis. Discussions have already been held between the Township and some concerned citizens (i.e. owners of properties with significant frontage) and we urge anyone with specific concerns about project costs to personally contact the Township to open a dialogue with regards to their individual issues or concerns regarding costs.</p> <p>With respect to existing septic systems, through Source Water Protection Legislation in the Province of Ontario, many septic systems in Everett will require legislated inspection on a regular basis by the Township and they will be required to be maintained and upgraded if deemed to be a threat to the drinking water system in Everett and the environment. Costs to upgrade and replace these systems can be over \$15,000. Any resident that connects to a new municipal sewer collection system will be required to empty and decommission their septic tank.</p>
<p>We have concerns that residents living close to the sewer treatment will be forced to endure bad odors? Can there be guarantee that it will not be the case?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 47:</u> Odour is a component measured in establishing a suitable location for the sewage treatment plant. The MOE and our engineering consultants review the location to confirm with the location is appropriately located to minimize odor issues and if required, mitigation measures need to be employed as part of the project design. These details will be further developed in subsequent Township/MOE approvals.</p>
<p>If there are problems with the sewer plant despite all best efforts to make sure there are none, will the township be able to fix it? Can we afford fixing a large sewage plant? (The current sewage system is very small, but it is expensive to fix. A large plant will be even more expensive.)</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 48:</u> Wastewater treatment is controlled through a Certificate of Approval issued by the MOE. This approval provides for the limits of treatment that must be achieved at the plant prior to disposal. There are safety factors within these limits set by the MOE. Though these levels are checked and maintained daily by our wastewater operator, monthly reports are prepared and provided to MOE. In the event of required repairs or upgrades to the wastewater treatment plan, improvements to a large plant may be more expensive to fix then a small plant, however, there are more users to pay for the cost and therefore reducing the burden to the individual user. Furthermore, there are efficiencies in larger wastewater treatment plants with respect to operation. For example, if the plant is quadruple the capacity of the small plant (i.e. has 4 times as many users and payers of the service), the cost to operate and maintain the plant would not be quadruple the cost.</p>
<p>Was R&M Homes required to do an environmental assessment to proceed with their sewage treatment plan?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 49:</u> In 2006, the MOE indicated they were satisfied that R&M Homes' proposed sewage treatment plan met the requirements of the MEA Municipal Class Environmental Assessment through their Official Plan Amendment and its supporting technical studies. MOE again confirmed this in June 2011. Many further hydrogeological and engineering studies were then completed and reviewed by Township, NVCA, and MOE, to confirm any influence on the environment. The Township is still waiting for confirmation on some outstanding concerns with their sewage treatment plan, and receipt of final engineering designs for our review.</p>
<p>Have other communities downstream the Pine River been invited to comment on the plan? What were their comments?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 50:</u> Neighbouring municipalities are circulated along with a long list of other agencies. We have yet to receive comments from any communities downstream of the Pine River.</p>
<p>It is recommended that some of the costs will be borne by the developers. The plant would be built 'in phases'. Some of the costs will be borne by the Townships. What are these costs? Which phases will be paid by whom? What are the maintenance costs for each phase?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 51:</u> Developers will pay for their respective development needs. The Township's costs will include upsizing costs to accommodate existing residents on the wastewater treatment plant and sewers. Maintenance costs would be borne by the users of the system.</p>
<p>Will the Township yield to the NVCA on their recommendations at the planning stage, throughout construction, and in the future while monitoring? Will the Township improve the current Master Servicing Plan to accommodate the NVCA's comments? This is of paramount importance to us.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 52:</u> The Township continues to work with the NVCA in improving environmental efficiencies. We have listened to their comments and continue to work in resolving all issues they have. We are committed to continue partnering with the NVCA in establishing initiatives towards protecting the environment.</p>

