	•		
Comment Source	Comment	Response	Updated Document Reference
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	Please provide a comment about possibility of karst in the area.	Added - no known/potential/inferred karst in site area Added	Referenced in 3.4 document published on June 25th
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	Please provide a comment about the groundwater flow direction.	A0080	Referenced in 4.1 document published on June 25th
	Although the Official Plan was not available on the Lanark County website at the time of writing, we note	Cambium concurrs and has retained the SPP characterization	
	that the data in the Source Protection Atlas is from 2022 and is therefore likely the most up to date.	Cambium concurrs and has retained the SPP characterization	
	o Please provide a statement about the hydrogeological sensitivity. Given the thin soil cover observed		
	across the site, it would be reasonable to assess the site as hydrogeologically sensitive. This classification		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	would necessitate the application of best management practices for the design and construction of on-	Several statements / discussions regarding hydrogeological sensitivity added	
	site sewage systems and well installation.		
	site seriege systems and well installation.		Referenced in 6.5 document published on June 25th
	The maximum pumping rate cited in the report of 482 L/minappears to be a transcription error within well		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	record3514549. The well record indicates that the recommended pumping rate was 10 GPM (gallons per	R	
nyuros - reel review - Biumetric	minute); thereappears to have been a mistranscription for 10 GPM, where the G was misread as a 6, and	Report updated to note discrepancy. Mean pumping rate recalculated excluding 2 apparent outliers	
	the recommended pumping rate was entered as 106 GPMin the MECP database.		
			Referenced in 6.1.1 document published on June 25th
	It is noted thatthe summary information provided in Appendix E does not include details regarding the		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	material of the casing and the depth to the bottom of the casing. This is an important information given the	Report undated to discuss well casing material and construction for existing wells near the Site	
,,	hydrogeological sensitivity of the site.		
	7. 10. 10. 10. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.		Referenced in 6.5.1 document published on June 25th
	Overall, the information presented in the report from the door-to-door survey is insufficient to assess the		
	risk of impacts on off-site water wells. A door-to-door survey should make a concerted effort to reach the		
	vast majority of residents on properties that could be affected by the development, match respondents'		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	wells with water well records, evaluate existing water quality, identify wells that may be vulnerable to	Report updated to more clearly reference the well survey completed as part of the prior hydrogeological	
,,	nitrate loading from the site (e.g., dug wells, wells with shallow casings, or wells with existing high nitrate	investigation for lot serverances by McIntosh Perry.	
	concentrations), to assess the potential impacts from off-		
	site sewage systems		
	BluMetric accents the selected subfactors: however, it is noted that, when plotted on a U.S. Department of	The inifiltration factor used by Cambium is consistent with the value used in the McIntosh Perry report and with the hydrologic group B soils present at the Site.	
	Agriculture soil texture triangle, the soil samples classify as loam. Given this classification and the	with the hydrologic group B soils present at the Site.	
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	relatively low estimated percolation rates, a smaller soil factor would provide a more conservative		
	assessment.	Cambium agrees that a lower value would provide a more conservative estimate of infiltration, but is not	
	usocsament.	consistent with available information for the site.	
	Post-development, the addition of impermeable surfaces is expected to increase the water surplus due		
	to reduced evapotranspiration. Increased runoff is also anticipated as a result of these surfaces, which		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	is accounted for by the inclusion of a stormwater pond in the concept design. Without the	N/A	N/A
,,	implementation of mitigation measures to enhance infiltration, it would be unreasonable to assume		
	that pre-development infiltration rates can be maintained. Furthermore, the opportunity to implement		
	mitigation measures to enhance infiltration is limited due to the shallow depth to bedrock.		
	Please revise the infiltration calculation to account for impermeable surfaces. If any portion of the		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	water surplus from impermeable surfaces is included inthe dilution calculation, please provide a clear	N/A	N/A
	justification for the volume used.		
	This result leaves little room for error. As nitrate concentrations at two neighbouring properties were	Cambium notes that the two neighbouring properties have on-site wastewater systems, to which the	
	measured at 1.79 mg/L and 1.9 mg/L, and these existing concentrations were not considered in the nitrate	elevated concentrations in the wells are attributed.	
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	assessment, the predicted concentration of 9.97mg/L would ostensibly represent an unacceptable		
	impact to groundwater quality.	$Given the progressive \ reduction\ in\ pastoral/agricultural\ development\ upgradient\ of\ the\ site,\ the\ background$	
		levels measured on site are anticipated to decrease over time.	
