

Manager of Public Works

From: oscseeds [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2010 10:32 AM
To: mike.meyers@genivar.com
Cc: tsbppwmanager@bmts.com
Subject: Sauble Sewer Project comments

Good morning

Please find attached our comments on the Sauble Sewer Project

Sauble Sewer project - we purchased our property in Sauble for the small community ambience, lack of carnival atmosphere (Wasaga and Grand Bend) and lack of high density buildings with the town itself. Sauble is a place to relax and enjoy the simpler joys of life.

With mandatory septic inspections and controlled growth within the community the do nothing approach is the only way we will vote on the Sauble Sewer project at the current time We don't want to see Sauble a Grand Bend look alike!
There are far too many retiree's and low income residents (seasonal and full time) that will not be able to afford the minimum 25,000 investment in the project.

Should more government funding from all levels reduce the cost per resident to something more affordable, 8-10M range we would be in a position to reconsider the options put forth. Here's another case where a few will decide for the masses.

If this does not happen we too will be adding our property to the potentially huge list of those for sale should the project get acceptance as we could not longer afford to own a residence let alone retire in sauble which was our future plan.

Respectfully your
Doug Yates/Donna Weickert

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] email.sanyates@sympatico.ca

Manager of Public Works

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 21, 2010 1:44 PM
To: tsbppwmanager@bmts.com; mike.meyers@genivar.com
Subject: sewage system Sauble Beach
Attachments: 21-10-2010 1;32;28 PM.jpg

NO! HELL NO!! am NOT in favor of the Sewer System!!

My neighborhood does not need this system. A properly installed and maintained septic system are safer than your proposed sewage system!...I have lost count of how many sewer systems I have seen on the news fail and how much effluent is released from them as well... If the town were to actually inspect suspicious units and act appropriately. I wonder who's brother or husband gets the contract for all this work.....?

I'll fight it all the way!

Nicole Yorke

WATER AND SEWAGE WORKS STUDY
TOWN OF SOUTH BRUCE PENINSULA
ADDENDUM PROCESS NO.3 - PUBLIC MEETING

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2010, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m to 4:00 p.m.

◆ COMMENT SHEET ◆

PLEASE ONLY SUBMIT ONE COMMENT SHEET PER PROPERTY

Please print clearly

Name: NICOLE YORKE

Mailing Address: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Email Address: [REDACTED]

gmail.com

Please return to:

Town of South Bruce Peninsula
Box 310, 315 George Street
WIARTON, ON N0H 2T0

ATTN: Phil Dwyer, Manager of Public Works
Town of South Bruce Peninsula
Email: tsbppwmanager@bmts.com
Fax: 519-534-4862

or
Mr. Michael R. Meyers, P.Eng.
Genivar Consultants LP
945 3rd Avenue East, Suite 212
Owen Sound, ON N4K 2K8
Email: mike.meyers@genivar.com
Fax: 519-376-8008

PLEASE RETURN BY NOVEMBER 8, 2010

Would you like to be added to our contact list?

Yes

No

I AM AGAINST THE SEWER SYSTEM

We would appreciate any comments you may have on the project. Please note that you are not restricted to submitting your comments using this comment sheet form, but you may also e-mail or mail your comments in writing to either of the addresses provided above.

I AM IN NO POSITION TO PAY THIS OUTRAGEOUS FEE!

I WILL NOT PAY IT. I SUGGEST YOU FIND OUT

THE CAUSE OF THE ISSUE BEFORE YOU EXPECT

HOMEOWNERS TO SHELL OUT. WHY DONT YOU SEE

WHERE THE PROBLEM IS COMING FROM FIRST.

COME CHECK MY SEPTIC. ITS JUST FINE!

I AM DISGUSTED WITH HOW MUCH MONEY

WIARTON WANTS TO SUCK OUT OF THE

BEACH I AM SICK OF BEING HIT FOR TRYING

TO MEASURE OUT AN EXISTENCE FOR MY FAMILY

YEAR ROUND! I WILL MOVE!

If more space is required for your comments, please use and attach an additional page(s).

**WATER AND SEWAGE WORKS STUDY
TOWN OF SOUTH BRUCE PENINSULA
ADDENDUM PROCESS NO.3 - PUBLIC MEETING**

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2010, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m to 4:00 p.m.