<p>Would the Township consider allowing residents within the boundaries to keep their septic system provided that they meet septic maintenance standards?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 53:</u> Such a decision would up to the Municipal Township Council of the day. If the Township were to install sewers, there would be a cost. There could be an option whereby frontage charges, (cost to install the sewer only), would be paid when this work happens, however, a connection fee is paid when the owner chooses to connect. There are great efficiencies in connecting when the sewer is being installed. The question of when this connection is to happen was not component of the MSP.</p>
<p>Is the current placement for the sewer treatment plant ideal? There might be some problems considering the wetland environment around. If it is not built there, where could it be built?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 54:</u> The preferred location in comparison to the alternative location adjacent to the Pine River was evaluated based on natural environmental impacts, social/cultural impacts, technical/operational impacts, and economic impacts as per the Class EA documentation.</p>
<p>What contingency solutions would be put in place in case of malfunction? We noted that such contingency plans are required by the MOE. (ref. <i>email from the MOE to K. Korpela, June 7, 2012</i>).</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 55:</u> Contingency plans for an upset condition are a component to be addressed at the engineering design stage of the project and through the MOE Certificate of Approval. Please note that a further Schedule C Environmental Assessment is required prior to the preferred solution of point discharge into the Pine River. The MSP only covered Schedule A, A+ and B projects and only completed Phase 1 and 2 of a 5 phase process as detailed in the Class EA documentation. Further studies and designs are required prior to any actual work being completed. The MSP evaluated all alternative wastewater solutions to provide preferred solutions to the problems and opportunities. For a discharge to the Pine River, a Phases 3 and 4 or the Class EA process must be completed. Phase 3 involves alternative design concepts for preferred solutions and provides for further public and agency review. Phase 4 requires completing an Environmental Study Report summarizing the rationale, planning, and design & consultation process of the projects and providing for further public and agency review. Phase 5 includes completing final engineering design, construction and monitoring construction for adherence to environmental provisions and commitments.</p>
<p>What type of warranty will be required from the developers?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 56:</u> 100% securities are held by the Township to complete any construction required until the Township assumes the works. The assumption of the works is typically required after the works are 100% complete and withstood regular operation for a specified period of time, (typically 2-5 years).</p>
<p>Is the Township prepared to change the location of the proposed wastewater treatment plant to protect the wetlands? If not, why? If yes, where?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 57:</u> The MSP evaluated the environmental impacts of the proposed locations. The preferred location was chosen as the site further away from the Pine River. The sewage plant would not be constructed in the wetlands. The final location on the property would require NVCA approval.</p>
<p>Is the Township willing to find other options for disposing of the waste water effluents than dumping them in the Pine River? If not, why? If yes, what are they?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 58:</u> The preferred solution was the point discharge option to the Pine River. An Assimilative Capacity Study was completed to study the effects of the Pine River based on a selected discharge limit. Based on this limit, Provincial Policy with respect to discharge to a receiving open watercourse were easily achieved. Based on comments received by the NVCA, the MSP went further to reduce the discharge objective to half that originally studied. The Township is also in the process of initiating a Phosphorous Reduction Program for the Pine River in partnership with the NVCA with the hopes of attracting other stakeholder groups to further improve the quality of the Pine River from its current state. This program would provide funding sources, (paid by development), to contribute 50-100% towards projects such as construction of manure and nutrient management systems; Livestock fencing; buffer strip creation for crops; clean water diversions around feedlots, livestock yards, and manure storage; construction of agricultural erosion structures; and milk-house wash-water treatment for agricultural operations adjacent to the Pine River. Non-agricultural projects could involve stream bank stabilization, septic system repair/replacement within 30m of river; and fragile land retirement and development of conservation easements including wetland creation.)</p>
<p>Is the Township willing to study and come up with alternative options to the current wastewater treatment plan, options that could keep the Pine River and the surrounding natural heritage areas in the current clean state that they are in now? If not, why? If yes, what are they?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 59:</u> Please refer to Township Responses 46 through 58 above and Township Response 60 below.</p>
<p><u>Drainage & Natural Heritage Study</u></p>	
<p>Has the Township included all comments and recommendations from the NVCA in the final plan, and if not, will it commit to do so?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 60:</u> We are currently working with NVCA to address all of their concerns. Recent meetings with NVCA have been very progressive. The Township will continue to partner with the NVCA to develop opportunities to improve environmental initiatives.</p>
<p>Who has paid for the Natural Heritage Study and the Drainage Plan?</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 61:</u> Our consultants fees were paid by the Township to be recovered initially through charge back to participating developers and ultimately through development charges.</p>

