



Staff Report

Operations – Capital Projects Division

Report To: COW-Operations_Planning_and_Development_Services
Meeting Date: April 30, 2024
Report Number: CSOPS.24.026
Title: East Side Municipal Class EA Public Information Centre 2 Follow-up
Prepared by: Emily Yeo, Senior Infrastructure Capital Project Coordinator

A. Recommendations

THAT Council receive Staff Report CSOPS.24.026, entitled “East Side Municipal Class EA Public Information Centre 2 Follow-up”;

AND THAT Council adopt Alternative 2A as the Preferred Alternative (increase Thornbury Water Treatment Plant (WTP) capacity, construct a new WTP, at-grade reservoir, and Booster Pumping Station at Site 2/5, and twin watermain from Site 2/5 to Happy Valley Reservoir and from Happy Valley Reservoir to East of pressure Zone 4);

B. Overview

This report outlines the comments received in relation to the second Public Information Centre (PIC) held virtually on March 20, 2024, for the East Side Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) and is seeking Council approval to adopt the Preferred Alternative.

C. Background

In 2019, the Town completed a Town-Wide Water Distribution System Master Plan. This study identified the need for a subsequent Schedule ‘B’ and ‘C’ MCEA to address water storage and water supply needs in the eastern pressure zones in the Town, including the approximate settlement areas of Craigleith, Swiss Meadows, Castle Glen, and Osler Bluff.

The purpose of this project is to evaluate options and select the Town’s water supply and east-side water storage needs and to enable the construction of municipal water infrastructure which will meet the Town’s immediate, long-term, and build-out needs.

In 2021, the Town initiated the East Side Water Supply and Storage MCEA and retained engineering consultant, JL Richards Ltd., to lead the project. As part of the project scope, Town staff identified the need for two PICs.

On March 1, 2022, staff presented Staff Report [CSOPS.22.018](#) entitled “East Side Water Supply and Storage MCEA PIC 1” for direction to proceed with PIC 1. Following direction from Council, the first PIC was held virtually on March 24, 2022, for residents and stakeholders to ask questions and provide comments to Town Staff. The public feedback from PIC 1 was provided in Staff Report [CSOPS.22.051](#) entitled “East Side Water Supply and Storage Class MCEA PIC 1 Follow-up” submitted to Committee of the Whole on June 27, 2022.

On February 27, 2024, staff presented Staff Report [CSOPS.24.015](#) entitled “East Side Municipal Class EA Public Information Centre 2” for direction to proceed with PIC 2. At that time, staff presented four reasonable potential solutions to address the deficiencies in providing treated water from the Thornbury WTP to the eastern pressure zones as well as storage deficiencies in pressure Zone 4 and 5:

- Alternative 1A – Increase Thornbury WTP Capacity and Build Storage at Site 2/5
- Alternative 1B – Increase Thornbury WTP Capacity and Build Storage at Site 9
- Alternative 2A – New Craigleith WTP and Storage at Site 2/5
- Alternative 3C – Increase Supply from Collingwood and Storage at Site 12.

After considering the environmental, technical, social, and economical impacts of each alternative, Town Staff have concluded that **Alternative 2A – New Craigleith WTP and Storage at Site 2/5** has the highest positive impact and therefore has been presented as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative.

Following the direction from Council, the second PIC was hosted virtually on March 20, 2024, for residents and stakeholders to ask questions and provide feedback to Town Staff.

D. Analysis

The comments received from residents and stakeholders in response to the Notice of PIC (issued February 28, 2024) and during the virtual PIC held on March 20, 2024, from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. were addressed at the PIC. Staff allowed an additional follow-up comment period of two weeks after the virtual PIC was held. All comments were addressed and summarized in Attachment #1 TBM East Side MCEA Public Information Centre 2 Summary and Attachment #2 JLR East Side MCEA Public Information Centre 2 Summary. All attendees were required to pre-register with the Town. There were 20 attendees at the PIC.

The public feedback indicated that of those attendees that responded, the majority shared a common concern related to the location and depth of the potential water intake for the proposed new WTP and runoff affecting water quality (i.e. snow making additives, water turbidity, etc.) in the Craigleith area. As a result, JLR clarified that additional studies will be conducted prior to the selection of the new intake if Alternative 2A is selected and advanced. Some of these studies include water quality sampling, bathymetry surveys, an ecological assessment, and an intake protection study to inform future source water protection work.

