

We believe that if sewers are installed in Inverhuron that there is no need for municipal water. Sewers would remove the risk of contamination for all and wouldn't require the ridiculous digging up of previously installed sewers. I have excellent water from a drilled well that I test 3 times during spring and summer and it always tests perfect. Our property sits on 40 feet of sand so I don't believe we need either sewers or water, but others may not be as fortunate. I would not connect or drink inferior chlorine treated lake water from Kincardine when I already have great well water. If we have to do any of this, I would only support sewers at a reasonable cost. Any proposal that costs @20,000 to \$30,000 is out of the question.

We feel the prices are too high for the sewers. We are connected to great working septic system

I have a seasonal cottage that can't be lived in year round. It mostly gets used weekends and the occasional week here and there. The last time I had the septic system cleaned out, I was told there was hardly anything in it. I feel that making me pay such a huge amount, the cost of mid priced new car, is very unfair. It is people who live year round that are causing the sewage problems and not seasonal cottagers. Also agriculture is the main culprit. This year the heavy rain has made the water at Inverhuron almost unswimmable. This is the first time in my life that I have not felt safe swimming at Inverhuron except out on the rocks. This is not caused by septic systems and certainly not by seasonal cottage septic systems. The sewer may be needed but make the those responsible for the problem pay. If I have to pay then I would like the option of paying for this over a 5-10 year period on my property tax.

think the low cost of the grinder pumps is very misleading and does not include the long term costs to the property owners to maintain those pumps. I also bet that none of the design engineers nor the vendors have taken into account the impact the sand will have on the grinder pumps. I don't think any of them understand the sand issues we have on the sand beach. Not sure what the \$2,075 for the Capital Reserve Fund is so I voted no on that.

Over the years I have invested 10s of thousands of dollars in wells, pumps and septic systems and they all work just fine. Kincardine council decided to extend the water line to Inverhuron in the hope that people would hook up and help pay for it under a threat that it would cost way more to do it later. No such luck so now they will force us to hook up? The sewers are the same story only when I did want to hook up rather than rehabilitate my septic system I was told that I couldn't. So now I have no choice? The bill for my property will be in the \$30-40K range when all is said and done and for what? I did not answer the what type of sewer I would prefer because keeping the system I have was not one of the choices.

I do believe that all residences need some kind of septic system and if they do not the residence should be condemned until it does have an adequate and approved system. There are too many properties that do not have any kind of septic system at all.

Missed the meeting, and am concerned about the grinder pump - is there a noise level attached to these pumps? Really not sure why these infrastructure upgrades must be paid by each resident. When they upgrade the sewers /water in Kincardine or Tiverton does each home owner pay an up front cost? As a taxpayer on Lake street we get no garbage/recycle service for more than 6 months, no road clearance, and yet we get no tax break for that lack of service.

We need to get on with this project.

I've already paid the water fee (\$6300) but didn't hook up. I believed this would help in selling my home when I retire. I plan to bring the water line to my house and install a sewer line in the event we are forced to hook up or I have a buyer that desires this prep. work.

We have a large property in Inverhuron that has an approved septic system. This septic system was recently installed within the last five years. This very expensive septic system was installed by Jackson Construction Inverhuron to Municipality of Kincardine code approval and inspection. This system as installed on site has a guaranteed service life of 25 to 20 years. We want the proposed new sewer policy to allow for exceptions to the mandatory hook up proposal as in our case. Also we have paid in advance for the water system that was installed but wish to not hook up as we have a recently drilled well with water that is always tested as free of any containments. We feel the proposed sewer system must be mandatory to property owners that are on holding tanks and unapproved septic systems but the policy of mandatory hook up must make allowances to code approved septic system installations as in our case.

And what of those on fixed incomes??? Is the municipality so cold as to mandate infrastructure to those who are retired who can't possibly afford it, even over time. Did anybody actually think of stipulating that those on fixed incomes would be exempt (or hooked up for free) until the next transfer of ownership of those properties, where cost could be applied to the sale or transfer. And as an owner on Lake Street South already with sewers, the idea of tearing op our current infrastructure to add water is ridiculous. Our water is clean, which annual testing supports. Kincardine water is suspect at best, as is the track record of the municipality in environmentally conscious installation, after the sewer debacle on Lake Street North shows, leaving a small area scarred for decades. Not tearing up and replacing our current infrastructure, at municipality cost, would save them revenue not possibly replaced by mandatory water hook-ups paid by property owners.

Our house is approx. 800 ft from the road. Do you know how much that will cost us? I say, force the people with the bad wells to bring them up to standards. Why are we being punished because they haven't been up keeping their systems? We're retired, and this may force us and many others to sell. But who wants to buy when they have this hanging over their heads. I want this money grab stopped!!!!

I have always been in favour of sewers even though I recently paid \$6000.00 to have our tile bed (leach field) completely replaced. I am not totally in favour of mandatory water. I do not understand why they must be a package deal.

