

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
00.0	Comments by Matthew Wilkinson, Otonabee Region Conservation Authority	
01.0	Please provide elevations, along the entire length, for the bottom of roadside ditch.	Spot elevations have been added throughout the ditch, noting that they will follow the roadway profile as shown in the typical sections.
02.0	Detail for Cross-Section E-E is not on the Preliminary Servicing and Grading Plan.	This cross-section label has been removed.
03.0	The control feature for the north roadside ditch is not labeled on the Preliminary Servicing and Grading Plan (see snapshot). There is a 34.5m long pipe at 0.0% with an unknown diameter. We are assuming this is a part of the roadside ditch control system. Please provide a detail for the control feature.	A quantity control structure will be provided at the outlet of the roadside ditch. The structure will be constructed as a concrete headwall with an orifice at the invert and overflow weir at the top. The proposed dimensions are shown in the Stage-Storage-Discharge calculations and a detail will be provided during detailed design.
04.0	The drainage easement should have an overland swale design incorporated to convey those overland flows above the 100-year event.	The 34.5 m pipe has been replaced with a surface swale connecting to the infiltration basin in PR-101 as requested.
05.0	The control feature for the south roadside ditch are the two driveway stormwater control structures as on the Preliminary Servicing and Grading Plan (see snapshot).	The control features for the south roadside ditch will be constructed as a concrete headwall similar to the north roadside ditch.
05.a	The control structure is a culvert with 4-50mm diameter holes cut in to bottom of the pipe and a 200 or 300mm hole in the top of the pipe. How will the control structure be maintained to prevent sediment collection and blocked flows?	The orifice diameter has been increased to exceed the minimum 75 mm as per the MOE manual and the weir will provide emergency overflow in the event of clogging.
05.b	The stage-storage-discharge table for Outlet 2, in Appendix C, sizes a 300mm diameter orifice/hole. Detail 101 – Typical Cross Section Infiltration Ditch & Culvert, delineates a 0.2m diameter opening. Please make the appropriate corrections.	NA
05.c	What are the elevations of the driveway control structures? Please add elevations to the grading plan and Detail 101.	Relative elevations are included in the Stage-Storage-Discharge calculations and actual details will be provided during detailed design.
05.d	Please refer to the red circle on the snapshot. Has the length of ditch used in the quantity control volume calculations included the approximately 60m of ditch between the control structures and the drainage easement? What diameter is this pipe? What function does the pipe perform? Could a trapezoidal ditch perform the same function?	The length of ditch between the control structure and the outlet has not been included in the storage calculations. This pipe has been replaced with a trapezoidal swale.
05.e	fyi - for reference this number was skipped in the letter	
05.f	The 6.0m wide drainage easement should have an overland swale design incorporated to convey those overland flows above the 100-year event.	An overland swale has been included in the drainage easement.
06.0	Flow Spreaders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infiltration has nothing to do with mimicking existing overland sheet flows. The grading constraints are self imposed based on the design. a. Flow spreaders will be incorporated into the design for both discharge points within the proposed subdivision.	Flow spreaders have been incorporated in the design at both discharge points and further details will be provided during detailed design.