The following were the primary concerns:

1. **New WTP Intake** – There was a common concern regarding the location and impact of the intake for the potential WTP, as well as runoff affecting water quality in the Craighleith area where the intake is currently being proposed. If Alternative 2A is selected, additional studies will be conducted before the location of a new intake is selected and advanced. These studies include water quality sampling, bathymetry surveys, an ecological assessment, and an intake protection study to inform future source water protection work.
2. **Sharing Water Supply with the Town of Collingwood** – There was an interest in sharing a water supply with the Town of Collingwood, as they are currently in the process of constructing a new WTP. As a part of the East Side MCEA, the Town investigated a regional water supply through Alternative 3C and worked with the Town of Collingwood to investigate the opportunity for a regional supply model that could work as a long-term solution. After evaluating the environmental, technical, social, and economic impacts of each alternative, Alternative 3C was not chosen as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative. Alternative 3C would have required long-term agreements to increase the water supply and conveyance from the Collingwood WTP, limiting the potential for phasing construction. Alternative 3C was also found to have a comparable Class D cost estimate to Alternative 2A for similar infrastructure upgrades, as Alternative 2A would cost \$66M +/- 30% for upgrades to Thornbury WTP, a new intake pipe, a new WTP, a new reservoir, a new Booster Pumping Station, and 6.5 km of watermain twinning while Alternative 3C would cost \$61M +/- 30% for upgrades to Thornbury WTP, a new reservoir, a new Booster Pumping Station, 14.5 km of watermain twinning, and cost sharing for the construction of the Collingwood WTP. As the timing and costing of distribution upgrades and ultimate expansion of Collingwood's WTP is unfinalized and would be contingent on Collingwood and partner municipalities.
3. **Future Development Incorporation** – There was a common concern related to current developments and whether they were included in the growth projections for the study. The East Side MCEA considered growth projections for future areas reserved for draft plan approvals. The Study also considered Official Plan Designated Lands with application and Official Plan Designated Lands without an application. Growth projections were based on the best available information and changes to estimated growth projections were closely monitored and updated as required.
4. **Costing for the Additional Infrastructure** – There was an inquiry about what infrastructure upgrades are included in the Class D estimate (+/- 30%) presented at the second PIC. The cost estimate includes the construction of a new WTP, a new at-grade reservoir, watermain upgrades to convey water from Site 2/5 to the Happy Valley Reservoir and further to pressure Zone 4, and capacity upgrades at the Thornbury WTP.

The recording of the second PIC and Q&A period is available on the project webpage, along with the presentation slide deck. A link to the project webpage can be found below.

[East Side Water Storage Environmental Assessment | Town of The Blue Mountains, ON](#)

Next Steps

Once provided further direction from Council, JLR and Town Staff will proceed with Phase 3 and 4 of the East Side MCEA for Alternative 2A. Another PIC will be held during Phase 3 of the project.

E. Strategic Priorities

1. Communication and Engagement

We will enhance communications and engagement between Town Staff, Town residents and stakeholders.

2. Organizational Excellence

We will continually seek out ways to improve the internal organization of Town Staff and the management of Town assets.

3. Community

We will protect and enhance the community feel and the character of the Town, while ensuring the responsible use of resources and restoration of nature.

4. Quality of Life

We will foster a high quality of life for full-time and part-time residents of all ages and stages, while welcoming visitors.

F. Environmental Impacts

The Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (Act) sets out a planning and decision-making process to ensure that potential environmental effects are considered before a project is implemented. The purpose of the Act is to provide for the protection and conservation of the natural environment (R.S.O. 1990, c.E.18, s.2).

Significant alterations to municipal infrastructure require a Class Environmental Assessment. The Class Environmental Assessment takes into consideration the impacts and the solutions on the natural and cultural environment. The level of impacts in each option are weighed against other impacts such as cost. Options for mitigating natural and cultural impacts (such as historic significance) are also put forth.

G. Financial Impacts

A Class D estimate (+/- 30%) for the capital construction cost of Alternative 2A was presented and discussed during the second PIC. Alternative 2A has an estimated capital cost of \$66M for all infrastructure upgrades related to the intermediate, long-term, and build-out needs of the eastern pressure zones.

Phase 3 and Phase 4 of the East Side Water Storage and Distribution EA will be mainly funded by Water Development Charges.

