

## **APPENDIX M**

### STAKEHOLDER CORRESPONDENCE





## 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

---

**Re: Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant Sewage Pumping Station EA - 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 PIC held on April 28, 2022. The PIC was held virtually on Microsoft Teams from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. A total of 24 individuals attended the meeting.

Included below is a summary of the primary concerns heard in the lead up to and throughout the PIC, as well as a detailed breakdown of the specific questions and comments.

- 1. Possibility of sanitary sewer servicing on un-serviced streets in the area around the Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant**
- 2. Potential for inclusion of failsafe measures to prevent sewage backups**
- 3. Likelihood of increased odours caused by proposed projects**
- 4. Possibility of redirecting the flow from the sanitary sewer that goes through the Timmons Easement to the sanitary sewer on Grey Road 21 and abandon the Timmons easement sewer**

### Comments Received Prior to the Public Information Centre

Karen Sweeney  
April 5, 2022

Need to know if sewers are planned for BROPHYS.

Thank you for your interest in the Environmental Assessment. The lift station at the Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant is necessary infrastructure required to service Craigleith area however, this project will not provide servicing to Brophy's Lane.

Robert Newman  
April 5, 2022

Looking forward to hearing the proposal and possibly raising a question or two of my own. One regarding leachate and it's removal from the Lakeshore site. The other regarding a "failsafe" system at the lift stations to prevent sewage backup.

The Town is looking at the options to build a sewage lift station at or in the vicinity of the Craigleith WWTP. A new lift station will take some of the pressure off the Craigleith Main Lift Station on Lakeshore Road. The Town is looking for an opportunity to relocate the septage receiving station at the same time. We understand the issues with the current lift station, and this seems like an excellent opportunity to build a facility that will work more effectively. The new lift station will be designed with future growth and the impacts of climate change incorporated.

Jeffrey Brydges  
April 18, 2022

Why has the Castle Glen Service Area been included and identified on the Study Area map, but not included in the description of the catchment area for the proposed sanitary sewer collection system, sewage lift station, and pumping infrastructure works?

I understand from the Nov 22 2021 town-wide water distribution system PIC that the Castle Glen Service Area was not identified on the Study Area Key Plan map.

What flows or equivalent units from the Castle Glen Service Area are included in the calculations for the sizing of the capacities of the pipes, pumps, and works?

If capacities for the Castle Glen Service Area are not included, then how is the Service Area to be serviced with both municipal water and sanitary sewer services?

We have included the anticipated flows coming from Castle Glen area in the Long Point Road Environmental Assessment (EA). Additionally, Castle Glen is included in the Water Storage and Supply EA as well. The Developer for Castle Glen is undertaking their own EA for water servicing, as their plans have differed from the original EA from 2006.

The Long Point Road EA is focused on considerations for a lift station that is adequately sized for the full build out of the sewer shed, including Castle Glen, installation a gravity sewer from Highway 26 north to the WWTP on Long Point Road and relocating the septic receiving station. We will not be considering the installation of the required sewers on Grey 19 to Castle Glen Estates. That is beyond the scope of this work. The 2006 EA did include the preferred option for sanitary servicing.

To the best of my knowledge, the anticipated build out of the Castle Glen area will be 2000 homes.

Cheryl Power  
April 19, 2022

Thank you for the confirmation. I have a quick question. Does this project mean in anyway that the area homes will eventually be moving from septic to sewer? (We own a home on Timmons)

The goal of this project is not to provide sanitary services to the Timmons area. The Timmons area will eventually be serviced through a local improvement project, however that is not currently in the 5-year plan.

Is there an opportunity to service properties on Timmons Street as part of this project? Will there be any development planned as a result of the project south of Timmons Street towards County Road 21.

This project is not intended to directly result in the extension of sanitary services. Property Owners in favour of a service extension project for the street may approach Council. Council can direct staff to pursue a project provided it meets the Towns affordability criteria. Benefitting residents would share the cost of the project. Residents may contact the Town's Planning & Development Department directly or view the [Planning & Development Projects webpage](#) for

current development projects. The Consultant is unaware of any developments proposed in this area as it is a regulated area.

Mike Spitzer

Indicated that he lives along the bay, and either was impacted by the sewer back-up around the Craigleith Sewage Pumping Station or was aware of it. He thought this project was a result of that back-up. He wanted to know if servicing was going to be extended along the waterfront as part of this project. He expressed some frustration that this was not completed when water was extended.

This project was not a result of the sewer back-up. This project is being undertaken to address growth and system efficiency. This project is not intended to directly result in the extension of sanitary services. Property Owners in favour of a service extension project for the street may approach Council. Council can direct staff to pursue a project provided it meets the Towns affordability criteria. Benefitting residents would share the cost of the project. This project is the prerequisite work to allow for any future extension and the Consultant is unaware of the conditions related to the water extension, but that water servicing was prioritized after Walkerton in some areas and without the Long Point Sanitary Sewer there may have not be an efficient way to service those properties.

James Ross

Timmons Street

Concerned that this project included providing communal sewers to Timmons Street. Resident indicated that he didn't want to see that happen.

This project is not intended to directly result in the extension of sanitary services. Property Owners in favour of a service extension project for the street may approach Council. Council can direct staff to pursue a project provided it meets the Towns affordability criteria. Benefitting residents would share the cost of the project.

Paul Fox

Wondering about sewers on Brophy's Lane. His septic has failed and he is in the process of replacing it.

This project is not intended to directly result in the extension of sanitary services. Property Owners in favour of a service extension project for the street may approach Council. Council can direct staff to pursue a project provided it meets the Towns affordability criteria. Benefitting residents would share the cost of the project.

Joe Luca

Is the Wastewater Treatment Plant being expanded, and will the Town be providing sewers on Brophy's Lane?

This project is not intended to directly result in extensions of sanitary servicing, but it may permit the future extension of services and that the standard approach is to coordinate with the Town and your neighbours to proceed to request a sewer extension from Council that would then be paid by the residents benefiting provided that it meets the affordability criteria. The rated capacity of the plant will not change from the current value. The actual plant size will not change,

however adding a lift station to the plant will allow for sewage to flow by gravity to the plant, then be lifted into the process.

### **Comments Received During the Public Information Centre**

Robert Newman

When the wastewater gets to the new lift station. What are the plans if there is a failure. What safeguards are there to prevent sewage backup in the line?

Pumping stations are designed with multiple redundancies in place including backup generators and multiple pumps to prevent backups. Sewers are also designed to allow for a buffer period for Town staff to respond in the event of a system failure.

Follow up: Is there a way to make this fail safe?

A level of design redundancy is maintained in terms of number of pumps and additional station capacity in accordance with Ministry of Environment guidelines.

Blair McDonnell

How can you ensure that the current odour problems will not become an issue at the WWTP?

The area surrounding the existing Craigleith Lift Station is periodically exposed to increased odour levels during septage receiving as the unloading zone is not in an enclosed facility. If the facility is moved to the Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant, the unloading zone could be moved to an enclosed location to minimize the amount of odour that could travel to the surrounding area. An enclosed facility would also allow for more odour-control measures to be put in place.

Alex Cumming

How long a process is this? How long before there would be a pipe in the ground to the proposed Castle Glen expansion and it would be hooked to the treatment plan?

This assessment is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2022. Upon completion, the Town could begin construction once budget is approved, and engineering design is completed. Installing sewer pipe to Castle Glen would have to go through a separate process of approvals and design.

Robert Newman

Am I to understand that the new site for leachate disposal will be changed from Craigleith Lift Station? Or you're not there yet?

If the preferred alternative is to relocate the station to the Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant, then the leachate would be trucked to that location and unloaded in the new facility there.

Follow up: Waste treatment plants have aerators, don't they?

Yes, wastewater treatment plants do have aeration facilities.

Alex Cumming

Is there a link to the 2006 EA for the Castle Glen pipe?

No, the 2006 EA document is not available on the Town's website, however it can be provided to you. This document was provided to the resident.

### **Comments Received Following the Public Information Centre**

George Powell

April 30, 2022

I question how you propose to handle wastewater from Castle Glen. What you mentioned at the meeting was pumping as part of the inflow. The flow from this development is large and could be handled by gravity. The cost of pumping forever is a significant cost. I believe this is an alternative solution and would make the sewer on Long Point Road a Schedule B MCEA.

The sanitary sewers from Castle Glen are anticipated to be gravity. The connection to existing sewers will be along Grey 21, just north of Grey Road 19, by Tees Please. The sewer on Grey 21 is all gravity, however, it currently takes a sharp left at Hwy 26 and goes to the Craigleith Main Lift Station. All flows to the Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant currently go through the Craigleith Main lift station, on Old Lakeshore Road, by Fraser Cres. The Long Point EA is to evaluate the options for three projects:

1. Installation of the gravity sewer north on Long Point Road to the plant - Schedule A
2. Relocate the septic receiving from the Craigleith Main lift station to the plant - Schedule A
3. Installation of the pump station, at or close to the plant - Schedule B

The reason the pumping station is required is to get the gravity flow up and into the plant. Currently the plant is only fed by a forcemain from the Craigleith Main Lift Station. We have no ability to lift up and into the plant right now.



## 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:** February 21, 2023

**Re:** Craigeith Wastewater Treatment Plant Sewage Pumping Station EA - 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 PIC held on January 26, 2023. The PIC was held virtually on Microsoft Teams from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. A total of 35 individuals attended the meeting.

Included below is a summary of the primary concerns heard in the lead up to and throughout the PIC, as well as a detailed breakdown of the specific questions and comments.

- 1. Concerns related to local impacts including increased traffic and the possibility of increased odours on Long Point Road and Brophy's Lane.**
- 2. Concerns related to the cost of the project and how it would be funded. Specifically, regarding the potential impacts of Bill 23 on the Town's ability to collect the Development Charges that are to fund the construction.**
- 3. Concerns regarding this project's relation to the Castle Glen Development Area.**

### **General Information Regarding the Potential Impacts of Bill 23 on this Project**

Bill 23 – also known as the “More Homes Built Faster Act” – will impact how the Town collects Development Charges, and how the Town is able to fund growth-related infrastructure expansion and replacement. The Town has not yet received complete details on the specific regulations around Development Charges that will be implemented through Bill 23.

