



## Upper York Sewage Solutions Environmental Assessment

### Recorded Comments/Questions at the April 12, 2012 Public Workshop

Comments/Questions Recorded by  
Sue Cumming, Cumming+Company

Comments/Questions Grouped and Responded to by  
UYSS EA Project Team

APRIL 2012  
REF. NO. 050278  
YORK REGION NO. 74270



**Conestoga-Rovers  
& Associates**

1195 Stellar Drive, Unit 1  
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 7B8



**AECOM**

 **BLACK & VEATCH**

## April 12, 2012 Public Workshop Recorded Comments/Questions Heard and UYSS EA Project Team Responses

In response to specific requests raised at the April 12, 2012 public workshop, the following table documents the comments and questions recorded on flip charts by Sue Cumming, independent facilitator, during the presentation along with responses from the Upper York Sewage Solutions Environmental Assessment (UYSS EA) project team for posting to the project website ([www.uyssolutions.ca](http://www.uyssolutions.ca)). Over 50 comments/questions were recorded, have been grouped based on project topic, and responses provided. This document is available for the benefit of all participants – those who attended on either the evening of April 11 or 12 and those who are interested in the UYSS EA process. Further, as with previous consultation events, a summary report will be prepared and posted on the project website summarizing workshop input from both the April 11 and 12 Public Workshops.

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
<b>Alternatives To the Undertaking<sup>1</sup></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Why are you pitting these 4 sites against each other? Instead, you should be looking at the big pipe. Is this a done deal?</li> <li>▪ What is the cost analysis of doing it this way instead of the big pipe?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As part of the UYSS Environmental Assessment, four alternative servicing solutions were assessed against a set of 15 screening criteria, approved by the Minister of the Environment as part of the terms of reference for this project and the subject of public consultation. As a result of this assessment, it was determined that two alternatives were viable: (a) “Discharge to Lake Ontario” after treatment of wastewater at the Duffin Creek Water Pollution Control Plant, and (b) the “Lake Simcoe Water Reclamation Centre” with modifications to the existing York Durham Sewage Systems. While both alternatives satisfied all of the criteria, the Lake Simcoe Water Reclamation Centre alternative was identified as the preferred alternative because it provides the following potential additional benefits:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Enhance Water Efficiency and Conservation Program by using reclaimed water to reduce the demand for water resources;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Further information on the Alternatives To the Undertaking is provided in the Screening Assessment of the Alternatives to the Undertaking and Addendum No. 1, currently on the project website; and in the Alternatives To the Undertaking Technical Concept Document, which will be posted to the project website in May 2012.

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Promote a water balance within the Lake Simcoe watershed;</li> <li>○ Improve the quality and increase the quantity of water in the receiving watercourse flowing into Lake Simcoe;</li> <li>○ Provide flexibility to accommodate potential future changes in regulations and technologies because construction can be phased over time; and</li> <li>○ No new wastewater infrastructure would be required within the Oak Ridges Moraine</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ As a result of the analysis of potential alternatives and identification of the Lake Simcoe Water Reclamation Centre as the preferred alternative, the next step is to identify a recommended location for the facility. This is the current stage of the UYSS EA process.</li> <li>■ The Discharge to Lake Ontario alternative has a higher capital cost than the Lake Simcoe Water Reclamation Centre alternative. Overall, the Net Present Value costs of the Discharge to Lake Ontario and Lake Simcoe Water Reclamation Centre alternatives are comparable.</li> <li>■ A report with the details of this assessment, including the costing analysis, entitled the “Upper York Sewage Solutions Environmental Assessment Screening Assessment of the Alternatives to the Undertaking Document” is available for download from the project website (<a href="http://www.uyssolutions.ca">www.uyssolutions.ca</a>).</li> <li>■ See responses below for further details on the Site Generation and assessment process for the proposed Water Reclamation Centre.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Water Reclamation Centre Site Selection</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Where are the sites?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ A map of the short list of potential sites for the proposed Water Reclamation Centre is available for download on the UYSS project website (<a href="http://www.uyssolutions.ca">www.uyssolutions.ca</a>). All of the potential sites are located in the community of Queensville in the Town of East Gwillimbury.</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
<b>Process<sup>2</sup></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How did you come to conclude that these sites should be the four shortlisted ones?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A sophisticated Geographical Information System database was developed for generating, screening, and assessing potential sites for the proposed Water Reclamation Centre based on information loaded into the database concerning the proximity to sensitive features and land uses (e.g. Provincially Significant Wetlands, Environmentally Significant Areas, the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System, residences, institutional facilities, Wellhead Protection Areas) and site suitability criteria. The Geographical Information System database was utilized to generate a long list of 22 potential Water Reclamation Centre sites by removing sites that did not meet mandatory criteria (e.g., located in the Towns of East Gwillimbury or Newmarket; 30 ha or greater; located within 5 kilometres of a suitable waterbody capable of accommodating treated effluent and appropriate elevation) and then assess these long list of 22 potential sites with respect to built, natural and economic environments while also accounting for the technical engineering requirements associated with the Water Reclamation Centre. Through the completed assessment, four sites were identified as having the least potential adverse environmental effects while ensuring the technical engineering requirements were met.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the 21 sites still on the table? Will you go back to these sites?</li> <li>▪ You seem like you are working to address these questions but there is a transparency issue – we just don't believe you and question why these four sites are the only sites being looked at. Will you reconsider the 21 sites and put these back on the list?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The 22 sites that form the long list of potential Water Reclamation Centre sites generated through the sophisticated Geographical Information System database may be revisited for consideration if none of the four short listed sites are deemed suitable as a recommended site.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All four of these sites are in Queensville. What happened to the sites in Keswick</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As part of the Site Generation process, mandatory site generation criteria, were developed representing the “must haves” that a potential</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> Further information on the Water Reclamation Centre site selection process is provided in the “Generation of the Long List of Potential Alternative Water Reclamation Centre Sites” and “Screening of the Long List of Potential Alternative Water Reclamation Centre Sites and Development of the York Durham Sewage System Modifications” documents, which will be posted to the project website in the near future.