Bought this property as a recreational facility 12 yrs ago. I share a water well with three other residents, the water has been tested regularly during the spring summer and fall, and has shown excellent quality. I'm sure everyone is concerned with environment issues and reducing(eliminating) effluent discharge into our waterways, and for my part our concrete storage vault and leaching bed has been more than adequate. I can afford the prescribed costs involved and being imposed as this project has been conceived. However I am more than a little sceptical that our municipal government has any clue how to manage the financing of this project, the social impact it will obviously instigate, and can we even imagine the threat of cost over runs, and have some confidence that these will be adequately addressed in the tendering process. Kincardine has taken a page from Ontario Hydro- "make 'em pay for our facility-keep the billing costs excessive-charge 'em for management screw ups-find new and innovative ways of describing the "customer liability "such as cost recovery- debt recovery- distribution costs and finally the cost of subsidising power delivery south of the border and into Quebec." I can afford this, but I'm not a fool. Maybe I'll just take my family elsewhere for fun and recreation. This is a poor investment for a guy that just likes to get away to the cabin in the woods. Regards, Gar

1300.00 for a seasonal property is a little much

Trying to go back and force those folks that opted out of the pipeline 10 years ago will kill any friendly thoughts with people towards the new project. The Municipality needs to live with the decision they made 10 years ago allowing people to opt out of connection to the water pipeline. They had no back up plan and residents should not have to pony up for their short sighted approach to projects. Chemically treated water is horrid no matter where it comes from. I prefer to stay with my well water and if I have to at some point, use a stand alone filtration system for my own use. In 10 years, we have not had a failed test. If I am forced to hook up to municipal water, it will be used for my toilet and not for drinking water. Sewers would be ok and taking advantage of a grant to offset the cost of what will likely happen at some point anyway is in everyone's best interest.

Council members should answer the questions fielded from at a meeting instead of the company hired - BM Ross Minutes and feedback should be posted from these meetings, or it becomes a "he said, she said or I don't know about that problem (like the storm water)" situation. I personally agree that everyone needs clean water and proper sewage, and that our lake should be protected, but an inspection of all the homeowners systems, would have seemed like a good place to start. I don't remember any kind of inspection to meet the code, being done for all, only the survey, which less than 1/3 of the residents participated in, and it is "pie in the sky" for the council to think that the kind of costs associated with this "upgrade" can be managed by many of our part or full time residence. I have a 20 acre piece of property on Whispering Woods, with a septic, recently redone and a well that is 138 feet deep, and tested on a regular basis. I noticed that on the maps posted that that you are proposing to dig up the first piece of Whispering Woods, east of Albert Rd, which will encompass only one cottage (which is currently empty) and my property. Since the town has recently redone this road and planted new trees, is it feasible to then dig for one occupied home? Would it not be wiser and more cost effective to leave this road alone for now, and put a "t" connection on the Albert Road Line for water and sewer, so that it can be connected in the future. This would result is less construction and digging , fewer parts, less repaving, etc. Secondly, could you look into having a full environmental assessment done on this area as was suggested by several at the meeting. As well, a full assessment would address the storm water issue that we have here. I have personally expensed a ditch across my own property to bring the storm water and spring runoff away from the septic and over to the road, where it travels down to the culvert at the corner of Albert and Whispering Woods, but in a year when there is a lot of water, there is nowhere for the water to go once it gets to the corner.

will be taking legal action towards the Municipal if this is approved.

there is no consistent information. Options, plans and costs vary significantly. We need timely, reliable and official information before making decisions. As a cottager I oppose grinder pumps because I do not wish to leave any power going to my cottage while it is shut down for the winter. The capital cost of connections in this survey seem excessive. In addition I have no means of assessing the proposed useage costs compared to other areas. robin Palin

Hi Gord I have a few points that should be raised - 1. The world is not static . How is undeveloped land to be assessed? Consider the 39 acres that the Saugeen Valley wants to unload so that they can have a new office in Formosa or undeveloped lots in the area - . - How will (or how much will) future developers/buyers pay for water and septic systems 2. Will the existence of this septic system lead to widespread development and the eventual deforestation of the lake range lands - The lake range lands from Kincardine through to Port Elgin are a unique land form that affects the local micro-climate. 3. Will the construction crews maintain all natural landforms - 4. We believe that it is in the

interest of all land owners to have adequate and safe water intake and waste systems. I don't believe that a lot of people understand the havoc that would be created if someone took ill from polluted well water. It would be another black mark on the county and would impact property values for a number of years. See you on the weekend Dennis

We are currently on the sewer system on Lake St. South and received no grants or assistance for that cost in 1992. We feel we should not have to bear any current or future costs for the new installation of sewers.

I feel that all of this should not be mandatory to hook up—for many this is a high cost and some are unable to financially support this. The Municipality should pay a portion of the costs, because we (Inverhuron taxpayers) have paid our taxes for years and they should have made sure that a portion of our taxes went back to Inverhuron

I feel that all of this should not be mandatory to hook up—unless you have problems with the existing systems. The Municipality should pay a portion of the costs, because we (Inverhuron taxpayers) have paid our taxes for years and they should have made sure that a portion of our taxes went back to Inverhuron

Should this proposal go through, what payment options are available to those who have too hook up?

We are the last cottage on Lake St.S. to be connected to the original sewer line. We had to hook up in order to get clear title for the lot which was on a 99 year lease which my Mother got in 1948. It has served us well It cost us 23,858.80 May 29, 1992 .Each year since hook up we have paid \$350.00 on average for maintenance for 3 months per year usage of this seasonal dwelling. We share a 95 foot drilled well with our neighbour. The water has always tested very good and has been no problem

.We really do not want Lake Huron water that is treated in Kincardine. It has not been that perfect from all reports. Sewers should be mandatory for all at Inverhuron .Once installed the Lake water quality should improve. Since there are no big farm operations close by, farm run off should not be an issue with our wells Why did the provincial government not assist with the financing of the Victoria water pipeline since the main purpose was for the Provincial Park? The Municipality is trying to recoup their 1.8 million dollar debt on this project at our expense..