<u>Other Types of Pollution</u>	
Will the Township set stringent standards/requirements as part of the development approvals to minimize other types of pollution, e.g. light, dust, noise, odors, etc.? What will these requirements be?	TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 62: Policies in the Official Plan Amendment will require dark-sky friendly lighting. Other requirements, such as dust control, fouling and cleaning of external streets, controlling construction refuse, noise and signage are typically dealt with on a site by site basis through Subdivision Agreements.
<u>Other Questions</u>	
With an increased Everett's population, what are the Township's estimated plans/costs for fire & police and recreation departments?	TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 63: To establish additional services to accommodate growth, development fees are charged for every new lot being developed. Municipal development charges cover items such as Roads, Police Services, Outdoor and Indoor Recreation, and Library. County development charges cover Library, Paramedic Services, Long Term Care, Social Housing, Public Works, and Roads. Educational development charges cover land acquisition and servicing of land to accommodate new schools. The cost to maintain these services is paid by the tax payer.
With an increase in Everett's population, will the municipal electoral map be redrawn for more representatives in what is now Ward 4?	TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 64: There are many possibilities for how future Councils will decide to deal with changes in the Township's population; a change in the electoral map would be one possible option. At this stage in the planning process no decisions have been made in this regard.
Like the NVCA, we would like an answer to this question: this proposal is subject to the Places to Grow Act and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Planning Justification Report indicates that this proposal is consistent with the legislation and growth plan. Have the County and Province confirmed this opinion?	TOWNSHIP RESPONSE 65: The Province has not yet commented on the Planning documents; although they have been sent the documents, they typically do not provide a response until after the Township has adopted a document. We are working with the County to ensure that our vision meets their requirements as well.
Expansion of Everett Settlement Boundary - What is the purpose with building a bridge across the Pine River for a walking path coming into our sub-division? It will create access where no one here wants it - especially the neighbouring homes and families. It will introduce a path for snowmobilers and other motorized vehicles. This bridge will be also standing near to the pipe that will dump affluent into the Pine River.	TOWNSHIP RESPONSE: We are unaware of any reference to a bridge across the Pine River within the MSP documentation.
Wastewater - What type of warranty will be required from the developers? Will a trust fund be set up to cover any future "situations"?	TOWNSHIP RESPONSE: 100% securities are held by the Township to complete any construction required until the Township assumes the works. The assumption of the works is typically required after the works are 100% complete and withstood regular operation for a specified period of time, (typically 2-5 years).
<p>Most of the people I've spoken to in Everett say the main reasons they moved to our village was: To have a large lot where you did not feel like your neighbor's home was right on top of you.</p> <p>To live in a Rural Setting where: The air is clean You can actually see the stars at night You can go for a walk at night without any fear You can go for a short walk and observe nature at its best (i.e. clean stream, beautiful forest, birds and animals)</p> <p>To get away from city traffic congestion, shopping malls, wall to wall people</p> <p>They are happy to commute long distances to work, shopping and other amenities to avoid having to live in larger Libran centers. It is often said to me "if I wanted to live in the city, I would have bought a home in the city."</p> <p>So why is Adjala-Tos allowing such a large expansion in Everett with smaller lots and more population density, which will turn Everett into the overcrowded town that the current population was trying to avoid when they purchased their home here?</p> <p>It is not necessary for Everett to change its personality so drastically. You have plenty of towns all around the area that are looking forward to major expansions (i.e. Barrie, Angus, Alliston, Tottenham, ect!)</p>	TOWNSHIP RESPONSE: Township Response: The Township also wants to protect the things that people love about Everett. This is the reason for providing policies on how growth will take place in our Township: most of it will be in Everett (which is currently the largest community in the Township) and the Official Plan Amendment will make sure that there are policies in place to protect areas where wildlife live, to ensure you can still see the stars, and to provide more trails for you to access areas where development will not be permitted and to reduce traffic congestion. While much of the new development will be on lots that are smaller than many of the newer lots in Everett, they will be similar in size to the older original lots found along Main Street; densities will not be the same as in other urban areas as the intention is to keep Everett as a rural settlement. Please keep in mind that, in 30 years or so when Everett is completely built out it will still only be about one half of the size that Alliston currently is. We are confident that the appropriate policies are being put in place to maintain Everett's rural charm and character.