H. In Consultation With

Jason Petznick, Communications Coordinator

Allison Kershaw, Manager of Water and Wastewater Services

Sam Dinsmore, Acting Director of Finance/Treasurer

I. Public Engagement

The topic of this Staff Report has been the subject of two Public Information Centre's; PIC 1 which took place on March 24th, 2022, and PIC 2 which took place on March 20th, 2024. Those who provided comments at either Public Information Centre, including anyone who has asked to receive notice regarding this matter, has been provided notice of this Staff Report. Any comments regarding this report should be submitted to Emily Yeo, Senior Infrastructure Capital Project Coordinator icpc@thebluemountains.ca.

PIC 1 was held in accordance with the following schedule:

- March 3, 2022 Notice of Study Commencement and Notice of PIC 1 advertised in Collingwood Connection;
- March 3, 2022 Notice of Study of Commencement and Notice of PIC 1 mailed to Stakeholders;
- March 17, 2022 Notice of Study of Commencement and Notice of PIC 1 advertised in Collingwood Connection;
- March 1, 2022 Committee of the Whole – Initial Staff Report CSOPS.22.018 with recommendation to proceed to public consultation;
- March 14, 2022 Council – Recommendations from March 1, 2022 Committee of the Whole confirmed;
- March 24, 2022 Virtual PIC 1 held;
- June 27th, 2022, Committee of the Whole – Staff Report CSOPS.22.051 East Side Water Supply and Storage Class MCEA PIC 1 Follow-up.

PIC 2 was held in accordance with the following schedule:

- February 27, 2024, Committee of the Whole – Initial staff report CSOPS.24.015 East Side Municipal Class EA Public Information Centre 2 with recommendation to proceed to public consultation;
- February 28, 2024, Public Information Centre 2 Notice posted;
- March 11, 2024, Council – recommendation from Committee of the Whole considered by Council;
- Wednesday, March 20, 2024, PIC 2 held virtually from 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm.

- April 30th, 2024, Committee of the Whole – Staff Report CSOPS.24.026 East Side Municipal Class EA Public Information Centre 2 Follow-up with recommendation to adopt Alternative 2A as the Preferred Alternative for the East Side MCEA.

Any comments regarding this report should be submitted to Emily Yeo, Senior Infrastructure Capital Project Coordinator icpc@thebluemountains.ca.

J. Attached

1. Attachment 1 TBM East Side MCEA Public Information Centre 2 Summary
2. Attachment 2 JLR East Side MCEA Public Information Centre 2 Summary

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Yeo
Senior Infrastructure Capital Project Coordinator

Pruthvi Desai
Manager of Capital Projects

Jeffery Fletcher
Acting Director of Operations

For more information, please contact:
Emily Yeo, Senior Infrastructure Capital Project Coordinator
icpc@thebluemountains.ca
519-599-3131 extension 304

Report Approval Details

Document Title:	CSOPS.24.026 East Side Municipal Class EA Public Information Centre 2 Follow-up.docx
Attachments:	- Attachment 1 TBM East Side MCEA Public Information Centre 2 Summary.pdf - Attachment 2 JLR East Side MCEA Public Information Centre 2 Summary.pdf
Final Approval Date:	Apr 12, 2024

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

No Signature found

Pruthvi Desai - Apr 12, 2024 - 1:51 PM

Jeff Fletcher - Apr 12, 2024 - 2:47 PM

No Signature found

Shawn Everitt - Apr 12, 2024 - 4:01 PM



Town of The Blue Mountains

32 Mill Street, Box 310
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0
Phone: 519-599-3131 Fax: 519-599-7723
www.thebluemountains.ca

Date: April 4, 2024

Re: East Side Water Storage and Supply Environmental Assessment - Public Information Centre #2

This memo is intended to provide a summary of the questions, comments and answers that were received prior to, or asked during, the Public Information Centre (PIC) held on March 20, 2024. The PIC was held virtually on Microsoft Teams from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. A total of 20 individuals attended the meeting including Town staff and the project team.

Included below is a summary of the primary themes heard throughout the PIC, as well as a table with the verbatim written questions and comments that were submitted before and after the meeting. To see all of the questions and comments that were brought forward during the PIC, please [view the full recording of the meeting](#).

1. Location of proposed Craigleith Water Treatment Plant (WTP) intake

Concerns were raised regarding impacts of runoff in Craigleith, and attendees were seeking more information regarding the process and studies that would need to be completed prior to selecting a location for an intake for the proposed new Craigleith WTP.

Staff/Consultant Response: If the preliminary preferred alternative for the new Craigleith WTP is selected and advanced, additional studies would be required and conducted prior to the selection of a new intake location (e.g. water quality sampling program, bathymetric survey, ecological assessments, intake protection study to inform and support future source water protection work for the new intake, etc.). Easements may also need to be granted for the installation and maintenance of the intake, however more information regarding these would not be available until a final route is determined.