### **General Information Regarding this Project's Relation to the Castle Glen Development Area**

Through the Town's Official Plan, the Castle Glen area is designated for resort development and includes special policy considerations envisioning 1,600 units, 300 hotel or commercial accommodation units, a maximum of 5,000 square metres of commercial uses, plus golf course(s) and other recreational uses and facilities. Importantly, such development or site alteration cannot occur until such time as further studies are completed, concept plans prepared, agreements entered into, and approvals of development applications such as a Zoning By-law Amendment, Site Plan Approval, and Plan of Subdivision and Plan of Condominium. Through these processes, the Town anticipates that residential unit counts and square footage for recreational and commercial spaces will become established. At this time, the Town does not have an active development application making it difficult to refine

estimates for growth in the area beyond what is noted in the Official Plan. The engineering design of this EA is being approached in such a way that the systems could accommodate the designated unit numbers assigned to Castle Glen through the Official Plan, in the case that it achieves full build out.

### **Comments Received in Advance of the Public Information Centre**

(Some questions have been edited for clarity and brevity)

How would the project be designed to address proper sizing and to prevent the potential of sewer back-ups?

All infrastructure will be designed with enough capacity to handle the full proposed build out of the service area based on the Town's Official Plan. The wastewater flow would be directed to the new pumping station proposed to be built on the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) site, and away from the Craigeith Main Sewage Lift Station where previous backups have occurred. Removing this load from the existing lift station would reduce the possibility of sewage backups occurring at that location, and the new pumping station proposed for the WWTP would be designed with redundancy built into its pumping capabilities. There would also be generators and installed to keep the facility running in the case of a power outage. The gravity sewer planned for Long Point Road could also be installed at a depth that would allow it to handle additional capacity if there was a failure at the pumping station.

Are there any road/intersection improvements planned to be completed at the same time? (i.e. roundabout at Lakeshore/Fraser and Highway 26, and Highway 26 and County Road 21)

The County and province have been looking at options for intersections in this area including a roundabout or signalized intersection, however no decisions have been made by the province or MTO.

According to the 2023 Wastewater Services report, the Craigeith Wastewater Treatment Plant is currently operating at 42% capacity. What is the best guess timeline and percentage of operating capacity required from the current treatment plant to meet the requirements of the development projects already approved on record with the Town?

The Town does not control the timelines for when certain developments will be completed and added into the wastewater system. The capacity listed in each year's Wastewater Services Report does take into account the developments that are connected, that have been allocated, and that are in reserve. The Town has done some preliminary work on what an expansion of the Craigeith WWTP would look like, but that work will not begin until the plant has reached 80% capacity.

Can you clarify how the preferred alternative solutions shown as C or B can best meet the needs of growth without having "quick fix" planning issues arise that may cause the Town to incur future costs?

The gravity sewer would be designed to handle the full anticipated build out capacity based on the Town's Official Plan. The "hard" infrastructure of the sewage pumping station including the wet well, inlet pipes and outlet pipes would also be designed for full build out. The "soft" infrastructure, such as the pumps, would be built to handle current capacity, with space allocated to add or upgrade additional pumps as additional units come online.

If the sewage pumping station is relocated to the Wastewater Treatment Plant property, what would happen to the land where the sewage pumping station is currently located?

The Craigleith Main Sewage Lift Station located on Lakeshore Road would not be removed or shut down through this project as it's required to service the Craigleith area. However, the EA has explored the possibility of relocating the septage receiving station from the Craigleith Main Sewage Lift Station to a new sewage lift station that would be located on the Craigleith WWTP site.

What are the estimated costs of construction and how will the work be funded?

The estimated costs of construction for each proposed alternative can be found in the PIC presentation slides. The cost of the preliminary preferred alternative is \$8.1 million. The project will be funded through Development Charges.

### **Comments Received During the Public Information Centre**

(Some questions have been edited for clarity and brevity)

The rapid growth of our area is putting huge demands on our infrastructure, and the need for improvements to our infrastructure going forward. When we look at some of the projections, we already have 20% more growth approved or pending approval than what is laid out in planning projections through 2046. This is excluding Castle Glen, so we're going to be way over those projections if Castle Glen were to come on board. If you look at the next decade or so, it seems to me that we could be above 15,000 units, as opposed to the plan for just under 8,000 units. Many people are asking not, "how all of these developments happen?" But rather, "should they all happen?" Considering the possible financing issues related to Bill 23, why is the Town looking at allocating upwards of \$8 to \$10 million towards a project, when at least 50% of the need is predicated on Castle Glen? Has the Town really stepped back and thought about a comprehensive planning analysis of what the Castle Glen development – the largest development in the history of the town or in reality, the history of the Niagara Escarpment – would mean from a financial, social and environmental perspective? If not, what can be done about this? And why are we investing right now with all these unknowns in front of us? Has the Town considered the water and sewage requirements for the plant without Castle Glen? – Bruce Harbinson

Not including any future development at Castle Glen, the Town is looking at an upcoming capacity issue at the Craigleith Main Sewage Lift Station based on development projects that are in the pipeline. Therefore, the Town needs to add capacity either by upgrading the Craigleith Lift Station, or by constructing a new lift station. Despite the fact that there is not a development application on record for the Castle Glen area, it would not be prudent

planning on the part of the Town to complete this project without considering the number of units that could be added by Castle Glen in the case that it achieves full build out.

Follow-up: Why does this EA specifically mention and consider Castle Glen, when other studies – including the Transportation Master Plan – not include mention of Castle Glen?

The Town's Transportation Master Plan was more of a high-level strategic plan, and did not get into detailed modeling of traffic in specific areas because the Town does not know the impact of traffic in those areas without having an active development application on record. This EA is considering the Castle Glen area because it's focused in to address a specific problem statement and area.

The presentation stated that archeological, soil and environmental assessments have been completed for the proposed project. Can you confirm that these assessments were completed for the Castle Glen portion of the project along County Road 19? If so, can these assessments be made public? - Tom Eisenhauer

The archaeological, soil and geotechnical work completed for this project includes the areas impacted by the proposed alternative solutions only which includes Long Point Road, Highway 26, Brophy's Lane and the Craigleith WWTP site.

Brophy's Lane residents currently experience a fairly strong odour from the Craigleith WWTP - do any of these plans address this issue? – Kathi Gray

There would be no additional odours expected for surrounding residents with the construction of a lift station on the WWTP property. Relocating the septage receiving station to the WWTP site would have the potential for bringing increased odours, but the Town is investigating construction options including odour control systems, planting of coniferous trees, and a fully enclosed receiving station to minimize the impacts to surrounding properties.

Alternative C makes the most sense however, will the plant be upgraded sufficiently to deal with odours properly? We too have smells near the sewage pumping station. I think the proper amount of dollars needs to be spent in order to update present and for future development. So, will this budget be chipped away and used for other projects and end up downgrading the new facility? – Robert Newman

(This question was received through the meeting chat, and the individual stated that it had been answered sufficiently by the response to the previous question.)

The presentation mentioned that one of the factors impacting the viability of Alternative B was traffic concerns at Lakeshore Road and Highway 26. The intersection of Highway 26, Long Point Road and Grey Road 21 is already very busy and potentially dangerous, and the preliminary preferred solution will only serve to make it more dangerous with trucks turning off of Highway

26 on to Long Point Road. I think The Blue Mountains, the Town of Collingwood and the MTO should get their act together and do something with that intersection before a disaster happens. – John Kirby

The Blue Mountains staff met on site in the summer of 2022 with senior officials from the MTO, Grey County, Simcoe County, and the Town of Collingwood to review that intersection. The MTO is looking at a roundabout or signalized intersection in that location, however a timeline for that installation is not clear at this point.

Assuming the EA is completed in April 2023, when is the Town anticipating to start construction of the chosen alternative and how long is the total construction anticipated to take? – Rebecca Alexander

The EA Report will be completed in April of 2023, and the preliminary design will be completed in the summer of 2023. There would be an additional waiting time of 18 months to receive Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks approval to move to construction. Including the Town's budget cycle, the earliest that this project would be moving to construction would be 2025 or 2026. In regard to construction, the work on Long Point Road is estimated to take 2-3 months, and the work on the WWTP site is estimated to take just over 12 months.

How many trucks are you planning for using the dumping station weekly upon completion, and then in 5 years? Will you be paving Brophy's Lane to accommodate the trucks? – Philip Watkins

The septage receiving station at the Craigeith Main Lift Station is currently receiving 4-5 trucks per day, with peaks up to 10 trucks per day depending on the time of year. The majority of the septage is coming from rural septic tanks and the Town's solid waste disposal site. The Town does not expect the volume of septage generated by those sources to grow too dramatically in the future. The Town's engineer is planning the design around paving and improving the road structure of Brophy's Lane between Long Point Road and the entrance to the WWTP.

What is the contingency plan for any leakage or spillage on site at the WWTP to prevent pollution to surrounding lands? – Carol

The pumping station would have designs in place to limit bypasses, including redundant pumps, backup generators and excess storage capacity in the sewer pipes. The septage receiving station would incorporate drains and catch basins that would capture any spillage and route it back into the WWTP.

For the record, I prefer Alternative C, but I have a question regarding funding. As we look at 2023, the Town has Capital Project management funds that are allocated for Development Charges of over \$17 million from 2023 to 2025. The town has \$32 million excess of Development Charges right now. Are there other funding sources other than just Development Charges that we can consider for this project since it will be a capital asset? Craigeith has

grown quite exponentially in the past few years, and is in need of parks, streets, and a lot of other items that can only be funded by Development Charges. We don't know what the economic timelines are for how fast the Development Charges accounts will recover as new developments come on board. I really think it should be mentioned in the report for staff to look at creative accounting or alternate sources of funding for consideration that would reduce the impact on current residents who need these other services. – Stephen Granger

Town staff are constantly looking for opportunities to secure alternative funding, and this project may be a good candidate for federal or provincial funding through grants to offset the costs.

Do the new capacity calculations account for new sewers for all the existing residents on Brophy's Lane and on the west side of Long Point Road, and does the new capacity take into account the Aquavil development? (this development was not referred to in the presentation) – Carol

The planning application for Aquavil has always assumed that the development would be serviced through the Craigleith Main Sewage Pumping Station. Any change to that plan at this point would have the potential to significantly hold up the development process, so it's not anticipated that the developer will change their servicing plan. The new gravity sewer on Long Point Road and the new lift station proposed for the WWTP site would have sufficient capacity for properties on Brophy's Lane and Long Point Road to be switched over to municipal services.