Traditional gravity flow system is the only way to go. Loss of electricity with the grinder pump means you can't flush your toilet until power is restored. Grinder pumps are great for cottagers that are only here for two months of the year.

think the Municipality should pay at least half of the cost not paid by the Grant. Inverhuron has contributed millions of dollars to the Municipality. It is time the Municipality invested some of that in Inverhuron.

If the sewer proposal goes through whereby the municipality owns and maintains the grinder pumps for Lake Street South, I will be expecting the municipality to buy back the grinder pump I paid for myself plus my portion of the spare grinder pump currently belonging to all eleven of us on Lake Street North, purchased in 2009/10. As I had to buy it, I expect full reimbursement for the price paid for both. Thank you, Eileen Kirk 149 Lake Street

Gordon:I think the whole sewer issue is the biggest waste of money since mystic cove fiasco if Kincardine has so much extra money they should lower our taxes.All the neighbors I have talked to agree.The type of system proposed has all kinds of problems with the grinders and lines.Please e-mail me with how I can help fight this stupid move.Also I answered B to question seven because the fields are locked and I could not send survey otherwise.I DO NOT WANT SEWERS PERIOD. Thanks James McKeary 519-368-6046

We believe that if sewers are installed in Inverhuron that there is no need for municipal water. Sewers would remove the risk of contamination for all and wouldn't require the ridiculous digging up of previously installed sewers.I have excellent water from a drilled well that I test 3 times during spring and summer and it always tests perfect. Our property sits on 40 feet of sand so I don't believe we need either sewers or water, but others may not be as fortunate. I would not connect or drink inferior chlorine treated lake water from Kincardine when I already have great well water. If we have to do any of this, I would only support sewers at a reasonable cost. Any proposal that costs @20,000 to \$30,000 is out of the question. Joan and Bryan Stewart

Thanks to IDRA for being so involved in this process. We have one cottage already on the sewer. Seems ridiculous to rip up road to install yet another system. How can municipality justify spending taxpayers' money to change systems? This is not fiscal restraint! Water: our well is good so who needs Kincardine water? Especially for less than 2 months per year. Some northern communities are suffering for lack of proper water & sewer systems. Our systems appear to be a luxury. Ontario should cancel the grant to Kincardine and spend the money where it's needed (and needed desperately).

I would prefer not to hook up to the water because I have a 106 foot well that produces clean water. However if in order to get the sewer, water was required than I would be in favour of hooking up to the water.

What percent of the residents of the municipality have had no municipal monetary support? Is Inverhuron the only part of the municipality that has not been given municipal monies?

I have e-mail going back to 2006 on this drivel. So now we have who knows how many sets of stats., environmental assessments, some of which make us look like we are living in the Greenick Swamp. Take the grant money, spend it in Inverhuron by assigning these dollars to the people who are in need, and FIX THE FLOODING. I believe in one of the recent meetings the question was asked "why haven't we looked at the flooding", and the answer was "well that wasn't part of our mandate". Well that's comforting isn't it. I don't happen to have 15k or 20k sitting around the house even if all this takes place. And...who puts the properties back in their original condition once the work is complete. Also if this takes place, I want to have my house checked and photographed by my insurance company before any excavation takes place. If this responsibility is not picked up by the municipality you will hear from my solicitor. I want to see the "terms" of how we are to pay back these dollars to the municipality. I certainly know I am not alone when it comes to the money issue. And then you want us to contribute to the Capital Reserve Fund??? I have no faith in this municipality, and consequently feel that there is another mandate out there. I think it would be of benefit to sit everyone down and give us the whole picture, and maybe, just maybe you might get resolution.

Should this proposal go through, what payment options are available to those who have too hook up?

After attending the meeting in July I was disappointed with the council members apparent lack of concern in representing the residents. As an engineer I thought the information that was presented was done so with good intent but the options for pursuing remedies by the council didn't fully encompass what the data suggested was possible nor fairly addressed the residents properties that currently meet water and septic standards. When evaluating the environmental risk assessment its clear that there are several properties that are at risk of contaminating ground water due to inappropriately sized or non conforming septic fields which is compounded by some scattered run off issues. However, the risk to contaminating the wells is virutally emliminated by implementing a low pressure septic system on properties that don't meet current septic field standard. The second claimed threat to the ground water quality, the limited filtering effect of the soil above the bedrock, was not well defended considering the well water samples proved to show little or no contamination currently even with the effect of the several questionable and inadequately engineering septic systems. My thought would be to first eliminate the largest threat to the well water, the marginal septic fields, then evaluate the water quality. I found the presentations lack of options for water supply and theoretical improvements to well water improvement if the septic system was improved to actually suggest that the primary goal/interest of the municipality is to gain water customers/income. My other concern regarding the project is the potential legal expenses that will add to the cost of the project if council tries to impose all or

nothing options on properties that can defend their existing water and/or sewer through appeals. Can any or all of the grant be used to pay for the septic system independently (ie no water project to connect to the municipality)? If so, would there be any cost to residents if it were used solely for that purpose? Brian Green bwgreen@gmail.com

Did other areas of Kincardine pay to the Capital Reserve Fund?

I prefer to have a democratic decision made rather than a dictated one. I realise that sewer and water in the long run may be a good thing for the community but I hate it being rammed down our throats by mostly people outside the community. It's hard to say what the total cost associated with the sewer will be as they may find it costs more to put in the pipeline than they think and the grant only picks up a specific portion.

