Date: June 7, 2024

Re: Wastewater Master Plan - Public Information Centre #1

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 May 23, 2024. The PIC was held virtually on Microsoft Teams beginning at 5:00 p.m. A total of 23 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. Impact on Clarksburg Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comments were received inquiring about whether or not the Wastewater Master Plan would provide an opportunity to pursue the preferred alternative solution found through the <u>2019 Clarksburg Master Plan EA</u>. The preferred alternative found through this EA was to extend municipal water and gravity sewer services throughout the entire community of Clarksburg.

Staff/Consultant Response: The Wastewater Master Plan is not intended to supersede any other studies that are focused on a more specific area of the Town, however it will incorporate the findings of these studies. According to provincial policy, and with the exception of growth-related expansions, the costs of maintaining and growing water and wastewater systems are to be paid by the users of the system. While full servicing of Clarksburg was identified as the preferred alternative through the Clarksburg Master Plan, the Town is unable to pursue this alternative at this time as the costs are not considered affordable within the guidelines of the Town's Affordability Policy. The Town will only be able to pursue servicing of Clarksburg if there is a way found to reduce costs or there is some other source of funding made available by the provincial or federal governments.

## 2. Calculation of persons per household

Comments were received regarding the Town's method of calculating users per unit/household. Some asked specifically about how the potential for Accessory Dwelling Units was being factored in, and others thought that the Town's calculation of 2.15 users per unit seemed low.

Staff/Consultant Response: The Town's calculation of users per unit is based on the 2021 census data. The calculations could be slightly distorted by the fact that there are a number of properties within the Town that are not listed as anyone's primary place of residence. This leads to those properties being assigned a value of "0" users in the calculations. The Town's infrastructure is sized in a manner that it would be able to accommodate the additional flow from these residences and from any Accessory Dwelling Units in the locations where those units are likely to be constructed. Additionally, as part of this Master Plan, flow monitoring was conducted in areas of Town with high numbers of short-term accommodations to determine the appropriate design criteria for assessing equivalent unit counts for a variety of different types of users.

#### 3. Future growth projections

Comments were received regarding the method of calculating future growth projections and whether they were based only on current development applications.

Staff/Consultant Response: Future growth projections are based on full build out of all of the developable land within the Town's urban settlement area boundaries, excluding lands designated as secondary plan areas. The actual number of proposed units will be considered for any development that has already gone through the Town's Site Plan Approval Process. For any developable land that does not have an active

application, a standard number of units per hectare is used based on available data.

#### **Written Comments Received**

## Fiona Orr Emailed 5/23/2024

Hi, I thank you very much for sending me the link. I tried very hard to get back in for one more question to address to the town which is that based on the report out of the EA done associated with Clarksburg in 2019 and I'm sure it's report is not different than other jurisdictions associated with this plan.

Unlike many of the other communities that address this master plan as they are residential, but Clarksburg is not just residential ...it's a business community and it needs to be thriving just like Thornbury just up the street that's what I'm advocating for ...

In the meantime, The township of Tiny across the bay ... has a six year turnover review of all residental septic and water systems. Why does the Town of BM not have this in place particularly given the results of the EA associate with Clarksburg in 2019?

One can continue to master plan these things for a long time, but in the meantime, you need to put in place systems that put reality in the face of citizens associated dealing with water and waste water problems.

Expensive they may be, but they need to be addressed. I really appreciate Alison and her team. They're doing the best they can but they need more staff and other help. A lot of help. Lmk who I should talk to.

### Fiona Orr

**Fmailed** 

# 5/28/2024

thank you so much for your response as well as that of the input provided by Tim and his office.

Having briefly reviewed the response, I guess, I am therefore a little confused as to why Clarksburg would not move forward with implementing a mandatory inspection system of Septic beds and, perhaps as appropriate, well inspection given that it appears to me TBM has already has been designated by the town itself as part a mandatory area for protection of source drinking water.

I attach below a current photograph of the sign posted on the Beaver river bridge in downtown Clarksburg, which I believe it's been there for a while.

"What is a drinking water protection zone? A drinking water protection zone may be a wellhead protection area (WHPA) around a municipal well (groundwater source from aquifers) or an intake protection zone (IPZ) around a municipal intake (a surface-water source"

In addition, it's my understanding that the area is under the authority of the grey suable conservation authority and septic bed permits will not be issued by the Town for the construction for a septic Bed system without prior approval by the authority.

Once again, highlighting the importance of the integrity of the drinking water in this protection zone.

As a reminder, and as I recall, the environmental assessment conducted for Clarksburg in 2019 stated of those Wells tested 28% contained some form of bacterial contamination. Also, back in 2019, a significant number of the septic beds in the community were identified to then be at or near the end of their useful life, which is typically 30 years.

Given the posted signage, and the EA report of 2019, while possibly unpleasant, I would suggest that the town has no alternative but to bring forward whatever appropriate next steps are to council to institute a complete and proper inspection of community water and waste water systems. I continue to refer to the six-year turnover inspection system currently done out of the township of tiny across the bay as one example.

One takeaway from the meeting for the new master plan EA related to water and waste water needs for TBM held just recently is that based on current cost projections, and without more support from the province or other funding sources, the town is simply not financially able to proceed to install the

	preferred recommended option from the existing EA for clarksburg. Likely other areas as well. The least preferred option stated in the report from 2019 was to do nothing.
	Given this, I would suggest it's appropriate for town to take additional next steps to protect the integrity of the protection zone of clarksburg drinking water sources, while it continues to explore any and all funding so that it can.
	I look forward to hearing from you or others as appropriate and I thank you for continuing to discuss this matter. I would be happy to help in anyway that I can.
Richard Lamperstorfer	Good afternoon,
Emailed 5/31/2024	1) Do the 'D' zoned (individual) lots within West Thornbury settlement area (my 13 acres) have assigned UNITS number?(for future build out)
	or,
	2) is that determined by Grey County minimum UPH? (units per hectare, greenfield) and/or TBM UPH?
	and,
	3) Is there an 'as of right' to hook up to sewer and water for one new build, at my own expense, to the whole TBM water and sewer system, including ongoing cost and maintenance, back to the source?(pipe)

# **Public Information Centre Virtual Meeting Chat**

Julie Tipping	You mentioned the Campus of Care and what and where are the additional residents for Alice St. is Jane talking about as you commented at 1,400.
	I believe that the census was more than 2.1 per household. This was in 2021 there are more people per household on our street alone average of almost 3. This doesn't factor in STA numbers either.
Pamela Spence	With recent legislation any property can add, i believe, up to 3 additional dwelling units. Each unit could have 1 or two bathrooms. How has this potential been accounted for in your factoring? do you still use 2.5 persons per HH even tho more families are moving here per the Housing Needs Study potentially increasing uses?
	I understood that the new equipment at Grey Rd 21 is being sized such that it could handle Castle Glen. Is that true? if so is that expense coming from taxation from current taxpayers?
	Arising from your comment about sewage hauling, there were 4 long tankers lined up at Craigleith today. Do you quantify that in this analysis?
Alex Hahn	The presentation indicated an additional 960 units added to the Camperdown service area at full buildout. Where are these units being contemplated and are they based on current applications?
Brad Campbell	With the sewage plants at or near capacity, then a heavy rainfall - a) how does TBM monitor & notify re swimming safety b) how common is spillover? Sorry if this is the wrong forum for this!