Are current residents going to pay for the sewage costs for new development? – E. Ward

No, the intent is for the construction costs of this project to be funded through Development Charges.

You touched on the fact that if pour soil or bedrock conditions were found at the WWTP, then Alternative D would be evaluated as the backup solution. Will a comprehensive geotechnical investigation be completed at the WWTP site prior to the Town's decision in April to confirm favourable conditions? – Justin L'Abbe

The geotechnical investigation has already been completed on the WWTP site, and the project engineer has found that the condition on the site is favourable.

Is it correct that treated waste is let into the Bay as water? Has this increased capacity forecast been studied as to the impact on the Bay? Also has the study team determined that there is sufficient water to do all this flushing and/or any impact on the water sources being the Bay as well? – Pamela Spence

The final effluent from the WWTP is discharged to Georgian Bay, and the Town holds an Environmental Compliance Approval. The Town's effluent has historically met or exceeded the ECA requirements for discharge into the natural environment. This data is available on

the Town's website, and is updated yearly in the Wastewater Services Report. The Town does have sufficient water supply for the area, and does not foresee any impacts on Georgian Bay.

#### Who pays for the sewage installation to Castle Glen? – John Kirby

In the event that a planning application comes forward for the Castle Glen area, and is approved, the developer would pay for their own servicing installation.

Thank you for the presentation and responses to our questions. It is clear that you have made plans to reduce the smell from dumping station from the current state. The issue we see is that you are taking a neighborhood that already has an odour problem from the WWTP, and adding odour to it. Furthermore, there will be the additional noise and pollution from the additional trucks at the WWTP. These changes will have a significant and negative impact on the neighborhood. What additional steps can you propose to mitigate this to ensure that this neighborhood remains livable? – Philip Watkins

The noise from the additional truck traffic will be mitigated through the proper reconstruction and paving of Brophy's Lane. In addition, the design of the proposed lift station and septage receiving station will prevent trucks from having to reverse which will minimize any potential associated beeping noises. The vegetation buffer between Brophy's Lane and the WWTP site will be disturbed through construction, so the goal will be to implement a more comprehensive buffering strategy through a future project that would see the addition of a berm and denser vegetation which would redirect the odours.

#### **Comments Received Following the Public Information Centre**

(Some questions have been edited for clarity and brevity)

Who is responsible for extending the services south of the Mountain Road/Grey Road 19 intersection on Grey Road 19, and does the Town have water and wastewater capacity for these developments? – Dave Rogowskey, Thursday, February 9

There are no capital projects at this time to extend the sewers and water further south on Grey Road 19. The servicing of this area will likely be driven by development demands and paid for by development charges. Property owners could potentially petition council for the sewers to be extended as a local improvement, but that work is outside of the scope of this project. The Craigeith WWTP is currently operating at 42% capacity based on the most recent Wastewater Services Report. The Town has done some preliminary work on what an expansion of the Craigeith WWTP would look like, but that work will not begin until the plant has reached 80% capacity. The Town also has a Municipal Class EA underway regarding Water Supply and Storage in the west pressure zones that cover this project area.

I attended this PIC on January 26 and am grateful for such a thorough review being given to this matter. I heartily support modifying the station such that its performance will be improved and the sources of material are reduced or redirected. To that end, the Alternative "C" seems to

make the most sense and that any improvements include the relocation of the "septage and leachate" receiving location. The Craighleith pumping station is not a safe or efficient location to have long trucks turning on to/off of Highway 26 when there are 500+ new houses and associated vehicles expected in this area. Removing this service to the WWTP makes logical sense. It is more remote, safer for the truckers, can be built to better standards, and will reduce the negative impact of this service. I do think the project should include a light or roundabout at Grey Road 21 and Highway 26, and better road surface on Long Point. Finally, I think it is folly to invest in services for Castle Glen at this time. It is too old, too uncertain and too controversial to understand the implications. Furthermore the Town should ask the developer to create its own water supply and treatment facilities and keep their waste on their site. Many remote developments in other counties provide their own. – Pamela Spence

Relocating the septage receiving station to the treatment plant gives the Town an opportunity to build it properly, and provide a safe and effective way of receiving these waste streams. Alternative "C" is the most cost-effective way of moving sewage to the treatment plant, and will be the easiest for the operators to maintain and operate. It also considers sharing of some utilities. Unfortunately, the scope of work for this EA did not include improvements to the traffic flow at the Grey Road 21/Highway 26 intersection. That is a very significant project involving two Counties, two Towns and the Province. This EA will identify options to improve the Town road by the actual treatment plant and address the preferred alternative to deliver both septage and sewage to the plant. When we consider installing a sewer and a pumping station, the Town needs to consider all lands that potentially could feed into the sewer shed. The road construction required for the installation of sewer is a significant cost. The actual pipe is a very small percentage of the cost. To upsize the pipe during the initial installation is minuscule in comparison to the cost to replace a pipe that may be deemed too small in 20 or 30 years. The Town would not be doing its due diligence to overlook a potential development like Castle Glen with this project. We have considered Castle Glen in the same way as all properties within the sewer shed with development potential. Using the Official Plan, we look at the potential density of all developmental properties that could feed into the system. In no way is this project (the EA) providing any type of approval for the Castle Glen development.

## Tiziana Venditto

---

**From:** Tiziana Venditto  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 27, 2023 9:26 AM  
**To:** Tiziana Venditto  
**Subject:** FW: Longpoint rd sewer extension

From: Ted Gibson <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 10:14 AM  
To: Jamie Witherspoon <jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca>  
Cc: akershaw@thebluemountains.ca  
Subject: Longpoint rd sewer extension

We are long time residents of Brophys Lane in The Town of Blue Mountains and are one of the 5 residents directly affected by the proposed location of Brophys pumping station We agree that this location is the best possible design to alleviate stress on Craigleith sewage pumping station for future development

The relocation of the lechate/septage receiving station will likely cause great concern to residents which are within 130' to 150' which are the closest according to fig 6-1. The reasons for moving the receiving station are the location of craigleith SPS to future and current residents, noise, odour complaints, traffic concerns of 700 round trips per year, strength of sewage and lechate cause spikes in treatment and maintenance issues with equipment and revenue recovery All of these concerns will be the same at Brophys pump station if it is re located The residents are all closer than craigleith SPS If you create a negative air space in an enclosed building then that air from balancing tank has to exhaust somewhere The only process which may be improved is the separation of grit etc from septage With up to 5 to 7 trucks per day dumping per day is the current flow of 1650 m<sup>3</sup> enough to mix or will it be mixed at the head works which is the current source of odours The improvements to long point rd and brophys lane will have to enable full load rds all year

We anticipate that the residents on long point and brophys will be given sanitary services Most lots are around 30 m in width and if we estimate that the servicing of Brophys would be 500 dollars less per m than long point then the service might cost between 40 to 50 thousand. Will that be a direct bill against these properties?

Please review my concerns. Thanks

T. Gibson

Sent from my iPhone

## Tiziana Venditto

---

**From:** Tiziana Venditto  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 27, 2023 12:46 PM  
**To:** Tiziana Venditto  
**Subject:** FW: 21-2061 - RE: Longpoint rd sewer extension

-----Original Message-----

From: Jamie Witherspoon  
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 12:57 PM  
To: Ted Gibson <[REDACTED]>  
Cc: akershaw@thebluemountains.ca; Jason Petznick <jpetznick@thebluemountains.ca>  
Subject: 21-2061 - RE: Longpoint rd sewer extension

Mr. Gibson,  
Thanks for your email regarding the Long Point EA.

With respect to your concerns, there are a few general issues that we'd like to address and we'll identify the mitigation measures that are being proposed.

1. The existing septage/leachate receiving station at the Craigeleith SPS is fully exterior with no cover or wind break. The majority of the odour complaints associated with the existing site are to the south and east of the facility which corresponds to the prevailing wind direction. Additionally, proposed development around the existing Craigeleith SPS will have residences within 30 m of the site and noise/odour will be more of a concern. At the proposed site location, the closest downwind receiver is approximately 180 m away from the proposed site. It is important to note that wind direction does change and the proposed design will use the prevailing wind to design for dispersion, it will also assume that the wind may come from another direction and as such, strictly dilution of odours is not the preferred mitigation measure. The preliminary design will address these issues to ensure that they are included in the implemented solution.
2. The existing facility has no balancing tank to allow for the dilution of septage/leachate before being pumped, so there is a plug of high strength waste that is pumped to the plant and we expect that there is odour release at both the receiving station and the wastewater treatment plant when it enters the system. The new system will have a sealed below grade tank that will include odour management mechanisms to minimize odours, this may include aeration, addition of oxidizing chemicals or treatment of the air being exhausted from facility with either carbon, biological odour control or alternative odour control method. This will be addressed in the preliminary design.
3. With the 5-7 trucks per day, we anticipate a liquid volume of 5,000 - 22,000 L per truck, so worst case is  $7 \times 22,000 = 154,000$  L per day. We anticipate an average flow into the new pumping station of 20 L/s on opening day and 50 L/s within five years and ultimately upwards of 240 L/s. Based on that volume coming in, the ratio of wastewater (weak) to septage (strong) is approximately 10:1 initially and as the wastewater flow grows, the ratio will increase as septage/leachate flow growth will be less than the wastewater growth. The goal of the balancing will be to move the septage/leachate into the plant as quickly as possible while maintaining a dilution ration that will not cause any shock to the treatment process of the plant and minimize odour production. We will have a mixer in the balancing tank that will add air to reduce the odour production and we will have controls to minimize the discharge of odours. It is important to acknowledge that this facility is and will remain a wastewater treatment plant and there are inherent odours associated with the existing facilities, The objective is to minimize existing odours and make it such that the addition of the septage receiving station does not make any existing odours worse.

4. With respect to traffic/vehicle concerns, the preferred approach is to have a drive through design that eliminates requiring vehicles to back-up (causing noise with their warning signals) and we are also proposing a traffic study at Highway 26 to address that intersection to improve safety. We have allowed for the upgrade of the roadway and access around the site to address the potential impact on the road of heavy vehicles.

5. In addition to active management solutions for odour and noise management, we will also be adding additional buffer features between the wastewater treatment plant and Brophy's Lane, these will include vegetation including a combination of coniferous and deciduous trees to provide year-round noise and odour attenuation and potentially a berm to reduce visual impacts as well as noise impacts from both new and existing operational activities at the site.