<p>We have been to all the open public meetings and have had two private meetings with Jacquie Tschekalin, Greenland consulting, Eric Wargel and the deputy mayor. We have asked the question many times about the cost of running the waste sewers past our home and the cost of hook-up to our house.</p> <p>The number we were given was staggering with the price being 560 dollars for every meter along the frontage of our property and 150 dollars for every meter from the road pipe to our house.</p> <p>This price is outrageous and will cost me $\\$560 * 97.5 = \\$54,600$ plus $\\$150 * 61.5 = \\$9,225$ TOTAL = $\\$63,825$</p> <p>We cannot afford a cost like this, it's like taking a second mortgage, even if you pay over 10 years. We have asked for the township to look into some provision for people who have large frontage, but no answers were given. With costs like this it scares me where we are heading.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE:</u> Opinions of probable capital costs presented at the public open house and in the Class EA documentation represent the total construction cost to complete all work associated with the sanitary sewer system, including items such as road and boulevard restoration. These costs are also based on a concept level design which does not maximize any of the potential efficiencies, and subsequent potential for cost reductions which can be realized during the detailed design stage. It should be noted that many other factors (such as alternative funding sources, grants, municipal budget allocations etc.) which could potentially result in cost reduction for individuals are unknown at this time but will be fully investigated by the Township prior to implementation.</p> <p>The opinions of probable cost provided in this assessment are for the purposes of assessment of alternative solutions - final costs will be assessed on an individual, property specific basis.</p> <p>As you are aware, the Township is open to discussing individual issues or concerns regarding costs.</p>
<p>We are also with the understanding that the New Horizons developments waste plant and subsurface bed is to be decommissioned with the new development of R&M homes? We asked what will happen to the land the waste plant is on? The answer we got is we don't know, we will think about it. With all the thought put into getting rid of the New Horizons waste plant and fields, it must of come up about what to do with the land! Our home property backs onto this field and we feel we are entitled to know what will happen.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE:</u> As discussed in previous meetings, at this time there are no specific plans for this property, as it will continue to operate as a wastewater treatment facility until such time as development allows for decommissioning of the facility. Any future decisions with regards to the property will ultimately be made by the Council of the day.</p>
<p>As per your purposed option. R&M homes will build a subsurface waste plant and the New Horizons development will hook into that. If your having lots of trouble with the subsurface waste system of New Horizons why will R&M homes plant work better? "I Know" its all new technology!</p> <p>I would like to see the developers prove to the people of Everett and all tax payers that a subsurface waste system will work with all the new technology they apparently have. The New Horizons waste subsurface system was to be able to substain 300 homes? Its not working and its not cost effective as only 100 homes are using it and paying for it monthly.</p> <p>It is to my understanding that the Walton group is to build off the Baily farm land and hook into the R&M homes waste plant. Why not slow down a little and have the Walton group build 200 homes and pay for the upgrades needed for the New Horizons waste to work proper. You have an existing building, new pumps, tanks and pumping stations already there. The subsurface weeping bed is to be replaced in the spring this is a waste of money if the plant is to be decommissioned. Use it to your advantage. REBUILD</p> <p>Now you have 300 homes on this new system, more people paying monthly more cost effective and a chance to show the people of Everett and the township that the new subsurface waste system works.</p> <p>When that is proven allow R&M homes to build out and install their subsurface waste system with potential of changing it over to surface system that will be treated and dumped into the pine river. At that point in time the main sewer system can be put in place and hook-up from existing residence can start to happen. But i emphasize that the developer must prove the new subsurface waste system will work so we do not have a situation as it is with the old New Horizons systems. Slow down and put 300 homes on test before you put 700 to 1000 homes on a system that might not work, and have a bigger problem. we are not trying to stop growth but slow down and show responsible and proven way to develop that won't cost everyone a lot of money just to live in Everett.</p>	<p><u>TOWNSHIP RESPONSE:</u> As described in the Class EA Documentation, R&M Homes is proposing a subsurface wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) which will include capacity for the proposed R&M Homes development as well as residual capacity for other potential connections, which could include the New Horizons Development. Development beyond this threshold will be accommodated by expansion of this same facility with surface water discharge to the Pine River.</p> <p>Other capital expenditures to upgrade existing facilities for new development are not considered economically feasible in the long term. As such, there are currently no plans to expand the New Horizons WWTP to accommodate any additional capacity beyond the 100 homes which are currently serviced.</p> <p>Ongoing maintenance of existing facilities will need to continue until such time as they are decommissioned.</p>