Fully support the sewers and don't begrudge paying towards installation or capital reserve for future sewer works. I believe the Municipality should be contributing. As seasonal resident we pay a disproportionate cost of upkeep and servicing in the Municipality, and the flippant comment that "You can use your property all year round" doesn't cut it. I would prefer to stay on my own water as I prefer the taste. If at some point due to contamination etc. I had to hook up to town water then so be it. I would even consider paying the water servicing fee but staying on my well as long as not being hit with the monthly charge and then no stranded municipal debt.

Am fully supportive of a sewer system being installed.

I am very concerned about the possibility of losing the grant due to small groups of people with differing agendas. Sewers and water are inevitable especially on the shores of a lake and I believe we should just get on with it. Hopefully this survey will not be used to slow the process.

We are pleased that the predecessor owner of our property paid for installation of the sewer service in the 1990's and eliminated the use of septic service. We have a well on our property. While we normally do not use it for drinking, we feel we are not inconvenienced by electing to buy drinking water during our 6-month annual use of our cottage. Tearing up Lake Street to install a water line at an appropriate distance from the existing sewer line is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

I really don't want to drink Kincardine's polluted, then chlorinated water. They should drill a well at Tiverton. Our well is fine. I think the government should be providing owners with low interest loans that can be paid over a length of time. Most people do not have this kind of money. I don't know what to answer for number 7. The survey doesn't give me a chance to say undecided.

feel that if the sewers are installed then it will insure a safe water supply. I'm all for sewers but don't feel it should be mandatory to have the town water.

We do not object to connecting to Municipal water, but it is too costly @ \$7,700.00. Would we have to pay the full amount at time work being done, or could we have the option of paying over a certain time/number of years?

VIA MAIL MOST OF US ARE SEASONAL SO ARE WE THE MAJOR CULPRIT OF WATER POLLUTION? THE ROAD IS NOT MAINTAINED IN THE WINTER I CAN NOT GET TO MY COTTAGE IN THE WINTER TIME. ITS A TAX GRAB. WATER CHAGE IN WINDSOR 5 TO 8 DOLLAR PER MONTH.

VIA MAIL - IF IT IS A GO EVERYONE SHOULD PARTICIPATE IF THE SURVEY SHOW THAN IT IS NEEDED IT WOULD BE CHEAPER TO HAVE THE MUNICIPALITY INSTALL THE WATER AND SEPTIC

VIA MAIL I AM 100 % OPPOSED TO THS PROCESS. I DO NOT WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN IT MY SEPTIC SYSTEM WORKS WELL THE ONLY WAY I WOULD BE INTRESTED IS IF THE TOTAL COST WAS COVERD UNDER THIS GRANT

VIA MAIL WE ARE NOT IN FAVOR OF ANY SYSTEM OUR WELL PASSED INSPECTION AS WELL AS THE SEPTIC SYSTEM

VIA MAIL Gravity flow Long range - yes - but it should be spaced out over at least a decade. Everyone at once will lead to higher costs

feel the cost of mandatory water and sewer hookup will make it necessary for some cottage owners to sell their property because they are unable to pay the high cost of these services. I feel this is very sad because some cottages have been in the family for 75 years or more..

VIA MAIL - WITH THE EVERTIGFHING ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION IT IS ONLY A MATTER OF TIME BEFORE ALL SEPTIC SYSTEM WILL HAVE TO BE INSPECTED AND THE LOTS ARE TO SMALL TO PUT A NEW SYSTEM ON THEM

VIA MAIL - WE JUST PUT IN A FULL SEPTIC SYSTEM IN 2008 SO WE DONOT NEED OR WANT A NEW SYSTEM I BELEIVE ALL PEOPLE SHOULD BE ON A THE SEWER SYSTEM OF SHOW PROOF THAT THEIRSEPTIC IS IN WORKING ORDER. PAYMENTS ARE HIGH AND ARE DIFFICULT TO MANAGE.

VIA MAIL - I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW I WOULD BE EXPECTED TO PAY FOR THIS? I AM A SINGLE MOTHER WITH 2 CHILDREN LIVING IN A HABIBAT FOR HUMANITY HOME GEARED TO INCOME.

VIA MAIL - I HAVE JUST HAD A NEWW DEEP WALL WELL DRILLED AND OWN SEWER IS OPERATING JUST FINE.

VIA MAIL - I THINK SEPTIC SYSTEM POSE A POTENTIAL HEALTH PROBLEM AND THERFORE I SUPPOT YHE MAMATORY SEWERS THAT MAY IMPROVE THE WELL WATER BOTTLE WATER IS A LOWW COST OTION . I WISH TO BE COONECTED TO MUNICIPAL WATER

VIA MAIL - THE ENVIROROMENT ASSESSMENT WAS POORLY DONE AND DIDNOT INCLUDE THE STORM WATER ISSUE. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW MANY RESIDENTS HAVE A DEFIFINENT SEPTIC SYSTEM?

VIA MAIL - COTTAGE OWNER SHOLD NOT BE TREATED AS IF THEY WERE PERMANENT RESIDENTS. MONTHLY CHARGES FOR WATER AND SEWER ARE UNFAIR TO PAY FOR TOWN WATER IS A REVERSING A DECISION THAT THE COUNCIL MADE WHEN THE WATER LINE WAS PUT IN.

VIA MAIL WE ARE 4 MONTH SEASONAL RESIDENTS LIVING ON A PRIVATE ROAD, WE HAVE ABUILT TO CODE SEPTIC SYSTEM AND WELL TEST REGULARLY THERFORE WE HAVE NO INTREST IN MANDATORY MUNICIPAL WATER

NO CANNOT DO OLD AGE PENSION WILL NOT STRETCH AROUND INCREASD TAXES AND NEW SERVICES.