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
	<p>and Newmarket? How is it that the four best sites out of how many that you considered are all in the same area? Is Queensville the sweet spot?</p>	<p>site must satisfy. Four mandatory site generation criteria were developed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The potential Water Reclamation Centre site must be situated within the Town of East Gwillimbury and / or Town of Newmarket.</li> <li>○ The potential Water Reclamation Centre site must be 30 hectares (ha) or greater in size.</li> <li>○ The potential Water Reclamation Centre site must be located within 5 kilometres (kms) of a permanent waterbody capable of accommodating treated effluent discharged from the proposed Water Reclamation Centre.</li> <li>○ The potential Water Reclamation Centre site must have an elevation of 218 to 253 metres above sea level (MASL).</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Since the proposed Water Reclamation Centre must be situated within the Town of East Gwillimbury or Town of Newmarket, no potential Water Reclamation Centre sites on the long list were identified in Keswick. Similarly, following the application of the site generation criteria, no potential sites on the long list were identified in the Town of Newmarket.</li> <li>■ In order to arrive at a short list of potential Water Reclamation Centre sites, screening criteria were developed in consideration of the previously applied site generation criteria while considering the built, natural and economic environments while also accounting for the technical engineering requirements. The screening criteria were applied to the long list of 22 potential Water Reclamation Centre sites using the sophisticated Geographical Information System database.</li> <li>■ The four sites identified as the short list of potential alternative Water Reclamation Centre sites all demonstrate advantages over the other long list of potential Water Reclamation Centre sites, making them more suitable for accommodating the proposed Water Reclamation Centre including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increased separation distance from sensitive natural features;</li> <li>○ Better site suitability characteristics, including site size, site</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will you tour the sites? Can't believe that you would pick this four or any site when it is clear that you don't know much about the sites and haven't been there. How could you get this far and not go onto the sites?</li> <li>▪ What happens next?</li> <li>▪ What is the process that we can expect?</li> <li>▪ There is a lot of vagueness coming across.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ elevation, and shorter length of conveyance infrastructure; and</li> <li>○ Avoiding existing agricultural operations/structures/artificial tile drainage.</li> <li>▪ As part of the Site Generation and Screening process, members of the UYSS EA project team and York Region staff conducted roadside visual surveys and field visit walkovers, where property owners provided permission, in the western half of the Town of East Gwillimbury. The purpose of these surveys and visits were to confirm existing information from provincial ministries and agencies, the Town of East Gwillimbury, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, York Region, and others as related to the long list and short list of potential alternative Water Reclamation Centre sites.</li> <li>▪ Further on-site and near site field investigations (i.e., natural environmental – fisheries and aquatic habitat, wildlife and terrestrial habitat, surface water, groundwater; land use; agricultural; archaeological; built heritage; air quality; noise and vibration; geotechnical, etc.) of the four sites will be carried out in the next step of the EA process as part of the comparative evaluation process by the UYSS EA project team.</li> <li>▪ As per the process outlined Minister of the Environment approved (as amended) Terms of Reference (March 2010), through Summer 2012 the UYSS EA project team will undertake further field investigations as outlined above, as part of the comparative evaluation of the four short listed sites, including a conceptual Water Reclamation Centre layout for each site.</li> <li>▪ The next round of public consultation events is tentatively scheduled for Fall 2012 to present and receive feedback on the recommended Water Reclamation Centre site and YDSS modification route.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Request for Expressions of Interest for</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the incentive for selling a site – for WH1 and WH2, how much money were they promised? What is the budget for the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Request for Expressions of Interest (REOI) for Potential Sites for a New Water Reclamation Centre (#P-12-04) process was executed by York Region's Supplies and Services Department in accordance with the</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
<p><b>Potential Sites for a New Water Reclamation Centre (#P-12-04) (Willing Host) Process</b></p>	<p>land? What prices are being established? This is awfully convenient. We have an issue with the transparency on this? Can they start building before 2031? Why do they get to advance their development interests?</p>	<p>Region's purchasing policies and Purchasing By-law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ This REOI was posted in January 2012, allowing interested parties to identify potential publicly or privately owned sites that could be considered along with those locations identified through the Site Generation process for the proposed Water Reclamation Centre.</li> <li>■ All submissions received through the REOI process were subject to the requirements of the REOI and assessed using the sophisticated Geographic Information Systems database. Sites that satisfied the mandatory site generation and avoidance/site suitability criteria were added to the long list of potential Water Reclamation Centre sites.</li> <li>■ Following identification of a preferred site for the proposed Water Reclamation Centre and approval of the UYSS EA by the Minister of the Environment, York Region will initiate negotiations with the aim of purchasing the identified property based on a fair market assessment.</li> <li>■ All development in the Town East Gwillimbury is subject to the requirements of and approvals under the Town's Official Plan and Zoning By-law.</li> <li>■ At this time, it is not known what site will become the preferred site. More work needs to be completed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Suitability of Short List of Sites</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Why do you think that it is okay to have this site so close to residential areas – our area – Balmoral Estates?