6. Future service connections along Brophy's lane are not a direct outcome of this project, but the proposed design will be able to facilitate these connections. If there is a desire to be serviced, residents can approach Council/Town and request an extension and the cost associated with those works would be recoverable from benefiting residences. There would be some savings to the residents if they were to coordinate their request with the proposed work on Brophy's lane as the incremental cost of adding a sanitary sewer would be less if it is coordinated with the Town project vs. doing it independently and particularly after the upgrade of Brophy's Lane is completed. There was recently two similar projects completed on Birch View Trail and Drake's Path where the sanitary sewer was extended to service residences and the estimated costs were in the \$30,000 - \$50,000 range. Both projects ended up less than the original estimates, but it is subject to market conditions at the time of construction.

Please let me know if our responses have addressed your concerns and if you'd like any further follow-up. As you indicated in your email, while the preferred alternative is to construct the pumping station at the wastewater treatment plant and relocate the septage/leachate receiving station, there are still some concerns that will need to be mitigated in order to minimize impacts on adjacent landowners and we recognize that. There is no formal public consultation process associated with the preliminary design; however, it is the Town's standard practice to have additional consultation through the detailed design stage before implementation. We do not anticipate this will move to detailed design until 2024 with the earliest construction in 2025.

We will flag your interest to the Town so you can be included in further consultation going forward.

We appreciate your interest and look forward to your future input as this project advances.

Regards,

Jamie

Jamie Witherspoon, P.Eng., LEED AP, ENV SP President & CEO

Cell: 519.400.6701

WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.

[jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ted Gibson <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 10:14 AM

To: Jamie Witherspoon <[jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca)>

Cc: [akershaw@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:akershaw@thebluemountains.ca)

Subject: Longpoint rd sewer extension

We are long time residents of Brophys Lane in The Town of Blue Mountains and are one of the 5 residents directly affected by the proposed location of Brophys pumping station. We agree that this location is the best possible design to alleviate stress on Craighleith sewage pumping station for future development.

The relocation of the lechate/septage receiving station will likely cause great concern to residents which are within 130' to 150' which are the closest according to fig 6-1. The reasons for moving the receiving station are the location of

craigleith SPS to future and current residents, noise, odour complaints, traffic concerns of 700 round trips per year, strength of sewage and lechate cause spikes in treatment and maintenance issues with equipment and revenue recovery. All of these concerns will be the same at Brophys pump station if it is re located. The residents are all closer than craigleith SPS. If you create a negative air space in an enclosed building then that air from balancing tank has to exhaust somewhere. The only process which may be improved is the separation of grit etc from septage. With up to 5 to 7 trucks per day dumping per day is the current flow of 1650 m<sup>3</sup> enough to mix or will it be mixed at the head works which is the current source of odours. The improvements to long point rd and brophys lane will have to enable full load rds all year.

We anticipate that the residents on long point and brophys will be given sanitary services. Most lots are around 30 m in width and if we estimate that the servicing of Brophys would be 500 dollars less per m than long point then the service might cost between 40 to 50 thousand. Will that be a direct bill against these properties?

Please review my concerns. Thanks

T. Gibson

Sent from my iPhone

**Ministry of Citizenship  
and Multiculturalism**

Heritage Planning Unit  
Heritage Branch  
Citizenship, Inclusion and  
Heritage Division  
5th Flr, 400 University Ave  
Tel.: 613.242.3743

**Ministère des Affaires civiques  
et du Multiculturalisme**

Unité de la planification relative au  
patrimoine  
Direction du patrimoine  
Division des affaires civiques, de  
l'inclusion et du patrimoine  
Tél.: 613.242.3743



June 13, 2023

EMAIL ONLY

Allison Kershaw  
Town of The Blue Mountains  
Manager of Water & Wastewater Services  
[akershaw@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:akershaw@thebluemountains.ca)

**MCM File** : **0017338**  
**Proponent** : **Town of Blue Mountains**  
**Subject** : **Municipal Class EA – Schedule B – Notice of Completion**  
**Project** : **Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design for a Gravity Sewer, Lift Station and Septage Receiving Station at the Craigeith Wastewater Treatment Plant**  
**Location** : **Town of Blue Mountains, Grey County**

Dear Allison Kershaw:

Thank you for sending the Notice of Study Completion for the above referenced project to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM). We were also able to download the *Project File Report (PFR): Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigeith Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades Municipal Class EA* from the Town's website and noticed the new date to submit comments.

MCM's interest in this project relates to its mandate of conserving Ontario's cultural heritage, which includes:

- archaeological resources, including land and marine;
- built heritage resources, including bridges and monuments; and
- cultural heritage landscapes.

Under the EA process, the proponent is required to determine a project's potential impact on known (previously recognized) and potential cultural heritage resources.

**Project Summary**

The Town of the Blue Mountains (Town) has completed a Schedule B Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) for the Sanitary Lift Station, Associated Inlet Trunk Sewer and the Septage Receiving Station Relocation alternatives. The purpose of the EA study was to determine the preferred approach to meet increasing sanitary flows at the Craigeith Sanitary Pumping Station and improve facility operations in terms of reliability, safety, noise and odour. In order to meet future needs of the upstream collection system, a review of alternatives identified the following preferred solution:

- Extending of the sewage collection system to the existing gravity sewer on the southern boundary of the intersection of Grey Road 21 and Highway 26. The sewer will proceed north within the Long Point Road allowance and terminate at the Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant (CWWTP).
- Construction of a new sanitary pumping station to be located on the existing CWWTP property on Long Point Road.
- Relocation of the hauled leachate and septage receiving station to the CWWTP where it will be co-located with the new sanitary pumping station.

### Comments

We have reviewed the above referenced PFR and have a couple of observations and comments to help support fulfillment of the municipality's obligations under Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process:

#### *Archaeological Resources*

A Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA) and report (under Project Information Form (PIF) P029-1094-2022) was found to be compliant and entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports, recommending Stage 2 AA.

Please note archaeological concerns have not been addressed until reports have been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports where those reports recommend that:

1. the archaeological assessment of the project area is complete and
2. all archaeological sites identified by the assessment are either of no further cultural heritage value or interest (as per Section 48(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act) or that mitigation of impacts has been accomplished through excavation or an avoidance and protection strategy.

Approval authorities and proponents typically wait to receive the ministry's review letter for an archaeological assessment report before issuing a decision on the application as it can be used, for example, to document that due diligence has been undertaken.

MCM recommends that the Stage 2 AA and any further recommended AA (e.g., Stage 3 and 4) be undertaken by a licensed archaeologist as early as possible during detailed design and prior to any ground disturbing activities.

#### *Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes*

The PFR is silent on whether there are any known (previously recognized) or potential built heritage resources and/or cultural heritage landscapes within the study area and whether those resources could be impacted by the proposed undertaking. We recommend that a *Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment* be undertaken for the entire study area during the planning phase and be summarized in the PFR. This study will:

1. Describe the existing baseline cultural heritage conditions within the study area by identifying all known or potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, including a historical summary of the study area. The Ministry has developed screening criteria that may assist with this exercise: [Criteria for Evaluating for Potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes](#).
2. Identify preliminary potential project-specific impacts on the known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes that have been identified. The report should include a description of the anticipated impact to each known or potential built heritage resource or cultural heritage landscape that has been identified.

3. Recommend measures to avoid or mitigate potential negative impacts to known or potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. The proposed mitigation measures are to inform the next steps of project planning and design.

Cultural Heritage Reports will be undertaken by a qualified person who has expertise, recent experience, and knowledge relevant to the type of cultural heritage resources being considered and the nature of the activity being proposed.

Community input should be sought to identify locally recognized and potential cultural heritage resources. Sources include, but are not limited to, municipal heritage committees, historical societies and other local heritage organizations.

Cultural heritage resources are often of critical importance to Indigenous communities. Indigenous communities may have knowledge that can contribute to the identification of cultural heritage resources, and we suggest that any engagement with Indigenous communities includes a discussion about known or potential cultural heritage resources that are of value to them.

We attached a table with detailed comments and recommendations to support documentation around cultural heritage due diligence.

Please note that the responsibility for administration of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and matters related to cultural heritage have been transferred from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM). Individual staff roles and contact information remain unchanged. Please continue to send any notices, report and/or documentation to both Karla Barboza and myself.

- Karla Barboza, Team Lead - Heritage | Heritage Planning Unit (Citizenship and Multiculturalism) | 416-660-1027 | [karla.barboza@ontario.ca](mailto:karla.barboza@ontario.ca)
- Joseph Harvey, Heritage Planner | Heritage Planning Unit (Citizenship and Multiculturalism) | 613-242-3743 | [joseph.harvey@ontario.ca](mailto:joseph.harvey@ontario.ca)

Thank you for making the PFR available for our review. If you have any questions or require clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Joseph Harvey  
Heritage Planner  
Heritage Planning Unit  
[joseph.harvey@Ontario.ca](mailto:joseph.harvey@Ontario.ca)

Copied to: Jamie Witherspoon, Project Manager, WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.,  
Mark Badali, Environmental Resource Planner & EA Coordinator, MECP