, our household supports the sewer initiative and making it mandatory however i would like to have a whole lot more information on the lagoons, their remaining life and expected future remediations costs over the next 10 years. we are completely opposed to the mandatory water hook-up in princible(oppressive nature of it), the quality of our water is just fine, we suspect we will eventually be drawn in to amortizing the stranded water line debt? and the ripping up the operational sewer pipe on lake st. s. at a cost of over half a million dollars. however, overall i am opposed to the project as it creates the opportunity for wide scale development of the community and much higher density. has council ever asked us as a community what are goals are? thanks for taking the initiative here.

No, I would not "like" to pay to be connected but I would connect to the system. If the cottage is connected to the sewer system there should no longer be a great concern about the well water in the area.

VIA MAIL – I PAID THE MUNICIPALTY \$19,141.80 IN JAN 2010 FOR THE WATER.

VIA MAIL JUST LEAVE US ALONE WE HAVE A GOOD WELL AND SEPTIC TANK

VIA MAIL GOOD TO HAVE WATER AND SEWERS BUT I FEEL THE MUNICIPALITY SHOULD PAY MOST OF THE COST

VIA MAIL - I am not sure what the capiyal reserve is but I can guess a tax.

VIA MAIL - I believe that in time the ministry of the environment will mandate sewers near the great lakes lets do it now when we have the grant money before it costs more with no grant.

VIA MAIL - The cost overruns for this project will be triple at lease there will be continues and on going problem if grinder pumps are

VIA MAIL Grinder pumps sound good, cost but is it sufficiently effective for our needs.

VIA MAIL The decision has been made it going to happen just how. Capital reserve for this project my understanding at the meeting 0 dollars. They were talking was not for original water line.

VIA MAIL - An earlier council decision was that the connecting to the water was not be mandatory. We think that decision should stand

VIA MAIL We want the best for the less cost

We should not rip up the existing sewer on lake st south just to deliver water to 40 cottages at a cost of \$500-800,000. that's almost adding an extra cost of \$2000 per cottager in the entire study area. How did they arrive @ \$7800 a cottage for water, that's a lot of copper pipe per person or is the cost to get the water all the way from kincardine? We would have been better to have joined up with Tiverton if that's the case. strongly feel the water should not be mandatory. Costs should be amortized over 20 years as the life of the sewer is 50 years. what will the construction schedule look like? will we have a lost summer?

Lake Street should not be altered at all. As far as the water is concerned I am extemely happy with my present situation and don't feel town water will be of any benefit to me or the rest of the ratepayers. I still can not forget Walkerton!

. BM Ross has repeatedly indicated the acceptable life of a septic system is 25 years before problems arise. So as not to penalize people who have kept their septic systems in good working order, suggest those with newer septic systems be allowed to delay payment for and hook-up to the new sewer system until their septic system is somewhere between 15 and 20 years old. Alternately these people should be given a prorated discount in the amount they contribute for a

new sewer system 2. Among the reasons we support a gravity flow system, is concern about the long term reliability of grinder pumps. Suggest those people with septic systems in good working order who hook up to grinder pumps not be forced to de-commission their septic systems but keep them as back-up. 3. A grinder pump system is much cheaper to install than a traditional gravity flow system. A gravity system is clearly inferior. Some lot owners will have no option but to go with grinder pumps if a "complete" gravity flow system or hybrid system is selected. These people should only have to pay the grinder pump cost of \$5,175, likely meaning those on gravity will likely pay more than \$21,275 or \$13,275 for complete gravity and hybrid respectively. 4. Many people may reluctantly be forced to accept inferior grinder pumps. To the extent possible, these people should be treated the same as the majority of Kincardine taxpayers on gravity. Therefore, regardless of the option chosen, the municipality should assume ownership, maintenance and operation of all grinder pumps, including the cost of powering the pumps. 5. If the survey indicates a significant majority of people in Inverhuron do not want to hook up to municipal water, extension of the existing water system should be dropped from the sewer-water project. Installation of a new sewer system significantly reduces the need for municipal water which is clearly inferior in terms of taste and cost.

I see no need for municipal water when we are here for only the summer months. Frankly my water is tested every spring and is free and clear of contaminants. I do not want the integrity of Lake St destroyed. There are many seniors on our street who can't afford this change, nor do they need it. Finally, what happened to our sewer rebate when our sewers were connected. Many others have hooked up on the East side of Lake St and we have not received any rebates at all. I find this another failure of the municipal government to fulfill their agreements. How can we trust them.

VIA MAIL - If connection is determined to be mandatory payment should be interest free in 15 to 20 annual instalments

It would have been nice to have a 'no comment' alternative to 8 & 9 which I would have used.

VIA MAIL Having spent over \$ 15,000. In recent years for a raised septic bed and well I am totally p.o d. This was done and passed by the MOH knowing this was in the planning stage. I wasted my money just typical of the government I am not interested in paying anything more. I expect that the municipality will assume the road maintenance.

VIA MAIL - THERE ARE SERVEAL COTTAGE OWNER WHO USES THIER COTTAGES ABOUT 30 - 35 DAYS A YEAR AND ARE SATIFIED WITH WELL WATER AND SEPTIC SYSTEMS MANY PEOPLE DO NOT HAVE \$ 20,000.00

VIA MAIL - I am appalled by this proposal and may have to sell if it comes to pass

VIA MAIL - Own property is big enough to have a septic system than will not effect the water.If we are forced to paid for water and sewer we should be given a choice of if we want to hook up or not. I am happy with my current water and sewer

VIA MAIL - Put a new septic system in 1980 it is working just fine. would like some questions answered on grinder pumps.