	Furthermore, as discussed above, the nitrate attenuation calculation is based on assumptions that may	у	
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	underestimate potential impacts. It is anticipated that applying more representative assumptions	N/A	N/A
,	could result in higher nitrate concentrations at the property boundary		
	Please provide more definitive recommendations for best management practices (e.g. depth of well		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	casing, separation distances, and raised septic beds) based on the assessment of hydrogeological	Recommendations added to report	
	sensitivity.		
	Oleman de la companya		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	Please review the concept plan and recommend suitable locations for supply wells and sewage systems,	Recommendations added to report	
nyurus - Peer review - Blumetric	taking into account the setback requirements for hydrogeologically sensitive sites (i.e., 30 m setbacks)	necommendations added to report	
	and the anticipated groundwater flow direction.		
	Although the minimum pumping ratefor any assessment is 13.7 L/m. The D-5-5 prescribed that unless		
	otherwise established by the MECP's satisfaction, that the minimum numning rate for a numning test must		
	otherwise established by the MECP's satisfaction, that the minimum pumping rate for a pumping test must be carried out for a four bedroom single family residence, and be based on the likely number of persons	Cambium acknowledges the rates used for some of the pumping tests were less than the value specified	
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	per well, which shall be the number of bedrooms plus one using peak demand rate of 3.75 L/minper	given the anticpated dwelling size. When the error was noted during the review of the pumping test data by	
	person. This results in a pumping rate of 18.8 L/min. As such the pumping rate used for these	the project manager, the correct rate was specified for the subsequent tests	
	assessments were below the D-5-5 requirements.		
			Not referenced in the report
	Discount of the second of the		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	Please provide field data required for a groundwater quality assessment. These are described in detail in	Field data tables added to report	
1	the MVCA Requirements and Consultant's Screening Checklist provided in Attachments A and B.	· ·	Append tables
	Please provide a comment about the appropriateness of the results of the hardness with regards to		
HydroG - Peer review - Blumetric	appropriateness for drinking water.	Comment added	
	•		Referenced in 6.4.1, 7.2 document published on June 25th
	Please provide a comment about the potential for corrosion and encrustation, including calculations of		,
	the Langelier Saturation Index and the Ryznar Stability Index.	Commens added	Referenced in 6.4 document published on June 25th
	BluMetric agrees that TW1 should be disinfected and resampled.	Well resampled and discussion added to report.	Referenced in 6.4 table 12 document published on June 25th
	.Please consider presenting water quality results in summary tables compared to the ODWQS in addition	Given the limited number of parameters which exceed the ODWQ criteria for this site, Cambium has limited	
	to lab provided certificates of analysis.	tables to those in the report body.	Referenced throughout the document published on June 25th
		words to those in the report body.	nere rended an oughout the document published on June 25th
	It is noted that several parameters required by the County of Lanark and MVCA for hydrogeological		
		Acknowledged. Cambium collected a second sample for the "subdivision suite" when resampling TW1	
	investigations in support of subdivision application plans were not sampled,including fluoride; Hydrogen		
	investigations in support of subdivision application plans were not sampled, including fluoride; Hydrogen Sulphide; Phenols; Tannin and Lignin; Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen; Organic Nitrogen; Phosphate, and Mercury.		Not referenced in the report
	Sulphide; Phenols; Tannin and Lignin; Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen; Organic Nitrogen; Phosphate, and Mercury.		Not referenced in the report
	Sulphide; Phenols; Tannin and Lignin; Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen; Organic Nitrogen; Phosphate, and Mercury. The MVCA Requirements and Consultant's Screening Checklist provided in Attachments A and Bfor	Acknowledged. Cambium collected a second sample for the "subdivision suite" when resampling TW2	
	Sulphide; Phenols; Tannin and Lignin; Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen; Organic Nitrogen; Phosphate, and Mercury.	Acknowledged. Cambium collected a second sample for the "subdivision suite" when resampling TW2	Not referenced in the report Not referenced in the report
	Sulphide; Phenols; Tannin and Lignin; Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen; Organic Nitrogen; Phosphate, and Mercury. The MVCA Requirements and Consultant's Screening Checklist provided in Attachments A and Bfor	Acknowledged. Cambium collected a second sample for the "subdivision suite" when resampling TW2	
	Sulphide; Phenols; Tannin and Lignin; Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen; Organic Nitrogen; Phosphate, and Mercury. The MVCA Requirements and Consultant's Screening Checklist provided in Attachments A and Bfor	Acknowledged. Cambium collected a second sample for the "subdivision suite" when resampling TW2	
	Sulphide; Phenols; Tannin and Lignin; Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen; Organic Nitrogen; Phosphate, and Mercury. The MVCA Requirements and Consultant's Screening Checklist provided in Attachments A and Bfor	Acknowledged. Cambium collected a second sample for the "subdivision suite" when resampling TW2	
	Sulphide; Phenols; Tannin and Lignin; Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen; Organic Nitrogen; Phosphate, and Mercury. The MVCA Requirements and Consultant's Screening Checklist provided in Attachments A and Bfor	Acknowledged. Cambium collected a second sample for the "subdivision suite" when resampling TW2	

Although D-5 Frequires only one (1) water quality sample during the last hour of the test; County of Lanatt, and Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MYCA) prescribes the collection of two (2) water guality samples for thridge-degical intestigation in support of subdivision agaication plans.