</li> <li>■ There is another solution, no new babies, no new homes, then could avoid this. Consider hierarchy of processes. With the growth coming, we have to address this. Don't like these four sites but we need to have a site somewhere.</li> <li>■ The criteria should reflect that you should not build this within a residential area – why are WH1 and WH2 near residential?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Proximity to sensitive land uses (which included residential areas) was considered during the Water Reclamation Centre Site Generation and Screening processes. With this in mind, the Ministry of the Environment Design Guidelines for Sewage Works (2008) which stipulates a minimum separation distance of 150 metres from sensitive operating unit processes to sensitive land uses (which includes residences), was followed to ensure this requirement was met. Furthermore, a minimum site size of 30 hectares provides additional separation distance. This will allow the proposed Water Reclamation Centre to be sited to maximize separation distances from existing and proposed sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools).</li> <li>■ The four short listed sites are not located within currently designated</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
	<p>What is the deal here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Why not put this in new areas? Why not put this in an industrial or commercial area? Why are you putting this in a residential area? Both WH1 and WH2 are in a residential area. This is also an area where there is a cemetery and Montessori School and lots of traffic going up Leslie.</li> </ul>	<p>residential areas. Presently the four short listed sites are situated within the Agricultural/Future Urban Area (“whitebelt”) designated in the East Gwillimbury Council adopted Official Plan (2010).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We appreciate the information on local land uses and traffic conditions in relation to the four short listed sites. This information will be considered further as we undertake the comparative evaluation process and complete further work.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site 30 is Chapman Farms who supply Campbell’s Soup Company. This is a huge agricultural operation – why would this not have been avoided? There is a university, high school here as well. Leslie is 50 mph and there is gridlock. You should look at the other side of 404/Woodbine within an industrial/commercial site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site 30 is not owned by Chapman Farms. The Chapman Farms agricultural operations (vegetable processing facility) are located further to the north of Site 30. These lands were avoided as a potential short list site. Site 30 is designated as Agricultural/Future Urban Area (“whitebelt”) in the East Gwillimbury Council adopted Official Plan (2010)</li> <li>▪ We appreciate the information on local land uses and traffic conditions in relation to the four short listed sites. This information will be considered further as we undertake the comparative evaluation process and complete further work.</li> <li>▪ The lands between the existing proposed Highway 404 extension and Woodbine Avenue were considered during the Site Generation process. However, these lands do not meet one or more of the avoidance/site suitability criteria.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the plan for Leslie Street? How can you propose these sites when the sign clearly says that you are entering the Greenbelt?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed linear infrastructure (to be constructed within existing road right-of-ways as much as possible) associated with each of the four short listed sites is under development as part of this stage of the UYSS EA and will be presented at the next public consultation event, tentatively scheduled for Fall 2012.</li> <li>▪ The portions of the sites within the Greenbelt Area that are considered unsuitable for locating the Water Reclamation Centre are illustrated on the display panels at the April 11 and 12, 2012 Public Workshops and currently available on the project website. These sensitive areas would remain as buffer and the Water Reclamation Centre would be located on</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
		land located outside of such protected areas.
<b>Holland Landing WPCP (Lagoons)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the status of the Certificate of Approval for the Holland Landing Site? Where is it? What is approved at the site? When was this approved?</li> <li>▪ Wouldn't it make common sense to use the site that you already have? The only reason that you are not looking at it is because the Town of East Gwillimbury wants to use it for something else. Why can't you just put the facility there? So what if there were promised made during an election. This site should be used.</li> <li>▪ You already have a proven site, would you consider the site shown in pink.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The existing Certificate of Approval for the Holland Landing WPCP (Lagoons) is an approval issued by the Ministry of the Environment to permit the operation of the existing sanitary sewage works, including a pumping station and a seasonal lagoon system. The Holland Landing WPCP (Lagoons) is located at 19932 Cedar Street, Holland Landing. The most recent amendment to the Ministry Certificate of Approval was issued as of June 23, 2009.</li> <li>▪ The Ministry directed York Region to identify the most suitable site for the proposed Water Reclamation Centre, subject to the Site Generation, Screening and assessment process, as per the Minister approved UYSS EA Terms of Reference</li> <li>▪ Although the Region's Holland Landing WPCP (Lagoons) site has an approved Certificate of Approval, the site would only be considered if another more suitable site could not be found</li> </ul>
<b>Public Consultation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Was this an invitation only meeting! How was notification undertaken?</li> <li>▪ How was notice undertaken?</li> <li>▪ Reaction: This is not enough, we don't read the local papers, how would be aware of the meeting if a neighbor hadn't told us? Everyone should have gotten a letter initially. You should send everyone a letter/mail drop as the project unfolds. Some people noted they had seen the notice in the ERA Banner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As with all public consultation events held as part of the UYSS EA, the April 11 and 12 workshops were open to any interested individuals.</li> <li>▪ As part of notification for the April 11 and 12 Public Workshops, letters were sent to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Property owners of the short list of potential Water Reclamation Centre sites via registered mail;</li> <li>○ Property owners of the long list of potential Water Reclamation Centre sites that were not on the short list of sites via regular mail;</li> <li>○ Over 120 property owners adjacent to the short list of potential Water Reclamation Centre sites via regular mail; and</li> <li>○ Over 520 property owners adjacent to the YDSS modification routes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Further, notification for the April 11 and 12 Public Workshops was accomplished through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notification to all agencies and interested members of the public</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