VIA MAIL - NO TO WATER AND SEWERS FOR INVERHURON

VIA MAIL - The water to the cottage and the apartment is tested on a regular bases and always is good The septic sytem is well maintain and is pumped out every two years

VIA MAIL THE COUNCIL SHOULD NOT HAVE CHAGED THIER MINDS ON THE WATER ISSUE.

VIA MAIL - NO NEED FOR SEWERS . IN RECENT YEARS WE HAVE UPGRADED OUR SEPTIC SYSTEM TO MEET HEALTH STANDARDS. IT SHOULD BE MANITORY TO UPGRADE YOUR SEPTIC SYSTEM

VIA MAIL WATER ANDSEWERS ARE NO NEEDED.

VIA MAIL Thank tou ti the IDRA for getting involved

VIA MAIL We agreed to connect to the water system. the cost kept increasing and so did the water bills I hardly use any water at the cottage . for sewer thay to will increase in cost

VIA MAIL - What grany . Why shold I pay for something I do not need or want. this is a waste of taxpayers money I do not agree to pay for water as there is nothing wrong with our well water

VIA MAIL - Some people complain that their water has a irion or sulphur taste these mineral are from ground water and can be elimmined by a filter.

VIA MAIL - Our septic system was put in i 1995. We also updated our water at that time.

VIA MAIL - Already paid but did not hook up. More info on types of sewers. Use part of the increase in assessment to ay for water and sewers.

We understand that the sewer connection will be put on Lake Street (and not on Victoria), which is a privately owned road. What are the ramifications of this? How can they justify putting municipally owned equipment on private property? What are the legalities of this situation?

I don't understand the different options for the sewer so don't know how to give an answer on it. I do want to make sure that there is low maintenance for it. I don't understand the need for the Capital Reserve Fund. It makes no sense that the current sewer system will need to be taken out and replaced if there are truly only 13 cottages that need water on the front road. There must be another way to get them water

This property is a Summer Cottage only and is used on average fifty days a year. It has belonged to the family since, we believe, 1917 but may not remain so after taking this massive financial hit. It may be a naive thought, but it seems ironic Federal/Provincial grants are given to the Municipality, but the property owner is left to shoulder the cost of this proposed project on his/her own.

This is yet another survey for something the vast majority of the full and seasonal residents of Inverhuron do not want yet the council and other interested parties are all for it to correct a mistake made by previous councils. Not included in your costing proposal is the twice yearly turning off and on the water supply for seasonal dwellers. I can understand why full time residents must pay the monthly charge of \$25.00 even though they may spend some time south in the winter but why seasonal users should be charged the same when the water is cut off for several months. It doesn't make sense except to wonder if it's just another way of getting money. Has the grinder proposal been tendered or is it a sweetheart deal? Is there no such thing as a grinder that operates on 110 volts or wasn't that thought of? When the water line was laid a few years ago, I asked my insurance company if the insurance rates would drop because of the close access to water and I was told no because the fire trucks would still have to travel the same distance with or without water so that was a waste of money putting in hydrants. It was mentioned at the meeting in July that one of the reasons behind the water/sewage was cited as what happened in Walkerton. Under the present system, each home owner is responsible for their water/sewage and it's not left in the hands of incompetents as was the case in Walkerton and could happen in Kincardine. No satisfactory answers were provided as to why other waterfront communities between Inverhuron and Kincardine weren't being considered as well. I'm referring to Lorne Beach, Lake Huron Heights, Kin-Huron Road, Concession 7, McLead Drive, Concession 5, and Sandpiper Lane. It was also mentioned at the meeting that a structure would have to be built on the park property in Inverhuron as the owners of lots nearby wouldn't sell. Has no one heard of expropriation instead of annoying all the residents, you would only annoy one. I would like some concrete answers about my concerns and not

some more tap dancing by members of council or the consultants. Barry Graham
519-474-3836

Sewers are a must, do it while there is still a grant to help out. Keep the cost down for each property owner as it will escalate way beyond what is predicted. What is the purpose of the Capital Reserve Fund.

. BM Ross has repeatedly indicated the acceptable life of a septic system is 25 years before problems arise. So as not to penalize people who have kept their septic systems in good working order, suggest those with newer septic systems be allowed to delay payment for and hook-up to the new sewer system until their septic system is somewhere between 15 and 20 years old. Alternately these people should be given a prorated discount in the amount they contribute for a new sewer system 2. Among the reasons we support a gravity flow system, is concern about the long term reliability of grinder pumps. Suggest those people with septic systems in good working order who hook up to grinder pumps not be forced to de-commission their septic systems but keep them as back-up. 3. A grinder pump system is much cheaper to install than a traditional gravity flow system. A gravity system is clearly inferior. Some lot owners will have no option but to go with grinder pumps if a "complete" gravity flow system or hybrid system is selected. These people should only have to pay the grinder pump cost of \$5,175, likely meaning those on gravity will likely pay more than \$21,275 or \$13,275 for complete gravity and hybrid respectively. 4. Many people may reluctantly be forced to accept inferior grinder pumps. To the extent possible, these people should be treated the same as the majority of Kincardine taxpayers on gravity. Therefore, regardless of the option chosen, the municipality should assume ownership, maintenance and operation of all grinder pumps, including the cost of powering the pumps. 5. If the survey indicates a significant majority of people in Inverhuron do not want to hook up to municipal water, extension of the existing water system should be dropped from the sewer-water project. Installation of a new sewer system significantly reduces the need for municipal water which is clearly inferior in terms of taste and cost.