Comment Source	Comment	Response	Updated Document Reference
Alderville First Nations	Adderville First Nation is requiring a File Fee for this project in the amount of \$300.00. This Fee includes administration, an initial meeting, project updates as well as review of standard material and project overviews. Depending on the number of documents to be reviewed by the Consultation Department, additional fees may apply. Please make this payment to Adderville First Nation and please indicate the project name or number on the cheque.		

Comment Source	Comment	Response	Updated Document Reference
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Introduction and Objective Section 1.0 requires further detail in regards to the subject property and proposed development, particularly regarding the history of the subject property and the existing surrounding land uses. It is noted multiple times throughout he report that clearing of vegetation had occurred within the limits of the subject property. Carification as to the liming and rationale for vegetation clearing is pertinent information. The identification of the study area (120m) should be stated at the onset of the EIS, as opposed to first being mentioned in Section 4.0.	Add property history and clearing timeline; move study area definition to Section 1.0.	Section 1.0 has been revised to address peer review comments requesting additional detail on site history, surrounding land use, vegetation clearing, and the study area boundary. New language clarifles that the subject property is located at the intersection of Rosedale Road South and Matheson Drive, within the Rosedale Settlement Area, and designated for residential growth under the Montayee Township Official Plan. Aerial imagery and field evidence are now referenced to confirm that vegetation clearing occurred prior to the 2024 field season, providing context for site conditions. The study area is described as including the subject property and 120 metres of adjacent land, in alignment with PPS (2024) Section 2.1.8 and municipal policy. This has been introduced in Section 1.0 to ensure clarify from the outset of the report. These changes provide the requested context and align with standard environmental reporting expectations for subdivision development.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Similarly, further detail pertaining to the proposed development is required. The EIS identifies the proposed land uses within the subject property, however, no details are provided regarding required grading, potential for conveyance of surface water or side due to the increased imprevious surfaces and what stormwater management techniques will be implemented.	Clarify that SWM and grading will be addressed through final engineering submission.	To address the peer review request for more detail on grading, surface water conveyance, and stormwater management: A new subsection titled "Stormwater Management" has been added to Section 4.14 of the EIS. This section outlines that a wet pond with an extended detention basin will be installed on the west side of the site. It describes the pond's function, including a foreign for sediment capture, a permanent pool for water quality, and a splitway for storm conveyance. The report confirms that low-impact development (LID) teatures (e.g., vegetated swales, filter strips) will be used where connection to the pond is not feasible. It is noted that these systems are designed to maintain pre-development hydrological conditions and meet or exceed provincial stormwater criteria (80% TSS removal). Erosion and sediment control during construction are also addressed, with a commitment to minimize impacts to adjacent habitats. The grading plan and final SWM design will be submitted by the project engineers following EIS approval, as per municipal requirements.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	The ES does not reference the submission of a Terms of Reference (TOR) to the approval agencies to determine a satisfactory scope for the ES. Please confirm whether a TOR was submitted to the approval agencies. If so, please include the TOR and all consepondence related to the POR including approvals from all agencies. If not, the agencies are to be consulted, and an approved scope for the ES appended. Section 2.2.18 (3) of the Worship of Montago (Total Plan (2023) states that: " the scope and scale of an environmental impact assessment shall be determined by the approval authority, in consultation with the Riceau Valley Conservation Authority, but shall be appropriate to both the type and size of proposed development and the nature of natural feature(s) to be assessed."	Acknowledge no formal TOR submitted; clarify pre consultation confirmed scope.	