		<p>in the contact database by e-mail and regular mail. Approximately 420 notifications were sent to individuals beginning on March 27, 2012;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Posting on the project website (<a href="http://www.uyssolutions.ca">www.uyssolutions.ca</a>) and York Region’s website (<a href="http://www.york.ca">www.york.ca</a>); and</li> <li>○ Newspaper advertisements in the Era-Banner publications for East Gwillimbury, Newmarket and Aurora on Thursday March 22 and Sunday March 25, 2012, in the Georgina Advocate on Thursday March 22, Sunday March 25, 2012, and Thursday March 29, in the Richmond Hill Liberal on Thursday, March 22, 2012, and in the Stouffville Sun Tribune on Thursday, March 22, 2012.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Notification for future public consultation events will include the preceding, and be expanded so additional residents/businesses receive direct notification.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What weight will the public input have in the decision-making process?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public consultation and input are integral to the success of the Environmental Assessment process. In accordance with the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>, all public input will be considered through the UYSS EA process.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How will we find out about future meetings?</li> <li>▪ How will we know about the document and any future meetings?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If you registered for the workshops, either in advance or at the door, you will be added to the project contact list and will receive notification via email or regular mail of future consultation events. You are encouraged to attend Tuesday Talks, held on the first Tuesday of every month between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. at 1195 Stellar Drive, Unit 1, Newmarket to meet informally and discuss the project further (further dates and information is provided below in a subsequent response).</li> <li>▪ The project website will have all new postings or events/meetings noted on the Home/Front Page.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Where do we find the information about all that you are talking about? We aren’t getting answers – we want a yes or no!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As information and studies related to the UYSS EA become available they will be posted on the project website in the “Library of Documents” section</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Where are these studies and all of this work?</li> <li>▪ Where will we find it on the web site – under what headings?</li> </ul>	<p><a href="http://www.uyssolutions.ca/en/onlineresources/LibDocuments.asp">http://www.uyssolutions.ca/en/onlineresources/LibDocuments.asp</a>).</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I would like to suggest that you take these wall charts with likes/dislikes/questions and comments and put them on the web site so that people can input their views and have these views available to all.</li> <li>▪ When will the questions and answers from tonight be available?</li> <li>▪ Why didn't you record tonight's question and answer? Can we expect these notes to be available as you have taken them?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A comment form with the wall charts (4 potential water reclamation centre sites and 3 concept routes for YDSS modifications) and a space to provide likes/dislikes/comments will be available on the project website during the second week of May. There will be a link on the Home/Front page directly to the comment sheet along with a timeline for forwarding comments to the project team. All comments provided will be considered and included in the Public Information Workshop Summary Report for the April 11 and 12 events.</li> <li>▪ As requested, this document is the transcript of the recorded questions posed during the April 12, 2012 discussion session, as well as responses to these questions.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ When are these Tuesday Talks and how do we find out about it?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ On the first Tuesday of each month, residents are invited to drop in anytime between 6:00 pm and 8:00 pm at the UYSS Project Office (1195 Stellar Drive, Unit 1, Newmarket). The project team is available for informal discussions about the project and questions or concerns you might have.</li> <li>▪ Tuesday Talks for the rest of 2012 will take place on the following dates:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May 1</li> <li>○ June 5</li> <li>○ July 3</li> <li>○ August 7</li> <li>○ September 4</li> <li>○ October 2</li> <li>○ November 6</li> <li>○ December 4</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do you have a contour /elevation map in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ These comments will be considered as part of preparing materials for</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
	<p>the room?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Can't understand the labeling on the map – the WH site 30 looks unsuitable. So do the other sites, why are these being considered?</li> <li>▪ There is no information on which streets these are through Newmarket – can't tell from the maps. You should add the street names.</li> </ul>	<p>future consultation events.</p>