I see no need for municipal water when we are here for only the summer months. Frankly my water is tested every spring and is free and clear of contaminants. I do not want the integrity of Lake St destroyed. There are many seniors on our street who can't afford this change, nor do they need it. Finally, what happened to our sewer rebate when our sewers were connected. Many others have hooked up on the East side of Lake St and we have not received any rebates at all. I find this another failure of the municipal government to fulfill their agreements. How can we trust them.

I am not in favour of digging up the sewer on Lake Street .I would like to see another solution to making municipal water available to us and connecting at

some point but not mandatory right now. I do not want to lose the opportunity to use provincial government funding to offset the cost of putting in the water line and think there is a solution that would not require digging up the existing sewer. Friends in Kincardine recently received new sidewalks and were not required an individual assessment to pay for this .Why are residents of Inverhuron always being asked to pay additionally for items that benefit the Municipality but we are considered seasonal ? We seem to be viewed as the cash cow. How will council pay for the debt from the previous water line installation ?

we have a well and test our water regularly. It has always had a good test and is very good tasting. It was stated at the meeting that the kincardine water at times has had a boil water advisory. We are not looking forward to that when our water is pure. We now have a holding tank for sewer that we have pumped out. We are not contaminating the environment but we would still like to hook up to the sewer.

While I understand the concern that the ground water may be contaminated by septic systems that are not up to standard, our cottage does not fall into that category. Our septic is only 11 years old and is well maintained. This is a cost that does not serve our family well. I am concerned that a grinder system (which is the only option for our property because of its elevation) will prove to be a step backward in my family's property waste management as this is a seasonal cottage. The septic system has no moving parts and therefore is more resilient during periods of disuse. I fear future maintenance costs passed on to us because of the grinder system not being of the quality advertised even if we take the precautions provided to us at the municipality meeting. I believe that a more prudent approach to the community as a whole is to force everyone to connect to the water and then force everyone to have a working well maintained and known septic system that is inspected on a regular basis by the Municipality much like the propane tanks on properties must be inspected by the utility as required by the Province. I also think that this whole project is simply a method of taxation by the Municipality and that they have retained BM Ross to find a "problem" that they can hang their hats on to justify the tax. I think the explanation of the "problem" is not strong enough to precipitate the need for this expensive tax. The requirement for hooking up to water is enough to solve any concern with human contamination. As far as the lake is concerned there has been no proof given that shows a contamination of this body of water is occurring.

This is a seasonal cottage and has a working septic system and well. The only way hooking up to both systems makes sense is to tear down the cottage and build a new house. We don't have that kind of money. We can't afford the "plan"

Since there are many who have good water I don't think a water connection should be forced. Having seen some of the "septic" systems over the 50 years I have been going to Inverhuron, I do think a sewer system is a good idea. Ken Stevens

Option A: Connect to municipal water Annual Cost for next 10 years: \$770 + \$300 = \$1070 Option B: Continue with Well + Bottled water 6 Bottles per season x \$7 per 18.5L bottle = \$42 per year Well + Bottled water option also does not give me watering restrictions that come with municipal water. It also does not come with the increased taxes that will be charged once we are a "Fully Serviced" property. Over the course of 10 years, the money that I would have paid the municipality would buy 1528 bottles of water or 28,278L or 6,221 Imperial Gallons at the corner store price of \$7 per bottle. Based upon my seasonal usage that would last me 255 years. Based on these calculations I am not interested in municipal water. As for sewer, my septic system is inexpensive and works fine. I would prefer to keep the \$6000 plus for my daughter's post secondary school education. I feel that this water and sewage project is being forced down our throats. Based on my calculations, this project does not stand on it's own merit. I can only come to the conclusion that this project is of benefit to people other than the residents of Inverhuron. The disparity of results between the Kincardine Times survey and this survey that is limited to the residents of Inverhuron support my suspicion. Although we are not American, the founding fathers of America had the right idea ... Government for the people, by the people NOT government for the corporations by the corporations!!! The people of Inverhuron have clearly spoken, let us see if the municipal government of Kincardine will listen.

Can we really afford all this, we all don;t work for Bruce Power, or the Municipality.

From my point of view, though, I hope that this process neither slows down or derails the process of bringing our community up to date on these important environmental projects. Personally, we have been lucky enough to have a good source of water that has always tested perfectly. I still think though that it is important that every residence has good water that is monitored more regularly than the 2 to 3 times per year that we get our water samples done. Even more importantly I believe that the sewers have the possibility of cancelling any possible environmental damage that old or makeshift septic systems and rock beds may be doing. Keeping the lake water safe is very important to me. And from a practical point of view, our system is hard to maintain given the distance from the road and would be very hard to replace.

My concern is that there remains a chance that asking for even more review might put the grants at risk. I do think that water and sewers are inevitable as cottages are used more intensively over many more weeks per year than used to be the case and for us to have to eventually pay the full cost instead of taking advantage of this present opportunity would be short sighted.

My concern is that the silent majority of people who are happy to go along with the present plan may not be heard. Please add my voice and the voice of my family members to the group that hopes the plan goes through and is not side-tracked.

I am supportive of this project but don't think it should be mandatory as we have a perfectly functioning septic system and well.