It is the sole responsibility of proponents to ensure that any information and documentation submitted as part of their EA report or file is accurate. The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the any checklists, reports or supporting documentation submitted as part of the EA process, and in no way shall MCM be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result if any checklists, reports or supporting documents are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33* requires that any person discovering human remains must cease all activities immediately and notify the police or coroner. If the coroner does not suspect foul play in the disposition of the remains, in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 30/11* the coroner shall notify the Registrar, Ontario Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, which administers provisions of that Act related to burial sites. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism should also be notified (at [archaeology@ontario.ca](mailto:archaeology@ontario.ca)) to ensure that the archaeological site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
1.	5.4.1 (Social environment - Archaeological Study)  p. 22-23	<p>Archeoworks Inc. was retained by WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc. to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) in support of this Class EA. This Stage 1 AA was conducted under the project direction of Ms. Kim Slocki, under the archaeological consultant licence number P029, in accordance with the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> (1990; amended 2021) and the 2011 S&amp;G.</p> <p>The objectives of a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA), as outlined by the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant <b>Archaeologists ('2011 S&amp;G')</b> published by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) (2011), are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To provide information about the property's</b> geography, history, previous</li> <li>• archaeological fieldwork, and current land condition.</li> <li>• To evaluate in detail, <b>the property's</b> archaeological potential, which will support recommendations for Stage 2 survey for all or parts of the property.</li> <li>• To recommend appropriate strategies for a Stage 2 survey</li> </ul> <p>...</p>	<p>Section 5.4.1 only partially addresses the cultural heritage component of the environment. The description of the cultural heritage environment should address archaeological resources, built heritage resources-and cultural heritage landscapes. We recommend replacing this section with the following text so that the PFR aligns with current legislation and terminology.</p> <p>5.4.1 <del>Social environment – Archaeological Study</del> Cultural Heritage Resources</p> <p><u>Section 5.4.1 describes the cultural heritage component of the environment, which includes archaeological resources, built heritage resources-and cultural heritage landscapes.</u></p> <p><u>5.4.1.1 Archaeological Resources</u></p> <p><u>A Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA) (under Project Information Form number (PIF) P029-1094-2022) was undertaken on August 12, 2022, by Archeoworks Inc. for the study area. A Stage 1 AA consists of a review of geographic, land use and historical information for the property and the relevant surrounding area, and contacting MCM to find out whether, or not, there are any known archaeological sites on or near the property. Its purpose is to identify areas of archaeological potential and further archaeological assessment (e.g., Stage 2-4) as necessary. The Stage 1 AA report is included in Appendix E.</u></p> <p>[Then include the outcomes and recommendations of the report, as is in the Executive Summary – <b>just copy and paste, don't summarize</b>]</p> <p><u>Further recommended assessment (e.g., Stage 2-4) will be completed as early as possible in the detailed design phase and prior to any ground disturbing activities.</u></p>

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
			<p><u>5.4.1.2. Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</u></p> <p><u>A Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment [date &amp; consultant] was undertaken to identify known (previously recognized) or potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes (BHR/CHLs) and assess potential impacts of the preferred alternatives. Based on the report, it was determined that there is # known and potential BHR/CHL within the study area.</u></p> <p><u>[include the findings and recommendations of the Report]</u></p> <p><u>The Cultural Heritage Report is included in Appendix X.</u></p> <p>If direct impacts to BHR/CHL(s) are anticipated, then a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) will be required for directly impacted resources and the findings and recommendations of the CHER shall be included in the PFR.</p> <p>See also comments in the cover letter.</p>
2.	5.5 (Evaluation of Alternatives)  p. 27	<p>The evaluation of alternatives is intended to be an unbiased assessment of each alternative against the defined design criteria and the Class EA environmental components that will allow for the selection of the preferred alternative. The following is a brief explanation of each of the primary criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ...</li> <li>2. ...</li> <li>3. Social/Cultural Heritage Environment – This is both a relative comparison and absolute assessment of impacts (positive and negative) of the proposed alternatives on the social (residents, visitors, community, recreational opportunities) and</li> </ol>	<p>Item 3 <b>addressing impacts to “Social/Cultural Heritage Environment” should be replaced</b> with the following two items to align with our recommended revisions to section 5.4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Archaeological Resources: Impacts to archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential.</li> <li>- Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes: Direct impacts to known or potential BHR/CHL (e.g., demolition, removal or alteration) or Indirect impacts (e.g., alteration/obstruction of views, vibration, and isolation)</li> </ul>

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments												
		cultural heritage (Indigenous lands, archaeological). 4. ... 5. ... ...													
3.	5.5 (Alternative Evaluation Ranking and Weighting)  Table 5-1  p. 28	Relative Impact - Social/Cultural Heritage Critical - Major permanent negative impacts on significant population, permanent loss of cultural features Significant - Significant permanent or long-term impacts on social environment, potential for loss of cultural features. Potential - Localized permanent or long-term impacts on social environment, potential for impact on cultural features. Minor - Limited permanent or temporary impacts on social environment, limited potential for impact on cultural features. Negligible - Limited to no impacts and any impacts are readily mitigated.	MCM recommends that impacts on BHR/CHLs are organized by direct or indirect impacts, as per MECP guidance. The table should be revised in the following manner to align with our suggested edits to section 5.5 above: <table border="1" data-bbox="1108 605 1808 1312" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Relative Impact</i></th> <th><i>Critical / Significant / Minor</i></th> <th><i>Potential</i></th> <th><i>Negligible</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Archaeological Resources</i></td> <td>Impacts to archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential</td> <td>Potential impacts to areas of archaeological potential</td> <td>No impact to archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</i></td> <td>Direct or indirect impacts to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</td> <td>Potential direct or indirect impacts to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</td> <td>No impact to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Relative Impact</i>	<i>Critical / Significant / Minor</i>	<i>Potential</i>	<i>Negligible</i>	<i>Archaeological Resources</i>	Impacts to archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential	Potential impacts to areas of archaeological potential	No impact to archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential	<i>Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</i>	Direct or indirect impacts to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	Potential direct or indirect impacts to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	No impact to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes
<i>Relative Impact</i>	<i>Critical / Significant / Minor</i>	<i>Potential</i>	<i>Negligible</i>												
<i>Archaeological Resources</i>	Impacts to archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential	Potential impacts to areas of archaeological potential	No impact to archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential												
<i>Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</i>	Direct or indirect impacts to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	Potential direct or indirect impacts to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	No impact to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes												

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
4.	5.5.4 (Social/Cultural Heritage Environmental Assessment)  Table 5-4  p. 30-32	<p>The Social and Cultural Heritage environment assessment is focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social – Impacts (positive or negative) on land use, enjoyment, nuisance, recreational impacts, safety, unreasonable change in conditions, etc.</li> <li>• Cultural Heritage- Impacts (positive or negative) on Indigenous land use, traditions impacted by project, disturbance of culturally significant features (natural or human made), archaeological potential or artifacts and historical significance.</li> </ul> <p>...</p> <p>Table 5-4: Social/Cultural Heritage Assessment of Alternatives</p> <p>Alternative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A: Do Nothing</li> </ul> <p>Social/Cultural Heritage Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...</li> </ul> <p>Alternative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B – Expand Craigleith Sanitary Pumping Station and Collection System</li> </ul> <p>Social/Cultural Heritage Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...</li> <li>• Area is previously disturbed and any cultural heritage features would have been previously impacted., ...</li> </ul>	<p>We recommend revising this section to reflect the revisions made to table 5-1 above.</p> <p>The Social and Cultural Heritage environment assessment is focused on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social – Impacts (positive or negative) on land use, enjoyment, nuisance, recreational impacts, safety, unreasonable change in conditions, etc.</li> <li>• Cultural Heritage- Impacts (direct or indirect; positive or negative) on cultural heritage resources which include archaeological resources, built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. <del>Indigenous land use, traditions impacted by project, disturbance of culturally significant features (natural or human made), archaeological potential or artifacts and historical significance.</del></li> </ul> <p><del>There may be a need to include other bullets to address Indigenous interests and burials, for example.</del></p> <p>...</p> <p>Table 5-4: Social/Cultural Heritage Assessment of Alternatives</p> <p>Include the following bullets in the row for Alternative A: Do Nothing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No impacts to known archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential</li> <li>• No impacts to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</li> </ul> <p>Replace the third bullet in the rows for Alternatives “B” “C” and “D” with the following two new points :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [This bullet should reflect the findings of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment]</li> <li>• [This bullet should reflect the findings of the Cultural Heritage Report]</li> </ul> <p>The scoring and conclusions of the analysis should be revised based on the revisions made above and the outcomes of the Cultural Heritage Report.</p>

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
5.	5.5.6 (Septage/Leachate Receiving Station Relocation Assessment)  Table 5-6  p. 33	Social/ Cultural Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining septage receiving at the existing Craigleith Sewage Pumping Station               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continued noise/odour associated with facility use which will increase as development approaches the SPS site.</li> <li>- Continued traffic issues.</li> <li>- Archaeological significance is limited as all areas previously disturbed.</li> <li>- SCORE: 6</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Relocate septage receiving to the Craigleith WWTP               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise and odour can be mitigated and will be more consistent with WWTP site.</li> <li>- Additional traffic will increase delay at unsignalized intersection of Long Point Road and Highway 26.</li> <li>- Archaeological significance is limited as all areas previously disturbed.</li> <li>- SCORE: 8</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	We recommend revising the table to clearly document the assessment as it relates to cultural heritage.  The third bullet states that “ <b>Archaeological significance is limited as all areas previously disturbed</b> ”. <b>There should be a discussion under the existing conditions articulating the location of the alternatives against the areas of archaeological potential.</b> This bullet may need to be revised.  Please include a bullet to address BHR/CHL based on the Cultural Heritage Report.
6.	6.5 (Environmental Impact Mitigation Measures)  Table 6-2  p. 41	n/a	We recommend including the following additional rows to table 6-2.  Identified Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archaeological resources</li> </ul> Description <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to archaeological resources and areas of archaeological potential</li> </ul> Proposed Mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Stage 2 AA and any further recommended AA (e.g., Stage 3 and 4) be undertaken by a licensed archaeologist as early as possible during detailed design and prior to any ground disturbing activities.</li> </ul>

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</li> <li>• The <i>Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act</i>, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must cease all activities immediately and notify the police or coroner. If the coroner does not suspect foul play in the disposition of the remains, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 30/11 the coroner shall notify the Registrar, Ontario Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, which administers provisions of that Act related to burial sites. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism should also be notified (at <a href="mailto:archaeology@ontario.ca">archaeology@ontario.ca</a>) to ensure that the archaeological site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Trigger Point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary Design/ Design and Construction</li> </ul> <p>Identified Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</li> </ul> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Insert recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Report]</li> </ul> <p>Trigger Point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning / Preliminary Design</li> </ul>

**Ministry of Citizenship  
and Multiculturalism**

Heritage Planning Unit  
Heritage Branch  
Citizenship, Inclusion and  
Heritage Division  
5th Flr, 400 University Ave  
Tel.: 613.242.3743

**Ministère des Affaires civiques  
et du Multiculturalisme**

Unité de la planification relative au  
patrimoine  
Direction du patrimoine  
Division des affaires civiques, de  
l'inclusion et du patrimoine  
Tél.: 613.242.3743



December 14, 2023

EMAIL ONLY

Jamie Witherspoon, P.Eng.  
Project Manager  
WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.  
[jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca)

**MCM File** : **0017338**  
**Proponent** : **Town of Blue Mountains**  
**Subject** : **Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule B –  
Amended Project File Report**  
**Project** : **Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater  
Treatment Plant Upgrades Municipal Class Environmental  
Assessment**  
**Location** : **Town of Blue Mountains, Grey County**

---

Dear Jamie Witherspoon:

Thank you for notifying the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) that the document: *Project File (PFR) (Amended as per stakeholder comments – October 5, 2023) Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades Municipal Class EA* (prepared by WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.) was posted on the Town of Blue Mountains website for our review and comment.