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
07.0	The 30m flow spreader along the rear yard infiltration swale behind Lots 3 & 4, identifies a low point. Please remove the low point from the design of the flow spreader. The point is to mimic existing condition overland sheet flow.	The low point has been removed.
08.0	Water Balance The Proposed Conditions Table	
08.a	The Outputs (mm/yr) values for precipitation surplus, net surplus and evapotranspiration are not correct. These values should be taken from the climate data for the Peterborough A station as presented in the Table.	The climate data provided in the previous submission used Climate Normals from 1971 to 2000. This has been updated to current Climate Normals (1981 to 2010).
08.b	Please adjust the infiltration values for each post development drainage area.	Infiltration values have been adjusted accordingly.
08.c	How do you calculate the run-off coefficient within the Infiltration Factor section?	The run-off coefficient in the water balance analysis is defined as the portion of initial water surplus that results in runoff, as defined in the Conservation Authority Guidelines for Hydrogeological Assessments. This is different than the runoff coefficient used in the rational method, which is the portion of precipitation that results in runoff.
08.d	The sizing table for PR-100 establishes an underground storage volume of 28 m ³ . How did you convert that volume to 334.4 mm/yr for the infiltration feature entry? The same question applies to all the infiltration areas.	The average annual infiltration provided for each infiltration feature is calculated using a daily water balance based on the same principles as the monthly water balance. Since 30 Years of data takes up so many pages we don't typically include the output in our reports. A description of the methodology and sample calculations are provided in Appendix F.
09.0	To demonstrate consistency with PPS policy 2.1.4 provincial comments are required to confirm the subdivision/condo application is setback 30-metres from the PSW. Technical staff have conducted a preliminary review of the April 19, 2022 response letter from Cambium and offer the following feedback:	Response by Others.
10.0	The development proposes a 10 metre setback from the northwest wetland and 15 metre setback from the watercourse associated to the wetland; however, complete inventories were not noted for either feature, given its location. The information presented on these systems has been inferred based on downstream conditions.	Response by Others.
10.a	Technical staff require a site visit to further assess site feasibility and that the buffers are appropriate to ensure that no negative impact to the hydrology of the wetlands, or downstream impacts to the neighboring properties.	Response by Others.
10.b	ORCA staff request that the setbacks be staked in the field prior to a site visit.	Response by Others.
11.0	ORCA supports the Woodland restoration plan provided this area can be zoned appropriately to help protect the new feature.	Response by Others.
11.i	fyi - for reference this number was skipped in the letter	
11.ii	Please include a buffer from the restoration area and new development at the zoning stage	Response by Others.

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
11.iii	Please provide the restoration plan at detail design.	Response by Others.
12.0	Clearance regarding Species at Risk from MECP can be sought as a Draft Plan Condition.	Response by Others.
00.0	Comments by John Brisbois and Ron Howieson, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Geotechnical Report	
01.0	Section 1 Introduction For Consideration - The text states that the proposed scope of development is to include on-site sewage disposal systems, and ditches and low-impact development features (LIDs) for storm water management. There is no explicit comment, discussion or recommendation in the report concerning these infrastructure components. It is suggested that the authors include a statement that these components are not addressed in the geotechnical report. Stantec Follow-up - Comment was added to the report directing the reader to the hydroleological report for information related to hydrogeological components of the development. This comment is considered closed.	NA
02.0	Section 2.1 Field Investigation Program For Consideration - The authors may wish to consider providing additional detail regarding the method of backfill of the boreholes that did not include monitoring well installations. Stantec Follow-up - Comment was added indicating the boreholes without wells were backfilled with bentonite. This comment is considered closed.	NA
03.0	Section 2.2 Laboratory Testing Program For Consideration - The section references Atterberg Limits Tests and provided Unified Soil Classification System designations on the borehole/monitoring well records and in the report text. However, the results of the tests (indicating the plasticity characteristics of the soil or that the test result indicated the soil was non-plastic) are not shown on the records or in the text. It is suggested that the authors consider including the results of the tests. Stantec Follow-up - The initial comment was premised on an assumption that Atterberg Limits Tests had been completed but had been left out of the report. In removing the reference to Atterberg Limits Tests from the report, Stantec now infers that Atterberg Limits Tests were not conducted. In the absence of Atterberg Limits Tests, some of the soils encountered in the investigation cannot be classified in accordance with the USCS. It is therefore recommended that the authors either complete Atterberg Limits Tests on representative samples of the fine grain soils encountered in the boreholes and test pits or remove the reference to the USCS in the report and classify the soils based on the results of the grain size and textural/visual examination. Provided one of these approaches is adopted, this comment is considered closed.	PRI Engineering - Soil sample BH21-17 SS3 was submitted for analysis of Particle Size Distribution, hydrometer, and Atterberg limits. This sample is considered representative of the generally fine grained soils on the Subject Property. The results of the testing indicate BH21-17 SS3 was comprised of approximately 15% gravel, 37% sand, and 48% silt and clay. It is noted that this sample has <50% passing #200 sieve, and thus does not require Atterberg Limits testing to classify with the USCS. If assuming the sample has >50% passing #200 sieve (for comparison), this material would be classified as Sandy Silt with Gravel/Sandy Silt (ML). This soil unit in borehole BH21-17 was described as Sandy Silt, and as such, it is determined that the Atterberg Limit results do not significantly impact the description of these soils and thus do not alter the comments or recommendation in the Geotechnical Investigation Report.