2. Regional approach for drinking water

Commenters has questions regarding the possibility of pursuing a more regional approach for water servicing given the commitment that the Town of Collingwood has made to increasing the capacity of its Water Treatment Plant.

Staff/Consultant Response: Several alternatives were evaluated as part of this study to address the water supply deficiencies in the Town's eastern pressure zones, including expanding the existing Thornbury WTP, building a new WTP in Craigleith, and increasing the supply from Collingwood's expanded WTP. Further information regarding the evaluated alternatives, including Alternative 3C – Increase water supply from Collingwood, is provided in the Staff Report CSOPS.24.015 and the Draft Project File Report for this study, available on the town's project web page.

3. Future water supply requirements for proposed developments

Commenters had questions regarding how future growth projections were considered through the modeling used to inform the study.

Staff/Consultant Response: The study's growth projections considered future areas reserved for draft plan approvals, are on Official Plan Designated Lands with application, or are Official Plan Designated Lands without an application. Growth projections were based on the best available information – changes to estimated growth projections were closely monitored throughout the study and updated as required.

4. Estimated costs and funding for identified projects

Commenters had questions regarding when elements were included in the Class D estimate (+/- 30%) and how much of the proposed upgrades were eligible to be funded by development charges. There were also questions regarding the additional staff costs that would be required to run a second WTP.

Staff/Consultant Response: Cost estimates include capacity upgrades at the Thornbury WTP, construction of the new Craigleith WTP and at-grade reservoir, watermain upgrades to convey water from Site 2/5 to the Happy Valley Reservoir and further to Pressure Zone 4. Given that the proposed infrastructure included in this project is related to growth, the Town would have the opportunity to utilize and collect development charges to fund the work. The Town's staffing levels are determined based on what it takes to make the water safe and distribute it to users. As additional infrastructure comes online, it's expected that more staff will be needed to maintain and operate the Town's water system. However, new technology and automation systems means that increases to staffing levels can be kept within reason.

Written Comments Received

<p>George Powell Emailed 3/1/2024</p>	<p>As I am sure you aware Collingwood is planning to expand its water treatment plant on a tight site and using ultra filtration water treatment a very costly treatment process. It was put in when the Town thought the raw water had a bacterial problem Giardia and cryptosporidium , this was never proven and I don't believe the Town test for the presence of these bacteria in their water supply. Would it not be prudent for the two Towns to look into a Regional system taking water from the Bay?</p>
<p>Pamela Spence Emailed 3/5/2024</p>	<p>I highlighted in my November 2023 power point Deputation concerns regarding erosion, volume and water quality of the runoff in numerous watercourses between Osler Rd and Northwinds Beach in the Craigleith area and the impact this runoff is having on Nottawasaga Bay. I have asked for this area and problem to be added to and studied within the Stormwater Natural Infrastructure Project (pg. 53) in the Town's 2024 Budget. I would like to reiterate these concerns to TBM staff and reinforce the necessity to study Nottawasaga Bay in Craigleith ahead of considering this area as a potential water intake location for the East Side project.</p> <p>As you may recall I made the case that the massive and dangerous runoff in Craigleith is much more than a freshet or spring occurrence. I presented visual examples from April to October 2023 of multiple occurrences of fast and dirty water in numerous Craigleith watercourses originating at the Escarpment carrying heavy plumes of soil stretching far into, out and down Nottawasaga Bay. I have included another example of additional erosion on February 27-28, 2024. I have not recorded every and all erosion incidents but offer a sampling.</p> <p>This erosion is my real-world example of the grave concern about and impacts from climate change aptly identified in the Town's Official Plan Review Background Paper entitled Environment and Climate Change, namely, that heavy rains and erosion will be an increasing occurrence in TBM.</p> <p>As winters warm and ski resort operators rely more and more on artificial snow making, there will be much more water running off all ski slopes when the snow melts. Estimates are that artificial snow has 50% or more water content versus 7-15% water content in natural snow. Snowmaking is done with inherent chemicals, bacteria and, periodically, fertilizer which lowers the temperature to preserve snow for races and skiing in general. The impact of this highly charged snow when it melts on the quality of our water is unknown. I am concerned that, combined with climate changes, the impact of artificial snow will be exponentially greater than the impact of natural snow melt.</p> <p>Currently, the principle drinking water intake is in Thornbury. According to staff and logic the quality of the water at Thornbury is not noticeably affected by any snowmaking operations in Craigleith which are 15 km to the south when predominant winds are from the north.</p> <p>However, the proposed East Side Water Storage and Supply project identifies Craigleith near Northwinds Beach as a future drinking water intake location. There have been large plumes of runoff stretching out from Northwinds Beach (watercourse 11) multiple times per year. As I reminder, I provide a set of photos of the dirty runoff and extensive plume from one sample date being June 26, 2023.</p> <p>Shockingly, the Town's Official Plan Review does not highlight or identify Craigleith as a location for Source Water Protection (TBM 2016 Official Plan Section C4). That must be changed.</p> <p>Ahead of determining a suitable location for water intake, now is the time to study and determine if the impacts of volume, turbidity, bedload, and chemical content of the runoff from the Craigleith watercourses will be detrimental to any future drinking water intake.</p> <p>Furthermore, the concern I highlighted also asked that the watercourses in Craigleith be studied under the Stormwater Natural Infrastructure Project in order to determine the impact of erosion and sedimentation to the banks of the watercourses, the shoreline as well as the effect the bedload and silt in the runoff has on the waterfowl, aquatic life, algae, vegetative growth, and infilling of the bottom of Nottawasaga Bay.</p>