<p><b>Potential Effects Associated with the Proposed Water Reclamation Centre</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will the WRC affect property taxes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The UYSS EA is not being funded by property taxes. Approximately 97% of the project is being funded by through development charges so that future approved growth will fund this proposed infrastructure.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will the WRC affect property values?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ York Region cannot offer speculation as to the likely current or future values of properties.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is it going to smell?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The design of the proposed Water Reclamation Centre (WRC) is intended to provide the optimum in air handling technology. As such, air quality control will be integral to the design of the WRC. The issue of odour is being taken very seriously as part of the proposed WRC. Based on past experience, unit operations which have the potential to generate air quality issues will be contained and the air 'treated' to reduce the amount of odour containing compounds prior to discharge to the atmosphere and these processes will be regulated by the Ministry of the Environment. The design of buffer zones around the plant will further reduce the potential for air quality issues occurring off site. Plant design will include the application of operating procedures which promote practices to proactively control the potential for air quality issues.</li> <li>▪ It is noted that the short list of potential alternative Water Reclamation Centre sites will be assessed through a net effects analysis considering type and scale of potential environmental effects (technical, natural, built, social, economic, cultural, and financial) from the Water Reclamation Centre site and their relative significance.</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As part of the net effects analysis, potential air quality effects (including air quality modeling) on sensitive receptors will be assessed with respect to the number of sensitive receptors affected and extent and duration of adverse effects. Appropriate avoidance/mitigation/compensation measures will be applied. Following the net effects analysis, a recommended Water Reclamation Centre site will be identified based on a comparison of the relative advantages and disadvantages of each site.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is it going to be attractive?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The WRC will be located on the recommended site to maximize visual screening techniques which may include berms, vegetative buffers, etc. A significant buffer zone around the plant is anticipated to add value to the community through preserved and managed greenspace and will be laid out to have high levels of environmental controls (e.g., green space buffer). All buildings will be architecturally designed to complement and blend with the surroundings. The Water Reclamation Centre will be a centre of excellence for reclaiming water with the administration buildings available and welcoming for meetings, displays, training, research and education.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the spillage capacity? What happens when it overflows? But what happens if it does?</li> <li>▪ If it exceeds capacity where does that sewage go?</li> <li>▪ What if all else fails?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The WRC will not allow overflows of untreated sewage directly into the Holland River. The WRC will be designed to manage peak flows (e.g., high flow conditions during storm events). All unit operations will be designed with redundancy to allow equipment to be removed from service for maintenance without loss of treatment performance. This approach is in keeping with the Ministry of the Environment's <i>Design Guidelines for Sewage Works, 2008</i>.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What will happen with the sludge? How many trucks?</li> <li>▪ Are you familiar with the situation in Dundalk? Six Nations is trying to stop the use of the site that the Town Council is creating. They don't want the sludge. They plan to stop this and it could become another situation like Caledonia, then what</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ During this stage of the project the UYSS EA project team will be evaluating biosolids management alternatives which will include on-site treatment or transfer to York Region's centralized treatment facility at the Duffin Creek WPCP. The number of biosolids handling haulage trucks will depend on the ultimate biosolids management alternative selected.</li> <li>▪ There are no plans to send sludge to Dundalk.</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
	<p>happens? Don't know if the sludge from this plant is going there but if it is what will happen when it gets stopped? Is the sludge going there?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am not satisfied with the information on the trucks. We are getting different numbers from different people.</li> <li>▪ But how will you know what the impact from truck traffic is and why don't you know that there are already real problems on Leslie Street?</li> <li>▪ What happens when there is a truck overturned on Leslie Street? We would like to avoid any more trucks on Leslie Street</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As mentioned above, during this stage of the project the UYSS EA project team will be evaluating biosolids management alternatives which will include on-site treatment or transfer to York Region's centralized treatment facility at the Duffin Creek WPCP. The number of biosolids handling haulage trucks will depend on the ultimate biosolids management alternative selected.</li> <li>▪ With respect to the truck traffic, the intent is to direct traffic to and from the plant through road corridors that are adequate to accommodate these types of vehicles and volume of traffic. The UYSS EA project team will investigate the traffic problems identified on Leslie Street and on other area roads.</li> <li>▪ As part of the net effects analysis, potential effects of noise, vibration, odours and traffic on sensitive receptors will be assessed with respect to the number of sensitive receptors affected and extent and duration of adverse effects. Appropriate avoidance/mitigation/compensation measures will be applied. Following the net effects analysis, a recommended Water Reclamation Centre site will be identified based on a comparison of the relative advantages and disadvantages of each site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>YDSS Modification Routes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ On the routes, our concern is about the timing of construction with other infrastructure projects underway. Perhaps we could have separate meetings in the future so that some people can talk about the sites and others the routes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Based on the proposed schedule for the UYSS EA, it is anticipated that should the project be approved, construction would follow the detailed design stage and construction will begin between 2016 and 2017. At the time of construction the Region would review and assess the need to coordinate construction projects to minimize impact to the local community.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other Comments and Questions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the routes planned for hook up?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is up to the local municipality to decide if local residents must or should connect to the new local wastewater system. The UYSS EA proposed routes are for York Region trunk sewers and are not a local wastewater collection system.</li> </ul>