◆ COMMENT SHEET ◆

PLEASE ONLY SUBMIT ONE COMMENT SHEET PER PROPERTY

RECEIVED

OCT 27 2010

TOWN OF
SOUTH BRUCE PENINSULA

Please print clearly

Name: _____

Please return to:

Mailing Address: _____

Town of South Bruce Peninsula
Box 310, 315 George Street
WIARTON, ON N0H 2T0

EDWIN CRAIG YOUNG

ATTN: Phil Dwyer, Manager of Public Works
Town of South Bruce Peninsula
Email: tsbppwmanager@bmts.com
Fax: 519-534-4862

Email Address: _____

or
Mr. Michael R. Meyers, P.Eng.
Genivar Consultants LP
945 3rd Avenue East, Suite 212
Owen Sound, ON N4K 2K8
Email: mike.meyers@genivar.com
Fax: 519-376-8008

PLEASE RETURN BY NOVEMBER 8, 2010

Would you like to be added to our contact list?

Yes

No

We would appreciate any comments you may have on the project. Please note that you are not restricted to submitting your comments using this comment sheet form, but you may also e-mail or mail your comments in writing to either of the addresses provided above.

Your current studies do NOT indicate that the private septic systems are responsible for your current E.Coli scare!

I truly doubt that tourism will decrease, quite the opposite. Do we have Provincial funding in place for the Provincial Tourism-Traffic.

*Who owns the beach? The Chippewas? How about the Feder...
...at or the residents of Double Beach? Will there be a toll
...charge on that effluent discharge pipe?*

It seems that many are paying for
the benefit of the few commercial
businesses.

We are not in favor of this project!

Craig & Valerie
Yours

Manager of Public Works

From: Wendy Yule [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2010 10:37 PM
To: tsbppwmanager@bmts.com
Cc: mike.meyers@genivar.com
Subject: Comment Sheet October 9th public Meeting Addendum 3

7 November 2010

Town of South Bruce Peninsula

315 George Street,
PO Box 310,
Warton, Ontario, Canada,
N0H 2T0

via e-mail: Attention Phil Dwyer MPW tsbppwmanager@bmts.com <tsbppwmanager@bmts.com>

copy Mike Meyers mike.meyers@genivar.com <mike.meyers@genivar.com>

Re: Comment Sheet October 9th public Meeting Addendum 3

I am very strongly against all of the options presented in the October 9, 2010 Sauble sewers meeting. I strongly support an inspection and upgrade program for the part of Sauble outside of the downtown core, combined with a solution, likely a small communal sewage system, for the downtown core.

I feel that your system of categorizing response sheets is extremely misleading and inappropriate. My views above cannot possibly be classified simply as for or against sewers. But if you insist on applying such an arbitrary and subjective categorization to responses, then you must categorize my view as *against sewers*.

My key concern about the meeting and the process is that the conclusion, or preferred solution, (option 5a), has been selected not through the formal class EA decision process, as required by law (EAA), but rather by some process completely outside of the formal decision process.

This is not good decision making and I believe it is **NOT** in the public interest.

The whole decision exercise needs to be redone, starting at the beginning and progressing forward as required by the class EA and by the EAA, rather than starting at the end and working backwards.

Another concern is the unsupportable assumption of septic systems as the cause of contamination of beach drains. Asked if there was any evidence to support Mr. Graham's contention that beach drain and ditch contamination is coming from septic systems, Mr. Graham responded "what else could it be". This rhetorical response clearly meant "the contamination is from septic systems". This contention is unsupported and unsupportable from the evidence at hand. And Mr. Graham has been told many times of other possible sources. Mr. Graham should just admit that the facts do not support his option 5a choice.

A third concern is the improper use of the comment sheets as a "referendum".

The information sessions are supposed to provide the public an opportunity to meaningfully participate in the decision process. Using the comment sheets as a bogus referendum detracts from this purpose. In trying to use the comment sheets as a referendum the proponent is diluting attention away from the substance of the response sheets, and is in effect limiting and constraining public input, the opposite of what is required.

Wendy Yule

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]