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
04.0	<p>Section 3.5 Groundwater and Borehole Stability Observations</p> <p>Recommendation 1 – The groundwater discussion in this section focuses on the depths that seepage was observed in the open boreholes. There are monitoring well records included in Appendix B and the hydrogeological report includes reference to the measurement of static groundwater levels in the monitoring wells. It is recommended that additional detail and clarification be provided in this section regarding the static groundwater conditions on the Site.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - The static groundwater levels recorded in the monitoring wells were added to Table 4 in this section. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
05.0	<p>Section 4.1.1 Site Preparation</p> <p>For Consideration - The section references the removal of existing structures, driveways, and buried structural components. Section 1 Introduction refers to the Site as “vacant field with periodic tree coverage”. The authors may wish to clarify this apparent contradiction and if there is existing development on the Site, to provide a description of the existing development.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - The section was edited to indicate that if existing infrastructure is encountered at the time of construction, it should be removed. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
06.0	<p>Section 4.1.2 Excavations and Dewatering</p> <p>For Consideration – The section references the stability of open cut excavations in the context of the presence/depth of the groundwater table. It is suggested that the authors consider referencing the static groundwater depths in this section for clarity.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - The previous version of the report referenced the depth of groundwater seepage recorded in the open boreholes. The comment provided for consideration was intended to suggest that the static groundwater depth (as determined via the monitoring wells) be added. However, contrary to the suggestion, the reference to the depth of seepage was removed. As this was a comment "For Consideration", this comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
07.0	<p>Section 4.1.2 Excavations and Dewatering</p> <p>For Consideration - The section refers to the “expected excavation depth for site development”. Section 1 Introduction states that the proposed development will consist of “. . . single family residential with basements”. Section 4.3 Foundations, refers to an anticipated foundation depth in the order of 3.0 m from the existing ground surface. For purposes of clarity and frame-of-reference, it is suggested that this section include reference to the “expected excavation depth” in the context of the service/utility trenches and the foundations/basements for the proposed residences.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - An expected elevation for the basement excavations has been added to the report. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
08.0	<p>Section 4.1.2 Excavations and Dewatering</p> <p>Recommendation 2 – The concluding paragraph of this Section states that consideration should be given to undertaking shallow excavation work in dryer seasons when groundwater levels are lower. Although it is acknowledged that this would be of benefit, it is possible that the construction schedule will not align with this consideration. Further, the use of the term “shallow”, as a subjective term, may not be considered reasonable and representative of the depth of the foundations/excavation required for the basements of the residences as reported in Section 4.3 Foundations. It is recommended that this statement be revised and that appropriate detailed recommendations be provided addressing dewatering/unwatering to facilitate installation of services/utilities and construction of basements/foundations.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - A statement has been added to the report indicating that groundwater seepage is expected in excavations and referring the reader to the hydrogeological report for information concerning required dewatering. In addition, Section 4.3 Foundations references the presence of the groundwater as shallow as 1 m below the ground surface and included a recommendation for waterproofing and foundation sub-drains in accordance with the Building Code. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
09.0	<p>Section 4.1.3 Service Trenches</p> <p>Recommendation 3 - The section refers to “shallow” service trenches. Typically, municipal services would be installed below the minimum depth of frost penetration (1.5 m as referenced in Section 4.1.5 of the report). The seepage observed in several open boreholes and the static water levels recorded in two of the monitoring wells installed in the boreholes were within 1 m of the ground surface. As such, it is anticipated that groundwater will be encountered in excavations for municipal services. Comment and recommendation regarding the presence of the groundwater and dewatering/unwatering should be provided in this Section and/or in Section 4.1.2 for this purpose.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - A statement has been added to the report referring the reader back to the recommendations in Section 4.1.2. That section references the presence of shallow groundwater and the expectation that groundwater seepage will be encountered in excavations and refers the reader to the hydrogeological report for further information regarding dewatering requirements. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
10.0	<p>Section 4.1.4 Material Reuse, Backfill and Compaction</p> <p>For Consideration – Paragraph 1 recommends that fill materials containing deleterious materials not be reused as backfill. Section 3 does not provide reference to the presence of fill materials in the boreholes. It is inferred that this statement applies to the reuse of the existing native soils as “fill” in the context of the proposed scope of development. The authors may wish to consider rewording the paragraph for purposes of clarity.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - The section includes a recommendation that any fill materials proposed for use should not contain any deleterious materials. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
11.0	<p>Section 4.1.4 Material Reuse, Backfill and Compaction</p> <p>Recommendation 4 – Paragraph 2 provides a recommendation limiting the cobble and boulder content in materials intended for reuse as fill on the project. It is recommended that the authors consider precluding the use of boulders entirely and limiting the use of the cobble size materials.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - A recommendation has been added to this paragraph precluding the inclusion of boulders in the fill materials and limiting the size and quantity of cobbles that can be included in the fill materials. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
12.0	<p>Section 4.1.4 Material Reuse, Backfill and Compaction</p> <p>For Consideration – Subsequent paragraphs in this section pertain to pipe bedding and service trench backfill. The authors may wish to consider moving these paragraphs to the preceding Section 4.1.3 Service Trenches, wherein similar information is provided.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - The authors have moved the recommendations regarding pipe bedding and trench backfill to the preceding section. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
13.0	<p>Section 4.2 Seismic Site Class</p> <p>For Consideration – Consistent with the OBC and NBC, the selection of the Seismic Site Class is based on the subsurface conditions to a depth of 30 m below foundation level. As the boreholes were only advanced to a maximum depth of 6.55 m, it is suggested that the authors provide clarification in this respect, perhaps through reference to regional geology information, OGS information, or other open-source reports.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - An overview of the regional geologic conditions has been added to this section in the context of the seismic site class and requirement for assessment to a depth of 30 m below foundation level. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
14.0	<p>Section 4.3 Foundation Design</p> <p>Recommendation 5 - The foundation recommendations include consideration for encountering localized very loose to loose zones in the glacial till founding stratum. The authors suggest that these materials be removed and recompacted or be replaced with an alternative material. A recommendation for the alternative material should be provided.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - Recommendations regarding the alternative material for use as backfill of localized sub-excavations has been added to the respective paragraph. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
15.0	<p>Section 4.3 Foundation Design For Consideration – In consideration of the depth of the groundwater conditions observed/reported and the depth of the foundations/basements, the authors may wish to consider providing recommendations regarding the damp-proofing and/or waterproofing of the perimeter foundation walls. Stantec Follow-up - Recommendations regarding waterproofing of the basement walls and use of sub-drains in the presence of the shallow groundwater conditions reported have been added to this section of the report. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
16.0	<p>Section 4.4 Slab-on-Grade For Consideration – The section includes a recommendation for a perimeter foundation drain and sub-drains below the floor slab to address the groundwater conditions. It is suggested the authors consider expanding on this topic, given the critical nature of this requirement in the context of the groundwater conditions observed. Stantec Follow-up - An additional comment regarding design of the basement floor slab and the potential for hydrostatic uplift has been included. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
17.0	<p>Section 4.5 Soil Retaining Structures For Consideration – The section references “rigid walls of the buried structures” which is inferred to be the basement walls of the residences. There is also reference to “retaining walls” though there is no reference to this infrastructure in other sections of the report. The authors may wish to consider editing the text for purposes of clarification. Stantec Follow-up - Additional comment has been provided regarding the potential requirement for retaining walls in the context of the general development of the property. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
18.0	<p>Section 4.5 Soil Retaining Structures Recommendation 6 – The closing paragraph of this section references the case where the perimeter drain and underfloor drains are not installed. Should this be the case, the entire basement (foundations and floor slab) must be designed and constructed water-tight and be designed to resist the hydrostatic uplift. The report should include clear recommendations specific to this case. Stantec Follow-up - Comment has been added regarding consideration of hydrostatic uplift in the design of the slab-on-grade should an underdrain system not be adopted. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
19.0	<p>Section 4.6 Driveway and Pavement Structure</p> <p>Recommendation 7 – The section provides a pavement design for a “Local Roadway” with reference to the majority of traffic consisting of “light duty vehicles”. It is reasonable to assume that traffic will also include garbage trucks, snowplows, and fire trucks. The authors should confirm that the design is satisfactory for the support of these heavier vehicles. In addition, reference should be included to the pavement designs provided in Table C.1 Geometric Standards for Road Design in the City of Peterborough - Engineering Design Standards (provided the specifics of the road Right-Of-Way is available for the proposed development).</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - The recommended pavement design does not meet the minimum requirements in Tacle C.1 of the City's Standards. Provided that the City advises of the intended road cross-section and the geotechnical consultant confirms the recommended asphalt pavement design meets the City's requirements, this comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
20.0	<p>Appendix A Borehole Location Testing Plan</p> <p>For Consideration – The first of three plans in Appendix A is the general Site Plan. The plan includes ten (10) borehole symbols without specific labels; there are no test pit symbols or labels. The second and third plans include eight (8) test pit symbols and labels, eight (8) shallow borehole symbols and labels (consistent with the text of the report) and ten (10) deep borehole symbols and labels (consistent with the text of the report). The configuration of the layout is different between the first plan and the second and third plans. It is suggested that the plans and investigation hole labels be reviewed for consistency.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - The three plans have been eliminated in favor of a single plan showing all borehole and test pit locations. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
21.0	<p>Recommendation 8 – Two of the three plans in Appendix A illustrate the locations of test pits included in the field investigation program. There is no reference to or discussion of the test pits in the text of the report; However, it is understood that the conditions encountered in the test pits are included in the hydrogeological report. It is recommended that the information obtained from the excavation and observations of the test pits be added to the geotechnical report. Discussion pertaining to the soil conditions, groundwater conditions, and stability of open-cut excavations, as a minimum, would be of value in this respect.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - The test pit records have been added to the report. The records provided a description of the conditions encountered and presence or absence of groundwater. Photos of the open test pits are also included. This comment is considered closed.</p>	NA
22.0	<p>For Consideration – The soil strata encountered in the investigation were classified in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). The authors may wish to consider adding the respective USCS Group Symbols on the borehole/monitoring well records and in the text of the report.</p> <p>Stantec Follow-up - Refer to comment above "For Consideration" in Section 2.2 Laboratory Testing Program. Pending resolution to the comment referenced above as outlined, this comment is also considered closed.</p>	NA

Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
0.00	Comments by Roger Freymond and Grant Whitehead, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Hydrogeological Study Report	
1.0	Wills needs to provide more detailed information of how they propose to achieve a post-development infiltration rate of 314.9 mm/yr, given the shallow groundwater table conditions in some areas of the Site and low permeability soil conditions. Stantec normally defers to MECP Design Guidelines for Sewage Works (2008), which recommends that an infiltration rate of 250 mm/yr be used for dilution, regardless of onsite soil conditions.	Wills' Hydrogeological Study Report has been updated to include the most recent infiltration data presented in Wills' Preliminary Stormwater Management Report (October 2022), which considers 320.0 mm/year of total infiltration. Detailed calculations and rationale are provided in Appendix A, and are further explained in the Wills' Preliminary Stormwater Management Report. On the basis of MECP Guideline D-5-4 (Predictive Assessment - Residential Development [5.6.2]), it is Wills' opinion that considering site specific factors (including post-development infiltration values) is appropriate as input into the modeling of contaminant attenuation.
2.0	Wills may need to revisit the use of enhanced treatment systems or consider a further reduction in building lots depending on how the comment above is addressed.	Please see response above.
00.0	Comments by Mackenzie Crowley, Engage Engineering	
01.0	FSR - Additional information is required to confirm that the existing water treatment and distribution system has adequate capacity to accommodate the new units.	
01.a	The average of the annual maximum daily flow should be utilized in determining the residual capacity of the existing water treatment system.	The Water Capacity Analysis (see Appendix C) has been updated to show the average maximum daily flows per month rather than the average daily flows per month as it was previously submitted.
01.b	Please provide water demand calculations for the proposed development. It is unclear where the 9m3/day comes from in analyzing the water system capacity.	Both the FSR and Water Capacity Analysis (see Appendix C) have been updated to provide clarity on where the proposed/post-development average maximum daily flows come from.
01.c	Adequate pressures for the development should be confirmed.	Ontario Clean Water Agency has informed us that "the plant typically operates between 60-70psi".
02.0	SWM - Section 2.0 references single-family homes and townhouses. There are no townhouses shown on the plans. Please confirm and revise.	This section has been reworded to clarify the type of units proposed.
03.0	SWM - It is unclear what is meant by 'no stormwater quantity or quality targets are proposed' in Section 3.1.2 for drainage areas PR-101 and PR-201. Please review and revise.	This section has been reworded to that no quantity or quality controls are required.
04.0	SWM - The proposed drainage areas should consider the entire site area.	The entrance to Heritage Line has been added to catchment PR-300, discharging to OUT-3 without any quantity or quality controls.
05.0	SWM - The design infiltration rates are less than 15mm/hr. Please review the functionality of the proposed design with no underdrain and how it will perform in the winter months.	In-situ infiltration rates were found to be less than 15 mm/hr in INF-03, which is located in the northwest corner of the Site. There are no infiltration facilities proposed at this location. As such, no underdrain is anticipated to be required. During detailed design, additional infiltration will be completed at the locations and depth of the proposed infiltration features and the final design will be revised as necessary.