Response To NVCA – Everett Secondary Plan Master Servicing Plan	
Stormwater Management: Please note: As an overall response to these comments, the Township recognizes the comments received, which shall be incorporated as part of this Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Project File by way of this correspondence and addressed in subsequent planning and design documents as required.	
1. The Master Servicing Plan (MSP) and the Master Drainage Plan (MDP) notes that Low Impact Development (LID) SWM measures should be encouraged through draft plan conditions or municipal guidelines to promote groundwater infiltration and provide tertiary stormwater quality control within future development areas. NVCA staff encourage the use of these measures and please ensure the final secondary plan include appropriate provisions.	The Township recognizes this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of this Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be incorporated as part of policies of the Secondary Plan and addressed in any subsequent development driven planning and design documents/drawings.
2. The proposed stormwater management facilities identified as SWM C & F in options 1, 3, 4, do not appear to drain to a sufficient outlet. As described in the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority Development Review Guidelines which identify a sufficient outlet as "a permanently flowing watercourse or lake" or a municipal ROW. The watercourse shown on the drawing as the outlet for SWMF F is not defined by the NVCA as a watercourse as was noted in our comments related to the Barzo Development dated July 25, 2008.	The MDP provides concept level recommendations for pond location and sizing. As noted in the MDP, the final SWMF sizing and locations, will be designed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents, namely through the draft plan and subdivision agreement stages.
3. Clarify why nodes are proposed for the different sub-watersheds. NVCA notes that post to pre control for the proposed development will need to occur at the outlets of the stormwater management ponds and not downstream of the secondary plan area.	As specific post development conditions are not known for much of the Secondary Plan Area, the concept level design completed as part of the MDP provides pre to post control at the confluence points of upstream catchments, and recommendations for pond location and sizing to achieve this overall result. Detailed, development specific pre to post controls, final SWMF sizing and locations will be designed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.
4. Clarify the description provided for catchment 13 as this site is not adjacent to the R&M subdivision and based on current land use mapping does not include forest land use.	Discrepancies between the MDP report and figures are noted by way of this correspondence. This catchment is predominantly located outside of Secondary Plan Area and consists of agricultural land. The modeling completed for this catchment in support of the MDP is accurate.
5. Provide the area weighted calculations for all of the input values for all of the options and catchments.	A copy of the VO2 Catchment Parameters has been provided in Appendix A for all scenarios.
6. Provide the assumptions and the stage-storage-discharge curves for the route reservoirs included in the modelling.	Concept level stage storage curves were developed to provide the desired pre-post controls at downstream nodes. Stage Storage curves for existing facilities were developed based on the best available geometry and outlet information for these facilities (i.e. from As Constructed Drawings, or in the case of R&M Homes, modeling submitted with the Draft Plan documentation). All stage Storage Curves can be found in the VO2 Model (provided digitally to the Kate Northcott of NVCA on January 9 th , 2013). This model can be provided again upon request.
7. Justify the use of the route channels within the hydrologic modelling. NVCA does not understand what the route channels are based on or why they were used in the modelling. As well, as the modelling cannot be appropriately calibrated the most conservative model should be created in order to determine the impacts from development	Route channels were included in the model to provide the most accurate representation of hydrology in the study area as numerous channels exist where route channels have been used in the model. Distances between route channels were calculated through scaled measurements between confluences of different channels within the study area with ADD-HYD's representing the confluence points themselves.
8. Who is responsible for paying and completing the maintenance as outline in Section 8 of the report?	This will be at the discretion of the municipality, however the costs will likely be borne by developers through subdivision agreements.
9. Clarify what is meant by the following statement included in Section 8.5.1.3 as the previous sections of the report do not allow for development within the regulatory floodplain: "Where the existing riparian storage has been altered, it should be demonstrated that these alterations satisfy Floodplain Management Policies established by the Province of Ontario"	This is meant to be a general statement and refers to approved features such as SWMF outlets or trails. See response to Comment #22.
10. Stormwater outlets in the Secondary Plan area may have to discharge to wetlands since other outlets are not available/not economically feasible. Although not a preferred option from an NVCA perspective, these outlets may be feasible subject to a scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) that demonstrates that no negative impacts to wetland features/functions. EIS scoping would require consideration/assessment of: a. Potential changes in seasonal wetland hydrology (water depths, duration of flooding). b. Assessment of wetland vegetation communities and associated functions and their sensitivity to treated stormwater inputs. c. Mitigation measures to avoid/minimize scour of wetland vegetation i.e. level spreaders	We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents. Please also see response to Comment #2