	<p>The Town expressed interest at the time of my deputation that these concerns were real and I would ask that that concern be turned into action. The study is critical to determining the feasibility and viability of considering the water in the Craigleith area for drinking purposes.</p> <p>I am out of the country March 20, 2024, the date of the public meeting, but am circulating these comments and ask them to be read at the meeting on my behalf. Please keep me apprised of any developments, decisions and next steps on this important project.</p> <p>Thank you for considering making the study of the Craigleith watercourses a part of the East Side Water Project.</p>
--	---

MEMO

Date: April 9, 2024

To: Emily Yeo, Town of The Blue Mountains

From: Jane Wilson, J.L. Richards & Associates Limited

CC: Gillian Pfeiffer, J.L. Richards & Associates Limited
Allison Kershaw, akershaw@thebluemountains.ca
Jason Petznick, jpetznick@thebluemountains.ca

Subject: Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) for Drinking Water Storage and Supply
Deficiencies in the Town's East Pressure Zones
Public Information Centre No. 2 – Summary Memorandum (R0)

JLR No.: 31000-003

1.0 Public Information Centre Summary

The second Public Information Centre (PIC) for the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) for Drinking Water Storage and Supply Deficiencies in the Town's East Pressure Zones was held virtually on March 20, 2024 starting at 5:00 p.m. The purpose of this PIC was to present the preliminary preferred alternative (Alternative 2A – Build a new WTP and storage facility on Arrowhead Road near Highway 26) and gather input from stakeholders, rightsholders, and residents.

A Notice of PIC was prepared by the consulting team and distributed prior to the PIC. A copy of the PIC Notice is provided in Appendix A. The Notice was issued via the following means:

- Placed on the Town's website the week of February 26, 2024.
- Mailed and e-mailed to review agencies, developers, Indigenous communities, and other stakeholders the weeks of February 26 and March 4, 2024.
- Placed in two (2) issues of the local newspaper (Blue Mountains Review) starting the week of February 26, 2024.

During the PIC, a presentation was held explaining the project (refer to Appendix B). A question-and-answer period was held following the presentation and representatives from the consulting team and Town staff were available to answer questions through the duration of the PIC. The PIC, including the question-and-answer period was recorded and is available on the Town's project webpage.

Both verbal and written comments received from attendees prior to, during, and following the PIC were noted by the consulting team and are summarized in Section 2.0 of this memo.

2.0 Public Information Centre Comments

The tables below provide a summary of verbal and written comments received prior to or asked during the second PIC. Refer to Appendix C for a copy of any written correspondence received from the second PIC.

Table 1. Public Stakeholder Comments Received Prior to and During Public Information Centre 2