Ref. #	Comment / Action	Status / Response
06.0	SWM - It appears that the proposal is to utilize roadside ditches to provide the required volume for quality and quantity control. Please provide conveyance calculations to demonstrate that the ditches can convey the required flows while still providing sufficient storage volume. (Repeat Comment)	The intent of this comment is unclear. Within the stormwater facility the conveyance flow rate is regulated by the outlet structure. As such, as long as the driveway culvert capacities are greater than the outflow rate, flows will be contained within the roadside ditching. Furthermore and emergency overflow weir has been incorporated in into the outlet structure design in the event that the outlet becomes obstructed. Detailed hydraulic calculations will be provided during detailed design to confirm the culvert capacities, erosion protection requirements and uncontrolled ditch capacities. If additional clarification is required for Draft Plan Approval, please contact the Water Resources Engineer directly.
07.0	SWM - Please provide culvert sizing calculations. Does the right-of-way have sufficient volume to contain the 100-year runoff and volume to ensure no runoff onto the properties? Does water spill across the driveways?	The 100-year storm (flow and volume) will be contained within the right-of-way. Culvert sizing will be provided as part of detailed design to ensure that stormwater will not spill across driveways.
08.0	SWM - Maintenance considerations should be considered for the outlet control structures. The 50mm drainage holes will be prone to clogging.	This comment is no longer applicable as the outlet control structure has been redesigned.