Natural Hazards: Please note: As an overall response to these comments, the Township recognizes the comments received, which shall be incorporated as part of this Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Project File by way of this correspondence and addressed in subsequent planning and design documents as required.	
11. The text of the report should note that while NVCA does have generic regulation mapping to identify areas that may be subject to regulation under the Conservation Authorities Act that site specific determination of the flood and erosion hazards will be required for all developments subject to the generic regulation within the Secondary Plan area to the satisfaction of the NVCA.	We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.
12. The proposed sizing of the tile field required for the sanitary servicing proposed under Option 6 and incorporated into the recommended Option 9 will interfere with the wetland adjacent to the proposed tile field. Based on NVCA wetland boundary mapping there appears to only be a 7 hectare area available outside of the wetlands without accounting for any buffers.	The proposed wastewater treatment plant and disposal tile bed for the R&M Homes development received Draft Plan Approval and a draft Certificate of Approval from the MOE. As per NVCA Comment 11 presented herein, a permit will be required for these works from the NVCA.
13. Clarify the location of the forcemain to the west of County Road 13 as based on the drawing it may interfere with a municipal drain that is not shown on Figure A2 of the Sanitary Report.	Please note that the forcemain location as presented is conceptual in nature, and protection of natural heritage features along the proposed pipe alignment has been considered as part of this Class EA. The final alignment shall be finalized as part of subsequent development driven planning and design documents.
14. Clarify what is meant by the following statement included in Section 8.5.1.3 as the previous sections of the report do not allow for development within the regulatory floodplain: "Where the existing riparian storage has been altered, it should be demonstrated that these alterations satisfy Floodplain Management Policies established by the Province of Ontario"	This is meant to be a general statement and refers to approved features such as SWMF outlets or trails. See response to Comment #22.
15. Please revise Figure A4 to include the node locations and Catchment 6.	This omission has been noted. The modeling completed for these catchments in support of the MDP is accurate.
16. Please revise the area for Catchment 5, 14 and 17 between the report and figure A4 as they are inconsistent.	Discrepancies between the report and figures are noted by way of this correspondence. The modeling completed for these catchments in support of the MDP is accurate.
17. The 'Certificate of Approval' with the MOE is now referred to as an 'Environmental Compliance Approval'.	We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.
18. The first bullet point under section 8.5.1.2 should have '100 year flows' replaced with 'regulatory flows'.	We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.
Natural Heritage System: Please note: As an overall response to these comments, the Township recognizes the comments received, which shall be incorporated as part of this Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Project File by way of this correspondence and addressed in subsequent planning and design documents as required.	
It appears that none of the document figures address the onsite discussions between the NVCA-Township-Landowner. Please advise on this matter.	This was addressed in the updated figures 3a and 3b which are attached to this response (Appendix A), and by way of this response to the NVCA comments the updated figures are included as part of the Class EA Project File and supersede the previous Class EA document figures.
Table 8.1 in the MSP study report (Implementation Strategy) suggests that development could occur within the NHS subject to demonstration of no negative impacts. We believe that this is not consistent with the Plan B NHS report which suggests that only limited development-related works could occur within the 30 m buffer associated with the NHS. We should confirm that the Plan B approach i.e. full protection of the NHS (with buffer provisions) is identified in OP/Secondary Plan policy.	See response to Comment #22.
Table 8.1 suggests that the Township would be the NHS lead with MNR as an assisting agency. NVCA staff request that NVCA also be identified as an assisting agency.	We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.
As per January 18, 2013 meeting, NVCA would accept trails and stormwater outlets within the 30 m (and possibly trails within other portions of the NHS) buffer subject to further review (possibly EIS as discussed in Plan B report). Further discussion of stormwater outlets is addressed under the stormwater heading of this letter.	Please be advised that any discussion within the MSP which pertains to works within the setback limits refers to approved work items (i.e. trails and stormwater outlets) only. Any additional investigations which may be required will be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.

Wastewater System: Please note: As an overall response to these comments, the Township recognizes the comments received, which shall be incorporated as part of this Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Project File by way of this correspondence and addressed in subsequent planning and design documents as required

19. NVCA staff suggests that the following text be added to page 26 of the MSP noting: "Pine River – one of the highest quality and most productive coldwater fisheries habitats linked to the Georgian Bay Lake Huron ecosystem. Supports large run of migratory rainbow trout and is main driver for Chinook salmon recruitment in Nottawasaga River, which supports approx. 30% of Chinook salmon production in all of Lake Huron-Georgian Bay.

Boyne River – coldwater habitat is more impacted than for Pine River but this Escarpment Stream represents the 2nd or third largest source of recruitment of migratory rainbow trout supporting the Nottawasaga River fishery, as well as a significant population of resident brown trout."

We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.