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Section 2.0 does not include all policies that are applicable to the proposed development, or identify the most up-to-date versions of the policies. Please include the Species at Risk Act (SARA) Section 2.1.1 and update the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) in Section 2.1.2.2 to the Provincial Planning Statement (2021) Further, specific appropriate policies pertaining to the Natural Confridors and Linkages identified on Schedule C of the Montague Township Official Plan have not been referenced	Update to PPS 2024 and add SAPA (Cahada); expand discussion of Natural Corridors.	Section 2.0 has been updated to reflect current and relevant policy frameworks: The Species at Risk Act (SARA, 2002) was added to Section 2.1.2, outilizing federal protections, critical habitat, and its relationship to migratory birds and aquatic species. The Provincial Policy Statement (2024) was already correctly cited in the original submission. To strengthen clarity, references to Sections 4.1.4–4.1.8 have been expanded to better capture development constraints related to natural heritage. Section 2.3.4 has been expanded to include policies specific to Natural Corridors and Linkages identified on Schedule C of the Montague Township Official Plan. This includes direction on maintaining ecological connectivity and minimizing fragmentation through sensitive development design.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	In addition to the background sources listed in Section 3.1 please review the following sources: Ontario Breeding Brid Altas, Ontario Butterfly Altas, Bumble Bee Watch, Ortario Palammal Altas and the appropriate subwatersheds and Widdle Rideau Subwatershed; and long-portar where appropriate. Subsections 3.1.1-3.15 provide descriptions of constraints, however, no connection is provided between the information gathered through the background sources and the constraints. Please review and revise as appropriate	Recheck sources listed (OBBA, Mammal Aldas, etc.); link relevant ones to constraint discussion.	The Ontario Butterfly Atlas was consulted, however, no federally or provincially listed Species at Risk beyond Monarch (Danaus pfexippus) were identified from the atlas for the study area. Monarch records were alterady addressed in the ES through direct field observation and habitat screening. Bumble Bee Watch currently does not contain site-specific data for the subject property or surrounding area, and no Bumble Bee SAR were observed during field surveys. Therefore, no changes were made based on this source. Ontario Mammal Atlas records were not directly cited, as mammal presence was evaluated through field observations, trail camera data, and evidence such as scat and tracks, which provided more reliable and site-specific information for impact assessment. The original desktop review tools (e.g., NHIC, (Naturalist, RVCA, DFO SAR Map, OBBA, eBird) remain the most relevant and spatially accurate sources for the study area. These, combined with extensive field data, form the basis for the constraint analysis in Section 3.1.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Section 3.2 does not provide adequate descriptions of the methodology employed for the field investigations. The EB identifies the use of Autonomous Recording Units (ARU) for multiple types of wildlife data collection, including birds, bats and amphibians. Further details pertaining to the location of the deployed ARUs, both they were deployed; i.e., what were they secured to, as well as the setting such as minimum tigger relevancy, sampling ince, chamel gain, and reigner window, as minimum tigger frequency, sampling ince, chamel gain, and reigner indexidence of wildlife or were they targeted?. Peases provide a figure detailing the locations of where ARUs were deployed. If the ARU units were utilized for Precing Bird Surveys, please identify the dates and timeframes for which that was extracted and analysed, and weather conditions within the timeframe, Additional information on the analysis methods used for the audior recordings produced by the ARUs is required. Specifically, how as Kaladisocape ProStraver used (fold human observer identify the calls via sound and spectrogram pattern? Was an automated cluster analysis or advanced usels for use a scalar or automated cluster analysis or advanced scalar leaves? If an automated process vasual used, how were the results validated?).	deployment details and Kaleidoscope use.	Section 3.2.3 was updated to clarify the purpose of ARU deployment, include a reference to Figure 4 showing ARU locations, and provide additional detail on how Kaleidoscope Pro was used to analyze acoustic data. Per County direction, technical recorder specifications were not included.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Further to above, please provide specific details on how ARUs were used for determining potential breeding of grassland bird species (Eastern Meadowark an Abbolich) and nesting habitat, as well as Common Nighthawk. As in-situ surveys conducted by a qualified Ecologist/Biologist utilizing industry-accepted protocols (i.e. NNRF Grassland filer Protocol and BRBA. Ontains Nightja Survey protocol) are the current accepted standards, details regarding the settings and locations of ARUs, as well as rationale regarding the accuracy of the data collected and analysis performed are required	Clarify ARUs supplemented point counts; provide rationale and results for each target species.	Section 3.2.3 was updated to clarify that passive acoustic monitoring was used to supplement visual surveys for Common Nighthawk, but not for Bobolink or Eastern Meadowlark, which were assessed using point counts in accordance with OBEA protocols. A reference to Knight et al. (2022) was added to support the use of autonomous recorders for detecting nocturnal bird species, consistent with accepted monitoring practices in Eastern Orizano. Analysis methods using Kaleidoscope Pro were detailed, and all detections were manually verified. Figure 4 provides ARU deployment locations.

EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	The presence of Bat Maternily Habitat needs to be confirmed through the completion of a maternily tree assessment and proper acoustic surveys located in the area with the most high-quality trees. Maternily trees are to be identified using the "Bats and Teed Habitats- Maternily Roost Surveys" protocol produced by the MECP (2022).	Add reasoning for ARU use; explain why maternity tree search not feasible for this site.	Section 3.2.5 was updated to describe the visual maternity roosting habitant assessment conducted during leaf-off conditions, focusing on trees with features such as exclosing bark, cowities, and snage. Large trees in Polygon 4 and along fencerows were identified as having potential roosting features. While formal maternity roost surveys following MECP (2022) protocols were not completed, the EIS now recommends that trees with potential roost features be inspected prior to removal, and but boxes be installed as mitigation. This aligns with standard screening practices for development applications where no confirmed maternity roosts are present but features of interest exist.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Please provide the industry-accepted protocol utilized for the Loggerhead Shrike Surveys.	State protocol used (WPC 2008); summarize methods briefly.	Section 3.2.2 was updated to confirm that Loggerhead Strike surveys followed the 2008 Loggerhead Strike Survey Protocol developed by Wildlife Preservation Canada. This includes timing (early morning between 6:00-10:00 a.m.), visit frequency (three visits during peak breeding season), and methodology (passive visual observation followed by directional call playback). Survey locations were chosen to maximize visibility and coverage within suitable habitat polygons.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Suitable habitat for Blanding's Turtle as well as other turtle species is identified within the report. As such visual encounter surveys are to be employed to determine presence/abence of the species, and if they are persent, how they are utilizing the lands within the subject properly and/or larger study area. Please provide details pertaining to the methodology used and timing of when the surveys were conducted.	Note visual encounter not done; describe mitigation fencing and exclusion prior to hibernation.	Section 3.2.4 and Section 4.2.2 were updated to clarify that no formal turtle surveys were conducted due to the limited suitability of the pond for long-term turtle use (e.g., shallow depth, lack of overwintering features), instead, visual encounter observations for turtles were completed opportunistically during all field visits between May and July 2024, focusing on warm daylight hours when basking activity is most likely. No turtles were observed during felderbord, and the pond was assessed as unlikely to support breeding or overwintering habitat for Blanding's Turtle. Precautionary mitigation (exclusion fencing) was recommended due to regional occurrence potential.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Table 1 identifies that Ecological Land Classification and botanical inventories were only completed during the month of May. Considering the presence of meadow communities, whether disturbed or on ca, surmen (fall buly- early August) is required to capture later flowering herbaceous species and grasses. EL cand botanical inventories are to be completed for the entirely of the study area (subject property plus 120m.) For areas where access is restricted, information should be obtained along the roadside, limits of the subject property or through aerial imagery.	Clarify surveys spanned May to July; add weather and effort details.	Section 3.2.6 and 3.2.7 were updated to clarify that botanical surveys were conducted across multiple visits between May and July, including dates from May 23-29, June 4-18, June 7-14, and July 5-9, 2024. This extended survey period captures early, mid, and some late-season flowering species within the meadow communities. The report also states that no late-blooming SARO-listed species expected in eastern Ontario (e.g., Solidago speciosa, Symphyotrichum praealtum) are regionally present, based on provincial records. ELC was conducted on the entire subject properly, and for adjacent lands where access was limited, aerial imagery and roadside observation were used.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	The Township of Montague identifies the presence of Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) within the Schedules of the Official Plan. Correspondence with the Township should be initiated to identify the type of SWH identified. Additional types of Significant Wildlife Habitat Sounde be considered and assessed, as per the Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules document (OMNR, 2015).	Add summary of Township consultation; confirm assessment was per OMNR 2015.	