From: Lynette Nicholson <LNicholson@ocwa.com>
Sent: November 23, 2022 3:30 PM
To: Mitchell Bell <mbell@dmwills.com>
Subject: RE: County File 15CD-21001 - Heritage Line Subdivision - Keene Heights Water Pressure

Hi Mitchell,
The plant typically operates between 60-70psi. There is no monitoring in the distribution system.

Thanks,
Lynette Nicholson
Senior Operations Manager | Kawartha Trent Region | Ontario Clean Water Agency
Cell: 705.731.7117 | lnicholson@ocwa.com



From: Karen Lorente <KLorente@ocwa.com>
Sent: November-17-22 1:51 PM
To: Mitchell Bell <mbell@dmwills.com>; Lynette Nicholson <LNicholson@ocwa.com>
Cc: Geoff Redden <GRedden@ocwa.com>; jfleming@dmwills.com
Subject: FW: County File 15CD-21001 - Heritage Line Subdivision - Keene Heights Water Pressure

Hello Mitch and Lynette,

I have copied Lynette Nicholson as the Senior Operations Manager for this facility to assist you.

Thank you,
Karen Lorente (She/Her)
Regional Hub Manager | Kawartha Trent | Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA)
C: 705 715 6865 | klorente@ocwa.com | www.ocwa.com

From: Mitchell Bell <mbell@dmwills.com>
Sent: November-17-22 11:52 AM
To: Karen Lorente <KLorente@ocwa.com>
Cc: Joe Fleming <jfleming@dmwills.com>
Subject: County File 15CD-21001 - Heritage Line Subdivision - Keene Heights Water Pressure

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Karen,

I am reaching out in hopes you can assist us with addressing a comment we received regarding a subdivision we are designing along Heritage Line that will pull from the Keene Heights Drinking Water System.

The comment requires us to confirm that the system has adequate pressure to service the additional dwellings we are proposing to add to the drinking water system. Would you be able to provide us with

average annual pressure of the system or something along those lines so we can speak to this comment? As soon as possible would be appreciated.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Thanks,



Mitch Bell · Project Designer

D.M. Wills Associates Limited

150 Jameson Drive · Peterborough, ON · K9J 0B9

Tel: (705) 742-2297 ext. 288 · Fax: (705) 748-9944

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

This email contains privileged and confidential information only for the use of the intended recipient(s) and should not be redistributed without first receiving permission from the sender. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by telephone.