MCM's interest in this project relates to its mandate of conserving Ontario's cultural heritage.

Under the EA process, the proponent is required to determine a project's potential impact on known (previously recognized) and potential cultural heritage resources.

**Project Summary**

The Town of Blue Mountains (Town) has completed a Schedule B Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) for the Sanitary Lift Station, Associated Inlet Trunk Sewer and the Septage Receiving Station Relocation alternatives. The purpose of the EA study was to determine the preferred approach to meet increasing sanitary flows at the Craigleith Sanitary Pumping Station and improve facility operations in terms of reliability, safety, noise and odour. In order to meet future needs of the upstream collection system, a review of alternatives identified the following preferred solution:

- Extending of the sewage collection system to the existing gravity sewer on the southern boundary of the intersection of Grey Road 21 and Highway 26. The sewer will proceed north within the Long Point Road allowance and terminate at the Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant (CWWTP).
- Construction of a new sanitary pumping station to be located on the existing CWWTP property on Long Point Road.
- Relocation of the hauled leachate and septage receiving station to the CWWTP where it will be co-located with the new sanitary pumping station.

The gravity sewer along Long Point Road is considered a Schedule “A” project and may proceed; however, the pumping station and septage receiving station at the Craigleith WWTP on Long Point Road will be considered a Schedule “B” project. The proposed solutions will be evaluated considering natural, cultural, technical and economic environment, and the preferred solution will be selected in consultation with regulatory agencies and the public.

### **Comments**

We have reviewed the above referenced PFR and have a couple of observations and comments to help support fulfillment of the municipality’s obligations under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process:

#### *Archaeological Resources*

A Stage 1 archaeological assessment and report (under Project Information Form (PIF) number P029-1094-2022 – included in Appendix E), prepared for the study area of the Schedule “A” and Schedule “B” projects, was found to be compliant and entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports, recommending Stage 2 archaeological assessment.

Please note archaeological concerns have not been addressed until reports have been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports where those reports recommend that:

1. the archaeological assessment of the project area is complete and
2. all archaeological sites identified by the assessment are either of no further cultural heritage value or interest (as per Section 48(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*) or that mitigation of impacts has been accomplished through excavation or an avoidance and protection strategy.

Approval authorities and proponents should wait to receive the ministry’s review letter for an archaeological assessment report before issuing a decision on the application as it can be used, for example, to document that due diligence has been undertaken.

MCM recommends that the Stage 2 AA and any further recommended AA (e.g., Stage 3 and 4) be undertaken by a licensed archaeologist as early as possible during detailed design and prior to any ground disturbing activities. This needs to be clearly stated in ESR Section 8 (next steps).

### *Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes*

A Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (dated October 4, 2023 and prepared by Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. - included in Appendix O) was prepared to identify known (previously recognized) and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes (BHR/CHL) within the study area for the Schedule "A" and Schedule "B" projects.

No known or potential BHR/CHL were identified, therefore no additional technical cultural studies (e.g., Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports, Heritage Impact Assessments, conservation Plans) were recommended.

Overall, the report is consistent with the requirements and standards of the Municipal Class EA and with MCM's best practices. However, we have the following recommended edits to assist with due diligence documentation:

- Terminology
  - Terminology throughout the documentation should be consistent with current legislation and policy, e.g., the definition of cultural heritage landscapes in section 3.0 is not consistent with the definition in PPS, 2020.
  - The term "cultural heritage resources" includes archaeological resources, built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. For consistency, the term "cultural heritage resources" should only be used when referring to all three types of cultural heritage resources.
- Section 2.2.1 (Environmental Assessment Act and Guidance - Legislation and Policy Review)
  - We recommend that this section be revised to include just the relevant legislation and policies that may affect this proposal. Please remove the reference: *Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (MCC 1992)*.
- Section 5.0 (Consultation)
  - The title of this section should be changed to "Information Gathering" (which is different from Consultation). A new section should be included entitled '*Community Engagement*' which provides a brief summary of the groups and individuals who were engaged, how and when community engagement was undertaken and the results of the engagement, including responses, comments or concerns expressed and how these were considered (a detailed summary can be attached as an appendix).

Please clarify whether Indigenous communities and/or heritage organizations were (or will be) contacted. Cultural heritage resources are often of importance to Indigenous communities. Indigenous communities may have knowledge that can contribute to the identification of cultural heritage resources, and we suggest that any engagement with Indigenous communities includes a discussion about known or potential cultural heritage resources that are of value to them.

MCM provided comments (dated June 13, 2023) on the PFR (dated March 29, 2023, and prepared by WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.). We note that our recommended edits were not included in the amended PFR and no responses have been provided by the proponent. Our comments are still valid if the amended PFR is to be revised.

Thank you for making the PFR available for our review. If you have any questions or require clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Joseph Harvey  
Heritage Planner  
Heritage Planning Unit  
[joseph.harvey@Ontario.ca](mailto:joseph.harvey@Ontario.ca)

Copied to: Allison Kershaw, Manager of Water & Wastewater Services, Town of The Blue Mountains  
Project Team Email, Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigeith Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Mark Badali, Environmental Resource Planner & EA Coordinator, MECP

It is the sole responsibility of proponents to ensure that any information and documentation submitted as part of their EA report or file is accurate. The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the any checklists, reports or supporting documentation submitted as part of the EA process, and in no way shall MCM be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result if any checklists, reports or supporting documents are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33* requires that any person discovering human remains must cease all activities immediately and notify the police or coroner. If the coroner does not suspect foul play in the disposition of the remains, in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 30/11* the coroner shall notify the Registrar, Ontario Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, which administers provisions of that Act related to burial sites. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism should also be notified (at [archaeology@ontario.ca](mailto:archaeology@ontario.ca)) to ensure that the archaeological site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Thank you for submitting your Request for Consultation with the Chippewas of Rama First Nation.

Please click here (<https://www.ramafirstnation.ca/rama-research-ethics-and-community-consultation/>) to be redirected to Rama's Research Ethics and Community Consultation page.

[Submit another response](#)

## Tiziana Venditto

---

**From:** Badali, Mark (He/Him) (MECP) <Mark.Badali1@ontario.ca>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2023 2:20 PM  
**To:** Jamie Witherspoon; Long Point EA  
**Cc:** Allison Kershaw; Shawn Carey; Battarino, Gavin (MECP)  
**Subject:** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant [MCM File 0017338]  
**Attachments:** Microsoft Outlook - Memo Style\_FNContactCorrespondence.pdf

Hi Jamie,

Thank you very much for providing this explanation of the steps that the Town of The Blue Mountains (Town) has taken to engage with the Indigenous communities and stakeholders that were originally missed. The ministry appreciates the measures that the proponent has taken to address this clerical error and the efforts to engage extensively with the public throughout the Class EA process.

We are in agreement that any outstanding engagement with Indigenous communities, including that which relates to the archaeological assessment, should be documented in the Project File.

The one outstanding piece from the ministry's perspective is the issuance of a Notice of Completion to all stakeholders and communities that fulfills the content requirements set out in the Municipal Class EA parent document. While the ministry understands that the proponent has reached out separately to stakeholders, based on the information you shared in your email below, our comments #3 and #4 shared previously still apply – the original Notice of Completion, previously issued on March 30, 2023, was not valid because the minimum consultation requirements of the Municipal Class EA process had not been fulfilled at the time of issuance.

**As such, once the Project File Report has been updated as you have described in your email below, the Town should circulate a revised Notice of Completion to all review agencies (including MECP), Indigenous communities, and interested members of the public with a minimum 30-day review period in order to fulfil the final point of consultation set out in the Municipal Class EA process.** This would also seem to be in line with the commitment to communities presented in the Town's attached memo.

To answer your question regarding proponents who receive comments after issuing their Notice of Completion, yes it is common practice for a proponent to address these comments through written responses and/or further consultation as necessary and through updates to the project file without reissuing the Notice of Completion, which is not contrary to the requirements of the Municipal Class EA process. In the case of this project, the reason that the Town should issue a Notice of Completion is that the original Notice was not valid, and so this would be considered the first valid issuance of the Notice (rather than a "reissue"), which is a minimum requirement of the Municipal Class EA process.

If you have any questions or concerns about the above, please do feel free to contact me to discuss further.

Best regards,

**Mark Badali** ([he/him](#)) | Senior Project Evaluator



**From:** Jamie Witherspoon <jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca>

**Sent:** December 4, 2023 9:35 AM

**To:** Badali, Mark (He/Him) (MECP) <Mark.Badali1@ontario.ca>; Long Point EA <LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca>

**Cc:** Allison Kershaw <akershaw@thebluemountains.ca>; Shawn Carey <scarey@thebluemountains.ca>; Battarino, Gavin (MECP) <Gavin.Battarino@ontario.ca>

**Subject:** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigeith Wastewater Treatment Plant [MCM File 0017338]

**CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.**

Mark,

Please see below for our comments.

1. The ministry recommends that the following communities be engaged in consultation as they may be impacted by or have an interest in this project:
  - Beausoleil First Nation
  - Chippewas of Georgina Island
  - Chippewas of Rama First Nation (Chippewas of Mnjikaning)
  - Chippewas of Nawash First Nation (represented by SON Environment Committee)
  - Saugeen First Nation (represented by SON Environment Committee)
  - Huron-Wendat Nation
  - Métis Nation of Ontario
  - MNO Georgian Bay Métis Council (please cc Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) Lands, Resources and Consultations Branch)

Based on the information provided to the ministry to date, we understand that three of the communities indicated in the above list have not yet been engaged with for this project:

- i. Beausoleil First Nation
- ii. Chippewas of Rama First Nation (Chippewas of Mnjikaning)
- iii. MNO Georgian Bay Métis Council (please cc Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) Lands, Resources and Consultations Branch)

The ministry advises the Town to also issue the Notice of Commencement for the project to these three communities and extend to them the same opportunities for engagement that the Town has extended to other communities and public stakeholders, if possible. The Town may want to consider offering all communities an invitation to meet, as an alternative to the two Public Information Centres that were held for members of the public

**WT – We issued the notice of commencement and all relevant communication to each of these communities with an explanation of what had occurred. See attached. Subsequent to receiving the email from you we added the other three groups and they received a similar email. During that**

period, we also received an email from the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism indicating that they wanted a cultural heritage assessment completed for the project. We proceeded with that work which took us until October and it indicated that there were no significant cultural heritage. During this period we did not receive any additional consultation requests. Subsequent to the re-issue of the information to all parties indicating the inclusion of the cultural heritage report, we have received one request from an Indigenous organization for a copy of the Stage 1 AA, which has been provided.