20. NVCA staff re-calculated potential ambient Phosphorus concentration in the Pine River associated with a WWTP discharging at 0.05 mg/L rather than 0.1 and used an estimated 7Q20 phosphorus concentration of 0.006 mg/L (representative of low data for 4th Line collected in mid and late June of 2012 respectively). As a result we note:

- a. Using this approach is that the total phosphorus concentration in the combined flow is only 0.01 mg/L (PWQO is 0.03 mg/L). However, the plant input under this scenario increase the P concentration in the Pine from 0.006 to 0.010 mg/L (almost doubled), i.e. the phosphorus release from the point source at the plant was still almost as great as the sum total of all other baseflow phosphorus sources contributing to the pine River at the 4th Line, from its 195 square km drainage area.
- b. With an exceptionally high quality coldwater stream ecosystem functioning at a very high level as a trout and salmon spawning habitat, it is difficult to quantify the impacts to coldwater fisheries recruitment of doubling the low-flow dissolved phosphorus concentrations but we know that the effects will not be positive. Any addition of phosphorus which increases plant and algae growth on the river bottom is likely to decrease the availability of dissolved oxygen needed to support the development of trout and salmon embryos in the eggs deposited in the gravel. Plant growth on the river bottom increases competition between the plants and other living organisms as the plants respire (breathe) at night and in the fall winter when the decomposing plant tissue removes oxygen from the water as it is oxidized.

As previously discussed with the NVCA and as presented in the Class EA documentation, the preferred solution ultimately includes a point discharge option to the Pine River. An Assimilative Capacity Study was completed to study the effects of the Pine River based on a selected discharge limit. Based on this limit, Provincial Policy with respect to discharge to a receiving open watercourse were easily achieved.

Based on previous comments received by the NVCA, the MSP went further to reduce the discharge objective to half that originally proposed as noted in the NVCA comments provided herein.

Having noted that the preferred wastewater treatment alternative solution will provide phosphorus treatment beyond that which is required by Provincial Policy, a meeting with NVCA in January 2013 was held and from that discussion the Township is in the process of proposing a Phosphorous Reduction Program for the Pine River (PR2 Program) in partnership with the NVCA (Please see Appendix B for a Draft for Discussion copy of the White Paper). The objective of this program is to attract other stakeholder groups to further improve the quality of the Pine River from its current state. This program would provide funding sources, (paid by development), to contribute 50-100% towards projects such as construction of manure and nutrient management systems; Livestock fencing; buffer strip creation for crops; clean water diversions around feedlots, livestock yards, and manure storage; construction of agricultural erosion structures; and milkhouse washwater treatment for agricultural operations adjacent to the Pine River. Non-agricultural projects could involve streambank stabilization, septic system repair/replacement within 30m of river; and fragile land retirement and development of conservation easements including wetland creation.)

21. Through review of the R & M proposal, NVCA staff identified potential impacts of nutrient plume from proposed septic tile bed. Further work to demonstrate that this plume will not impact the wetland/associated functions (to the east/northeast) is required.

We note that the facility is currently draft plan approved. We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.

22. Section 8.4 of the MDP provides some description of proposed monitoring (including water chemistry, fish, benthic) in support of WWTP discharge to the Pine River. A full description of our proposed monitoring program (sent to Greenland in January) is attached.

Three stations are proposed but no detail as to where they would be located. They should include a control (upstream), impact (immediately downstream) and recovery (where fully mixed downstream) station to be determined through consultation with MOE/NVCA. Water chemistry sampling should focus on summer baseflow (limiting conditions) rather than random/seasonal flows. Full nutrient scans should be undertaken during each sampling event. Benthic monitoring should be undertaken annually (rather than every three years) to reduce noise associated with monitoring gaps. Effluent discharge should be phased i.e. monitoring should demonstrate no negative impacts to the Pine River prior to release of new phases of development.

We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents.

Moreover, we would expect that the full monitoring program would be developed in concert through the PR2 Program from the proposal identified in the comment response #24.