Comment/ Question Grouping	Recorded Comments/Questions Heard	UYSS EA Project Team Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Why does the pumping station at St. John Sideroad smell sometimes? Similarly, why does the pumping station at Bogart smell sometimes?</li> <li>▪ Was the pumping station approved in context of the plan to go back down to the YDSS?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Please contact York Region, Environmental Services reception and ask to be directed to someone who can respond to questions about odour at the Bogart Creek and Aurora pumping stations.</li> <li>▪ In terms of the Aurora sewage pumping station on St. John's Sideroad, York Region is currently rehabilitating the existing Regional trunk sewer that conveys wastewater to the Aurora pumping station for pumping downstream into the York Durham Sewer System. The rehabilitation is very complex and requires that the wastewater be diverted from the permanent sewer through a temporary network during the repair potentially causing instances of odour being emitted. The Region is very committed to minimizing odour and the construction duration time. This work is very critical to the integrity of the trunk sewer system. The odours that you may have encountered are not part of the normal operation of the trunk sewer or this facility.</li> <li>▪ The Queensville Sewage Pumping Station was a component of the approved Queensville Holland Landing Sharon (QHLS) Wastewater Servicing project (formerly YDSS extension) in East Gwillimbury approved in 2007 to service approximately 5400 residents. This was a separate and earlier environmental assessment process.</li> </ul>