2. Once the Town has completed the necessary additional consultation with Indigenous communities, please ensure that the Project File Report has been updated to document consultation with Indigenous communities, with MECP, and with all other review agencies.

WT – There were no requests until after we issued the notification regarding the cultural heritage assessment as indicated above.

3. MECP advises the Town that the original Notice of Completion, previously issued on March 30, 2023, is not valid because the minimum consultation requirements of the Municipal Class EA process had not been fulfilled at the time of issuance. As such, that original Notice of Completion dated March 30, 2023 should be rescinded. MECP suggests that if the original Notice of Completion is posted anywhere (e.g. on the municipal website), the Town should consider removing these postings to avoid confusion by any community/stakeholder that is only hearing of the project now.

WT – We provided an explanation to the added organizations indicating the error and providing them the opportunity to both consult and have the necessary time for their review. The intent was that we would not finalize the EA until adequate consultation was completed. We did not receive any additional correspondence from stakeholders other than the MCM; however, we extended the review period due to the need to complete the cultural heritage assessment. In our opinion, the majority of the consultation through the project was with local residents and we exceeded the minimum consultation requirements locally. Therefore, from those that were consulted perspective, the project was complete. From those that were not consulted, we provided them with the same notification and access to information (including videos of the public consultations) and as long as they were not excluded from consultation by limiting their review period, then once their review period was complete (it was approximately five months), the EA would be completed. Due to the Cultural Heritage Report, we provided a supplemental notification to all stakeholders indicating that this had been completed at the request of the MCM and that there were no issues identified, but we would provide an additional review period and access to the report to confirm if any stakeholder disagreed with this assessment. During this period, we had an indigenous organization request a copy of the archaeological assessment, which they were provided. Before we close the EA, we will reach out to them to confirm if they would like to consult further about the project. In our opinion, while the timeline of the completion of the EA did not follow standard periods (we extended them), it did meet the objectives of the Class EA process in terms of providing opportunity to consult and to consult if requested to ensure that projects are completed in a holistic manner.

4. Once the Project File Report has been updated and the original Notice of Completion dated March 30, 2023 has been rescinded, MECP advises that the Town should circulate a revised Notice of Completion to all agencies, Indigenous communities, and interested members of the public with a minimum 30-day review period. When issuing this revised Notice of Completion, the Town should consider providing an explanatory note indicating why some communities and agencies are seeing this Notice for the first time and why some are seeing it for the second time.

WT – We feel that rescinding the Notice of Completion and Reissuing it considering that all stakeholders have been apprised of the changes to the Project File will be more confusing than the approach that we took of extending the review periods. However, we do feel that the request by the

Indigenous organization for the archaeological assessment and any consultation that comes from that should be documented in the Project File. Once that is completed, we will issue a Notice of Completion indicating that change, if you feel that is necessary. The question I have is that historically, when we do an EA and we have a request for further consultation, we have the consultation or respond to the comment. As long as the comment is resolved and the stakeholder is satisfied and does not want to advance it to the Ministry (former Bump Up) We don't reissue the Notice of Completion, we resolve the comment and advance the project.

We acknowledge that the clerical error in issuing notifications for the project to the indigenous communities and organizations was significant although unintended. We have rectified that by providing the notification, access to all of the project information and providing the opportunity for consultation and have not placed any hard deadlines to resolution of any requests for consultation. With the exception of the request for a copy of the archaeological assessment, we have had no other requests or responses for those groups that were originally missed. We will follow that request through to ensure any opportunities for consultation are pursued.

Let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further. We want to do the right thing to ensure that the project can advance while ensuring that we have met the consultation objectives of the Municipal Class EA process.

Regards,  
Jamie



**Jamie Witherspoon, P.Eng., LEED AP, ENV SP**

President & CEO

Tel: 1.833.WTINFRA (984.6372) ext. 101

Cell: 519.400.6701

WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.

[jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca)

---

**From:** Badali, Mark (He/Him) (MECP) <[Mark.Badali1@ontario.ca](mailto:Mark.Badali1@ontario.ca)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 21, 2023 3:07 PM

**To:** Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>

**Cc:** Allison Kershaw <[akershaw@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:akershaw@thebluemountains.ca)>; Jamie Witherspoon <[jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:jamie.witherspoon@wtinfrastructure.ca)>; Shawn Carey <[scarey@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:scarey@thebluemountains.ca)>; Battarino, Gavin (MECP) <[Gavin.Battarino@ontario.ca](mailto:Gavin.Battarino@ontario.ca)>

**Subject:** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant [MCM File 0017338]

Good afternoon,

MECP was recently copied on the MCM email below in response to the WT Infrastructure email dated November 13, 2023, regarding the Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant project being completed by the Town of the Blue Mountains in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA). As the one window MECP contact for this

MCEA project, I have not been in receipt of any project correspondence since June 7, 2023, to which I responded on June 20, 2023 (please see attached email).

The WT Infrastructure email dated November 13<sup>th</sup> indicates that an amended Project File Report is available for review on the Town's website, and that if no additional comments are received or consultations are requested prior to December 13, 2023, the Town will consider the requirements of Schedule B of the MCEA process to be satisfied to allow the project to proceed to implementation.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind the proponent of the MECP advice provided in the attached June 20<sup>th</sup> email. Please review the items #1-4 in this email. Specifically with respect to the information shared in the WT Infrastructure email below, I note that item #4 from my attached June 20<sup>th</sup> email should be completed before MCEA requirements can be considered as fulfilled and the project can proceed to implementation. Issuance of a valid Notice of Completion is a mandatory requirement of the MCEA process, as discussed in section A.3.4.1 of the MCEA parent document.

**Can you please advise on the status of the Municipal Class EA process for this project, including the status of how the proponent is addressing MECP comments #1-4 that were provided in the attached email dated June 20, 2023?**

Thank you,

**Mark Badali** ([he/him](#)) | Senior Project Evaluator  
Environmental Assessment Program Support | Environmental Assessment Branch  
Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks  
[Mark.Badali1@ontario.ca](mailto:Mark.Badali1@ontario.ca) | (416) 457-2155

---

**From:** Barboza, Karla (She/Her) (MCM) <[Karla.Barboza@ontario.ca](mailto:Karla.Barboza@ontario.ca)>  
**Sent:** November 15, 2023 10:24 AM  
**To:** Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>  
**Cc:** Harvey, Joseph (MCM) <[Joseph.Harvey@ontario.ca](mailto:Joseph.Harvey@ontario.ca)>; EA Notices to SWRegion (MECP) <[eanotification.swregion@ontario.ca](mailto:eanotification.swregion@ontario.ca)>  
**Subject:** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craighleith Wastewater Treatment Plant [MCM File 0017338]

Hi there,

Thanks for sending the amended Project File Report for the above referenced project to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM).

Please note that the responsibility for administration of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and matters related to cultural heritage have been transferred from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM). Individual staff roles and contact information remain unchanged. Please continue to send any notices, report and/or documentation via email only to both Joseph and myself.

- Karla Barboza, Team Lead - Heritage | Heritage Planning Unit (Citizenship and Multiculturalism) | 416-660-1027 | [karla.barboza@ontario.ca](mailto:karla.barboza@ontario.ca)
- Joseph Harvey, Heritage Planner | Heritage Planning Unit (Citizenship and Multiculturalism) | 613-242-3743 | [joseph.harvey@ontario.ca](mailto:joseph.harvey@ontario.ca)

For future projects, please contact the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) (copied) for an updated Government Review Team contact list.

We will review the amended Project File Report and provide comments, as appropriate, by December 13.

Thanks again,  
Karla

Karla Barboza, (She/Her) RPP, MCIP, CAHP

Team Lead, Heritage | Heritage Planning Unit | Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism | 416-660-1027 | [karla.barboza@ontario.ca](mailto:karla.barboza@ontario.ca)

---

**From:** Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>

**Sent:** November 13, 2023 12:54 PM

**Subject:** The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

**CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.**

Your organization was previously identified as a potential stakeholder or interested organization in the Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades Municipal Class EA. The initial notice of completion for this project was issued on March 30th, 2023, and subsequently additional comments were received that resulted in the Town of the Blue Mountains proceeding with an additional Cultural Heritage Assessment of the preferred alternative in order to fully address the comments received. This study was completed in September of 2023 and the final report was completed in early October 2023. There were no identified items of cultural significance identified through the additional investigations and this has been documented in the amended report. The amended report can be found on the Town of the Blue Mountain Website via the following link <https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/municipal-infrastructure-projects/craigleith> . If you would like a digital copy sent to you directly, please respond to this email and we will have a copy sent to you.

As there are no additional findings that change either the selection or potential impacts of the preferred alternative on the Natural, Social or Economic Environment, in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process, we consider the project to be complete and the project may proceed to implementation subject to budgetary and regulatory approval. To date, there have been no requests for additional consultation or input from the public, government and agency stakeholders or indigenous communities that has not been responded to and addressed.

If you have any questions or wish to consult with the Town further on this project, please respond to this email or contact one of the project contacts on the Township website <https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/municipal-infrastructure-projects/craigleith>

If no additional comments are received or consultations are requested prior to December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023, the Town will consider the requirements of Schedule B of the Municipal Class EA Process to be satisfied to allow the project to proceed to implementation. At this time, the plan is to proceed with detailed design in 2024 with construction of the proposed works planned for 2025 subject to budgetary and regulatory approvals.

The Town of the Blue Mountains is committed to public consultation throughout the project implementation and questions or concerns regarding this or any project may be raised with the Town as they may arise.