Comment No.	Project Component	Comment	Answers and Follow up Required/Action
Public Commenter 1	Future Development	Inquired when water will be supplied to the developments of Castle Glen, Osler Bluff, and Swiss Meadows.	Water is currently supplied to the Swiss Meadows development. Servicing of Osler Bluff and Castle Glen is dependent on developer timelines, however these developers were incorporated into the MCEA under build-out conditions.
Public Commenter 2	Future Development	Noted concerns on the impact of the Castle Glen development on springs. The commenter also inquired if pipes built to service Castle Glen will cross private property.	A Class Environmental Assessment Addendum for the Castle Glen Development is being undertaken by others; these comments will be relayed to the consultant undertaking this work.
Public Commenter 3	Future Development	Inquired on how the future water supply requirements for proposed developments were incorporated into the study.	The growth projections considered future areas reserved for draft plan approvals, are on Official Plan Designated Lands with application, or are Official Plan Designated Lands without an application. Growth projections were based on the best available information – changes to estimated growth projections were closely monitored throughout the study and updated as required.
Public Commenter 4	Preliminary Preferred Alternative	Inquired on if the new intake pipe will cross through Craigeith Provincial Park.	The routing of the proposed intake pipe will be confirmed during the subsequent Schedule C EA.
Public Commenter 5	Preliminary Preferred Alternative	Raised concerns about the water quality and impacts of runoff and erosion at the proposed Craigeith intake location.	<p>Additional studies will be conducted prior to the selection of a new intake if Alternative 2A is selected and advanced (e.g., water quality sampling, bathymetry surveys, ecological assessment, intake protection study to inform future source water protection work, etc.).</p> <p>In addition to intake studies, archaeological, and ecological field studies would be conducted for the new Craigeith WTP site. Archaeological, cultural heritage, and ecological studies may also be required for the existing Thornbury WTP site before upgrades are undertaken.</p>
Public Commenter 6	Preliminary Preferred Alternative	Inquired on how the Town will regulate ski hill runoff in Craigeith.	The new Craigeith WTP will require a Source Protection Plan, which will dictate what activities are allowed within the Intake Protection Zone (IPZ) surrounding the new intake. Activities within the IPZ that can

Comment No.	Project Component	Comment	Answers and Follow up Required/Action
			impact the intake and drinking water may be mitigated or restricted. Additionally, water quality sampling will be conducted prior to the location of the intake being selected.
Public Commenter 7	Preliminary Preferred Alternative	Inquired on how issues of high turbidity in the water system will impact the cost of water.	The intake pipe will be offshore and is anticipated to be less impacted by high turbidity following rainfall events and instances of runoff and erosion. The WTP can be equipped to treat for high levels of turbidity; the type of technology implemented at the WTP will be confirmed during the subsequent Schedule C MCEA. If membrane technology is selected as preferred, high turbidity events may require the membranes to require cleaning; if high turbidity events happen frequently this could increase the cost of cleaning chemicals used to clean the membranes.
Public Commenter 6	Preliminary Preferred Alternative	Questions were received regarding the breakdown of project costs.	The commenter was referred to the cost breakdown outlined in the presentation. Additional details on costing are provided in the Draft Project File Report posted on the project webpage: https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/municipal-infrastructure-projects/east-side-water
Public Commenter 7	Preliminary Preferred Alternative	Inquired on the annual costs of running two WTPs.	There may be a need for additional staffing to run and maintain a second WTP, however, additional operations staff will be required as the Town grows regardless of the number of plants.
Public Commenter 8	Alternative Evaluation	Suggested that a regional water supply that considers the existing agreement between the Town of Collingwood and the Town of The Blue Mountains be considered.	As part of this study, the Town investigated a regional water supply through Alternative 3C – Increase Supply from Collingwood and worked with Collingwood to investigate the opportunity for a regional supply.
Public Commenter 9	General	Inquired on the timelines of sewage and drinking water infrastructure upgrades.	The capacity of both the sanitary and drinking water systems are actively monitored, however they are not currently built to the same scale. Depending on the area, there will be different system constraints in the water and sewer systems.

Table 2. Agency Stakeholder Comments Received Prior to and During Public Information Centre 2

Stakeholder	Project Component	Comment	Answers and Follow up Required/Action
MTO	Preliminary Preferred Alternative	Inquired on if the preliminary preferred alternative crosses the Highway 26 right-of-way (ROW).	The routing of the proposed intake pipe will be confirmed during the subsequent Schedule C MCEA, however the intake will be required to cross the Highway 26 ROW. JLR will continue to engage with MTO as this project progresses.
Town of Collingwood	Alternative Evaluation	A representative from the Town of Collingwood inquired on if project phasing for the preliminary preferred alternative was considered.	Additional information was provide to the Town on phasing by the consultant for discussion with the Town of Collingwood.
MNRF	Environmental Impacts	The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) provided information and relevant policies and legislation to guide the identification of natural features and resources in the project area.	These comments were noted by the project team.

J.L. RICHARDS & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Prepared by:



Jane Wilson, M.Sc., P.Eng.
Associate, Municipal Infrastructure and Planning Market Chief