Our cottage is only used for the last two weeks in July and the month of August and the first two weeks of September. We have a septic system that was re-done five years ago and is in fine working order. We have a sand point that has always tested clear by the time we arrive in July. Our family is opposed to this project. When the township gets the farmers up the Little Sable River to clean up their feed lot runoff then the cottagers may be more receptive to this project. But right now, the farms up the river from Inverhuron are posing a greater health risk than the cottages along the lake.

we have been paying what I consider to be high taxes for many years, we do not have sewers, water, street lights, sidewalks and snow removal only on Victoria St. Why has there not been some of our tax dollars put aside for these services - do the people in Kincardine with similar properties pay higher taxes than people in Inverhuron? I am most disappointed that there has not been any foresight by the council so that these services would not be such a financial burden for us.
Ruth Schumacher

Its hard to know exactly how to evaluate the options without more information - I picked the sewer system that is cheapest but really dont know if this one involves more costs on an ongoing basis or not. Also not sure what is mean by the Capital Reserve Fund - what it would include. Finally if the cost of water and sewer are lower for all by having it mandatory then I would be in favour of that.

We pay taxes for the full year and it is a seasonal cottage we do not wish to support in making any other contributions. Bert / Connie Bylsma

We do not want either the water or the sewer. We put in a new septic system August 2008. We will not be drinking any of the Kincardine water. Our well water is fine now and do use bottled water also.

According to this survey questionnaire the grinder pump appears to be the least costly, I do not believe the municipality could adequately maintain the grinder pumps. I was never a supporter of the Inverhuron water system. I have my own well with good potable water that I maintain at my own expense. When the new standards arrived after Walkerton there were a number of residents whose systems did not meet code. There were Inverhuron residents with substandard systems that wanted the waterline and its 66' right of way, expecting people like myself to subsidize their costs. I now read in the paper, that due to costs some residents (17 I believe) should be left on their own wells because they have good water. If that flies, then I shouldn't have to hook up either. When the municipality wanted the 66' right away to maintain, at the time their 8" water line, the writing was on the wall for an eventual road extension. I believe I have the right to use

my own well water as long as it's properly maintained, however it would be difficult to argue against a reliable sewer system. Sincerely Mike Kelley

do not think it is a wise use of money to dig up Lake St. for water hookups for a minimal number of people who want it. I am sure an alternative arrangement can be made for them specifically at a greatly reduced cost, minimal inconvenience and construction

Thank you for the opportunity to give our opinion on this important matter. We believe that mandatory sewer connection is the best way to safeguard our beautiful Inverhuron for everyone, not just property owners. However, being currently connected to a system that works perfectly well, we think it would be wasteful, expensive, and deleterious to the environment to rip it up. We have paid already for the installation of our water and sewer, and when these systems were being installed, we urged the municipality to look to the future and plan for community-wide delivery of both services. This did not happen. Why should we have to pay thousands more for poor planning? We hope that a full investigation of alternatives is happening this time. Why should we pay thousands into the Municipality of Kincardine's Capital Reserve Fund if the Municipality is not contributing to the cost of installation?

Please disregard the answer of question #7, as I do not want any other type of sewer system either than septic tank. This is totally unfair to cottage owners. I see that the governing bodies of small towns (Kincardine) are as corrupt as large cities. Someone is making money off of this.

think it is a waste of time and money. It will only benefit a few who wish to develop small lots at the expense of those of us who do not need either sewer or water. Has anybody done a study on the rates of tooth decay re: drinking lake water vs. well water?

\$12000 a bit steep to connect to the hydro to run the grinder pump the responsibility of the home owner? Why is the gravity flow system so much more expensive? What is this Capital Reserve Fund?

VIA MAIL . We have our well tests ok for over 25 years also our septic tank has worked for over 25 yrs with no problems. I have a letter from the municipality that water is not mandatory. the council needs to resign.

Live on Private road! Not going to happen

I am vehemently opposed to digging up Lake St again.

Way too much money for seasonal cottagers. I like the thought of no more septic tank, but OMG, this is a lot of money.....

sewer@ water should be paid for by municipal kincardine at a cost/month to all residences equally over time period (cost/residence)we have enough problems with enviroment fish sanctuary provincial park conservation ETC. Any monies with either Gov't may it be all parties might be a start to resolve issues and I know are neighbours have helped with progress to infrastructure in the area.(Bruce Power)your way of being cost effective is bullying, not the answer.your cost is absurd. Please forward,

when we perfectly good wells why should be told we have to inferia water.

I also feelthat the grant should be allocated to the residents on Lake street that recently connected. As per conversations with the project manager,,he advised that there was no reason that we should NOT be elibible for the same funding.
Ann Hoover

We would like sewers at no cost

I am in favour of contributing to the capital reserve fund provided it is managed properly.

When we bought our property, the usage was for seasonal only. Since we purchased the property, the Municipality has changed the usage to all year, there has been more septic usage along Victoria Road- hence the groundwater problem. Yes, I believe the Municipality should also share in the cost as they are partly to blame for the problem. We still only use our property 3 weeks of the whole year.

I am supportive of this project but don't think it should be mandatory as we have a perfectly functioning septic system and well.

Our cottage is only used for the last two weeks in July and the month of August and the first two weeks of September. We have a septic system that was re-done five years ago and is in fine working order. We have a sand point that has always tested clear by the time we arrive in July. Our family is opposed to this project. When the township gets the farmers up the Little Sable River to clean up their feed lot runoff then the cottagers may be more receptive to this project. But right now, the farms up the river from Inverhuron are posing a greater health risk than the cottages along the lake.