## Tiziana Venditto

---

**From:** Marie-Sophie Gendron <Marie-Sophie.Gendron@wendake.ca>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 13, 2023 1:16 PM  
**To:** Long Point EA; consultations  
**Cc:** Thiefaine Terrier  
**Subject:** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

Kwe Tiziana,

My colleague Andrea reviewed the report and should reach out soon to send her comments. We will be able the invoice shortly after she has sent her comments. Usually, we work through wire transfer, I can provide a blank cheque for this purpose. Let me know if you have any other questions,

Tiawenhk,  
Marie-Sophie



**NATION HURONNE-WENDAT**  
BUREAU DU NIONWENTSÍO

---

**Marie-Sophie Gendron**  
Analyste archéologue

255, place Chef Michel Laveau  
Wendake (QC) G0A 4V0  
T : 418 843-3767  
@ : marie-sophie.gendron@wendake.ca

**WENDAKE.CA**

---

**De :** Long Point EA <LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca>

**Envoyé :** 13 décembre 2023 11:22

**À :** Long Point EA <LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca>; Marie-Sophie Gendron <Marie-Sophie.Gendron@wendake.ca>; consultations <consultations@wendake.ca>

**Cc :** Thiefaine Terrier <Thiefaine.Terrier@wendake.ca>

**Objet :** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [longpointea@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:longpointea@wtinfrastructure.ca). [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Marie-Sophie,

I tried to call at the number indicated below but I was not able to reach you.

I am following up on the email below. Could you please let me know As soon as possible how do we want to proceed?

We would like to move the project forward as fast as possible.

Thanks,  
Tiziana



**Tiziana Venditto**

Water and Wastewater Process Analyst  
WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.  
[tiziana.venditto@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:tiziana.venditto@wtinfrastructure.ca)

---

**From:** Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 6, 2023 3:35 PM  
**To:** Marie-Sophie Gendron <[Marie-Sophie.Gendron@wendake.ca](mailto:Marie-Sophie.Gendron@wendake.ca)>; Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>  
**Cc:** Thiefaine Terrier <[Thiefaine.Terrier@wendake.ca](mailto:Thiefaine.Terrier@wendake.ca)>  
**Subject:** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

Sounds good. You can proceed. How do you want the payment to be processed?

Let me know.

Thanks,  
Tiziana



**Tiziana Venditto**

Water and Wastewater Process Analyst  
WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.  
[tiziana.venditto@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:tiziana.venditto@wtinfrastructure.ca)

---

**From:** Marie-Sophie Gendron <[Marie-Sophie.Gendron@wendake.ca](mailto:Marie-Sophie.Gendron@wendake.ca)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 6, 2023 1:55 PM  
**To:** Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>  
**Cc:** Thiefaine Terrier <[Thiefaine.Terrier@wendake.ca](mailto:Thiefaine.Terrier@wendake.ca)>  
**Subject:** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

Kwe Tiziana,

I hope this email finds you doing well. I am Marie-Sophie, an archaeologist working for the Huron-Wendat Nation. Thank you for reaching out with a copy of the Stage 1 AA for the Long Point Road Sanitary and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant Project. We would like to take the time to review the report. Please find attached a quote for our participation on this project. Let me know if you have any questions.

Tiawenhk,  
Marie-Sophie



**NATION HURONNE-WENDAT**  
BUREAU DU NIONWENTSİO

---

**Marie-Sophie Gendron**  
Analyste archéologue

255, place Chef Michel Laveau  
Wendake (QC) G0A 4V0  
T : 418 843-3767  
@ : [marie-sophie.gendron@wendake.ca](mailto:marie-sophie.gendron@wendake.ca)

**WENDAKE.CA**

---

**De :** Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>

**Envoyé :** 24 novembre 2023 08:54

**À :** Dominic Ste-Marie <[Dominic.Sainte-Marie@wendake.ca](mailto:Dominic.Sainte-Marie@wendake.ca)>

**Cc :** Lori-Jeanne Bolduc <[Lori-Jeanne.Bolduc@wendake.ca](mailto:Lori-Jeanne.Bolduc@wendake.ca)>; Mario Gros Louis <[Mario.GrosLouis@wendake.ca](mailto:Mario.GrosLouis@wendake.ca)>

**Objet :** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

Thanks for letting us know.

Please find in attachment the stage 1 archeological assessment.

Please confirm that you received the document, and you were able to access it.

Thanks,  
Tiziana



**Tiziana Venditto**

Water and Wastewater Process Analyst

WT Infrastructure Solutions Inc.

[tiziana.venditto@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:tiziana.venditto@wtinfrastructure.ca)

---

**From:** Dominic Ste-Marie <[Dominic.Sainte-Marie@wendake.ca](mailto:Dominic.Sainte-Marie@wendake.ca)>

**Sent:** Friday, November 17, 2023 10:10 AM

**To:** Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>

**Cc:** Lori-Jeanne Bolduc <[Lori-Jeanne.Bolduc@wendake.ca](mailto:Lori-Jeanne.Bolduc@wendake.ca)>; Mario Gros Louis <[Mario.GrosLouis@wendake.ca](mailto:Mario.GrosLouis@wendake.ca)>

**Subject:** RE: The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

Kwe,

It appears that the link to the stage 1 archeological assessment on the project's website is non-functional. Can you please send it to us so that we may take account of it before stating any comments.

Tiawenhk chia' önenh  
Dominic Ste-Marie  
**NATION HURONNE-WENDAT**  
Bureau du Nionwentsio

---

**Dominic Ste-Marie**  
Conseiller en Gestion du Territoire

255, place Chef Michel Laveau  
Wendake (QC) G0A 4V0  
T : 418 843-3767  
@ : [dominic.ste-marie@wendake.ca](mailto:dominic.ste-marie@wendake.ca)  
**WENDAKE.CA**

---

**De :** Long Point EA <[LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca](mailto:LongPointEA@wtinfrastructure.ca)>

**Envoyé :** 13 novembre 2023 12:54



**Objet :** The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

Your organization was previously identified as a potential stakeholder or interested organization in the Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades Municipal Class EA. The initial notice of completion for this project was issued on March 30th, 2023, and subsequently additional comments were received that resulted in the Town of the Blue Mountains proceeding with an additional Cultural Heritage Assessment of the preferred alternative in order to fully address the comments received. This study was completed in September of 2023 and the final report was completed in early October 2023. There were no identified items of cultural significance identified through the additional

investigations and this has been documented in the amended report. The amended report can be found on the Town of the Blue Mountain Website via the following link <https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/municipal-infrastructure-projects/craigleith> . If you would like a digital copy sent to you directly, please respond to this email and we will have a copy sent to you.

As there are no additional findings that change either the selection or potential impacts of the preferred alternative on the Natural, Social or Economic Environment, in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process, we consider the project to be complete and the project may proceed to implementation subject to budgetary and regulatory approval. To date, there have been no requests for additional consultation or input from the public, government and agency stakeholders or indigenous communities that has not been responded to and addressed.

If you have any questions or wish to consult with the Town further on this project, please respond to this email or contact one of the project contacts on the Township website <https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/municipal-infrastructure-projects/craigleith>

If no additional comments are received or consultations are requested prior to December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023, the Town will consider the requirements of Schedule B of the Municipal Class EA Process to be satisfied to allow the project to proceed to implementation. At this time, the plan is to proceed with detailed design in 2024 with construction of the proposed works planned for 2025 subject to budgetary and regulatory approvals.

The Town of the Blue Mountains is committed to public consultation throughout the project implementation and questions or concerns regarding this or any project may be raised with the Town as they may arise.

## Tiziana Venditto

---

**From:** Andréa Perkins <Andrea.Perkins@wendake.ca>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 14, 2023 11:36 AM  
**To:** Long Point EA  
**Subject:** The Long Point Road Sanitary Sewer and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant

Kwe Tiziana,

Our team has reviewed the Stage 1 archaeological assessment report for the Long Point Road Sanitary and Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant Project, and found everything satisfactory. We have no modification requests or other comments.

Tiawenhk chia' entïio'!

Andréa Perkins



**NATION HURONNE-WENDAT**  
BUREAU DU NIONWENTSÏO

---

**Andréa Perkins**  
Assistante de recherche

255, place Chef Michel Laveau  
Wendake (QC) G0A 4V0  
T : 418 843-3767  
@ : [andrea.perkins@wendake.ca](mailto:andrea.perkins@wendake.ca)

**WENDAKE.CA**

## Jamie Witherspoon

---

**From:** Jamie Witherspoon  
**Sent:** Monday, April 3, 2023 10:00 AM  
**To:** Allison Kershaw  
**Subject:** Town of the Blue Mountains, Grey County - Municipal Class EA Notice of Commencement - Proposed Trunk Sanitary Sewer Extension and New Sewage Pumping Station on Existing Craigleith Sewage Treatment Plant Site -  
**Attachments:** LongPointRoadEA-Notice-of-Commencement-and-PIC-Apr5-AODA.pdf; INITIAL PROJECT INFORMATION.pdf

Please find attached the notice of commencement for the Craigleith Wastewater Treatment Plant Sewage Pumping Station Environmental Assessment and a summary of the initial project information for the purposes of your review and consultation as appropriate.

This project does not include the re-rating or changes to the wastewater treatment process and is focused on improvements to the efficient conveyance of wastewater from the community to the existing Wastewater Treatment Facility and mitigating existing impacts associated with the operation of the existing pumping station and septage/leachate receiving station.

We apologize for the delay in sending this to you as there was an internal miscommunication that resulted in some stakeholders and potential stakeholders not receiving notification at the notice of commencement stage. The Town is committed to notification and consultation with all potentially impacted and interested parties/stakeholders and this delay on our part will not impact your opportunity to review, comment and consult on this project.

The project website is located here: <https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/municipal-infrastructure-projects/craigleith>

**If you have any questions, require additional clarification or wish to arrange for further consultation please contact the undersigned by responding to this email.**

**Alternatively, if you do not wish to be consulted further on this project, please respond to this email stating that no further correspondence is necessary, and we will remove your organization from the contact list for this specific project.**

The next step in this process will be the circulation of the notice of completion in approximately 30 days to provide an additional opportunity for consultation if it is desired/requested. Due to the delay on our part in contacting your organization/agency/community, the project file will not be finalized formally until the notice of completion is issued to you directly and an additional 30 day period has elapsed.

If your organization/agency/community wishes to consult further with the Town and that consultation requires amendments to the work completed thus far, we are committed to revising the Project File to include all consultation communications and outcomes.

We appreciate your time and look forward to the opportunity to consult with you fully on this project.

Regards,