<p>Water Servicing: Please note - As an overall response to these comments, the Township recognizes the comments received, which shall be incorporated as part of this Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Project File by way of this correspondence and addressed in subsequent planning and design documents as required.</p>	
<p>23. Section 1.1 water supply requirements: a. How was the maximum day demand (MDD) peaking factor determined/defined: the MDD peaking factor (MOD/ADD) calculated for phase 1 is 2.23, phase 2 is 2.1, and phase 3 is 2.0. b. NVCA staff recommends that the values use a consistent per capital use value and a consistent MDD peaking factor comparable to the factor calculated from the last three years (2.43).</p>	<p>Water demand calculations (including calculation of peaking factors, which vary based on total population) were completed in accordance with MOE guidelines.</p>
<p>24. Section 2.0 existing water supplies: Please confirm that the two former PW wells (PW 1-78 and 2-78) that were "abandoned", in fact, "decommissioned".</p>	<p>This has been confirmed by the Township Public Works Superintendent – please see attached email correspondence in Appendix A.</p>
<p>25. Section 2.1 Existing and Future Aquifer yield: Does the existing PTTW have pumping restrictions, e.g. can't pump wells 1 and 3 concurrently, as this would have impacts on the location of future water supplies. The modeled results of available groundwater resources is 2500 m3/day whereas the projected water demand is 2607 m3/day please advise on the anticipated local groundwater level impact this may have.</p>	<p>As detailed in the Class EA documentation, the average daily demand that can be supported by the existing aquifer is 2,500 m3 per day. It is expected that future water demands for the Secondary Plan equivalent population will be below this level per the Class EA documentation and in any event, future development would be limited to that average daily demand level.</p>
<p>26. Section 4.0 source water protections: It is noted that the only storm water management ponds were addressed as a potential significant drinking water threat. It is recommended that the other 20 drinking water threats be addressed too.</p>	<p>Most threats are ideally captured through other processes as summarized below: #1. Waste Disposal Site – N/A, and through MOE Prescribed Instrument (ECA). #2. WWTP – Not a significant threat due to proposed location of WWTP and disposal areas. Also through PI (ECA). #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #21 – Some of these threats have been identified in Everett. Through development of these lands, such threats should be eliminated. Any additional wells will be required due to development of existing agricultural properties. Such process is further captured through OMAFRA PI (NMP/NMS/NASM Plan). #10, #11. App. of pesticides to land – See #3. Also through MOE PI (Pesticides Permit). #12. App. of Road Salt – Only a significant threat where application area is 8-80% impervious surface. Land Use Planning and LID would provide control measures. #13. Handling & Storage of road salt – Threat already evaluated in Everett. New Well to have regard for this existing threat. #14. Storage of Snow – Land Use Planning restriction for any new or redeveloped lands. Such applications must be reviewed by RMO. #15, #16. Handling & Storage of fuel – Existing significant threat in Everett to be addressed though RMP. New well locations to have regard for such existing conditions. New development / redevelopments to be reviewed by RMO. #17, #18. Handling & Storage of organic solvent – Land Use Planning and New development / redevelopments to be reviewed by RMO. #19. Consumptive Water Takings – Through MOE PI (PTTW). #20. An activity that reduces the recharge of an aquifer – Proposed LID.</p>
<p>27. Figures: The figures appear to be out of order. Figure 6 requires a scale to outline the values of the recommend rate and the tested rate. Figure 3- site location map capture. Zone should include other identified potential significant drinking water threats.</p>	<p>We recognize this comment, which shall be incorporated as part of the Class EA Project File by way of this correspondence and which shall be addressed as part of any subsequent development driven planning and design documents (i.e. detailed hydrogeological studies completed in support of future PTTW applications or development applications).</p>
<p>Response To MTCS – Everett Secondary Plan Master Servicing Plan</p>	
<p>The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) has an interest in the conservation of cultural heritage resources including archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes.</p> <p>Although Stage 1 of an archaeological assessment was completed, but there was no mention of built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes either in the existing conditions or in the evaluation criteria for alternatives. Potential effects these resources should be identified and mitigated as part of the evaluation of alternatives. Checklists have been provided (<i>Screening for Impacts to Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</i>) to determine whether a cultural heritage impact assessment is necessary to identify potential undocumented built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.</p>	<p>In accordance with the MSP Process, alternative servicing solutions were developed for water, wastewater, stormwater and transportation infrastructure. Alternatives which appeared to be in keeping with the Problem / Opportunity Statement and the goals of the Everett Secondary plan and which did not have any obvious shortcomings, which might render the options infeasible, were short listed for further evaluation.</p> <p>As part of the final solution selection process, "short listed" alternative solutions were ranked against one another in relative terms for each of the evaluation criteria as follows: Natural Environment Impacts; Social / Cultural Environment Impacts; Technical/Operational Considerations; and, Economic Impacts.</p> <p>For each infrastructure Category, the solutions which scored the highest on the combined total of the above referenced evaluation criteria was chosen as the preferred solution.</p> <p>MTCS checklists have been filled out for Sanitary Master Servicing, Master Drainage Plan/Stormwater Management, transportation Master Plan, and Waster Servicing Master Plan, and no significant impacts to Heritage Features were noted for any of the preferred options.</p>