Sections 3.2.9 and 4.13 were updated to document that follow-up correspondence with the Township of Montague confirmed the mapped Significant Wildille Habitat in the southwest come of the property was based on a previous consultant's designation, with no supporting documentation available. An independent field assessment was completed using the OMNRF (2015) Significant Wildille Habitat Criteria Schedules for Ecoregion EE, which found no confirmed or candidates SWH on-site. This includes assessment for amphibian movement corridors, deer wintering areas, and other applicable features. These findings are summarized in Section 4.13.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Section 4.0: Results The results of multiple studies were not provided in Section 4.0 of the EE. Please provide results for the following studies: - Breeding Bird Alss - Steretised Monitoring the Esterney Results of the Section 4.0 of the Se	Add table in Section 4.0 summarizing study results by species, date, and method.	Section 4.0 was updated to include summarized results for all major field studies, including: Breeding Bird Surveys (following OBBA protocol): results presented in Sections 4.7 and Appendix A Loggerhead Shrike Surveys: methods and results detailed in Section 4.8 using the Wildlife Preservation Canada (2008) protocol Eastern Meadowlark and Bobolinic Monitoring: results included in Section 4.2.3 and 4.2.6, with discussion of habitat suitability Bard Materialy Roosting Habitat: visual survey results presented in Section 4.1.0, no formal MECP maternity protocol applied, but recommendations provided Passive Acoustic Surveys (ARU): results summarized in Section 4.9 with Kaleidoscope analysis methods described in Section 3.2.3 Turtle Observations: incidental observations and habitat assessment results included in Section 4.2.2 Botanical inventory and ELC: conducted across multiple visits from May to July, results detailed in Section 4.11 and 4.12, with expanded species lists in Appendix A Each study is now clearly linked to corresponding results in Section 4, addressing the reviewer's request for traceability and completeness.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Please revise Table 2 to include Species at Risk identified in the additional background resources identified above. Additionally, please identify where the records with "OMNR listed as the Site Obtained" were derived from.	Explain use of OMNR sources for Butternut and Black Ash as common screening tools.	Table 2 was reviewed and updated to include any Species at Risk identified through additional desktop sources (e.g., NHIC, eBird, INaturalist, DFO SAR mapping). No new federally or provincially listed SAR were identified beyond those already listed in the table. The source marked as 'OMNR' for select species (e.g., Black As), Buttemtly selects of guidance documents such as the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (OMNR, 2015) which list these species as ecologically or planning-relevant in site screening processes. A clarifying footnote has been added to Table 2 to explain this designation
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Blanding's Turtle habitat has been assumed present in the EIS report (Section 4.2.1.4). Assuming presence of Blanding's Turtles requires the incorporation of regulated habitat por the findangered Species Act (2007) based on the features on site identified as suitable. As such, the pond feature and a 30m buffer from the limits of the pond feature are to be assumed habitat for Blanding's Turtle. Standardized turtle surveys are to be completed to identify the presence/absence of Blanding's Turtle and other turtle species, and how they are utilizing the subject property and larger study area, if present.		Section 4.2.2 was updated to clarify that while the on-site pond does not meet the criteria for overwintering or nesting habitat, a precautionary approach was applied, and the pond and a surrounding buffer are treated as potentially suitable habitat for Blanding's Turtle. Although the EIS does not explicitly assign a Categoral Arbabitat designation, mitigation measures, including seasonal exclusion fencing, have been recommended to align with the protective intent of the Endangered Species Act (2007) and MECP guidance.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Black Ash was noted as being observed on the subject property, Black Ash is identified as an obligate wetland species, however, no wetland communities were identified through the EC. Re-examination of these individuals is recommended as it seems highly unlikely that Black Ash would be located within an area lacking wetland communities. Further, the ES tasts that Black Ash have been used in fencerows. Please provide the reference for this information.	Clarify habitat conditions; cite forestry knowledge of species in moist lowlands.	Section 4.2.1.1 was updated to clarify that all observed Black Ash individuals were located in moist fencerows and disturbed areas, and were either dead or under the regulatory threshold size for protection under 0. Reg. 6/24. Although Black Ash is often associated with wetland habitats, it is also known to occur in moist but non-wetland soils, including hedgerows and fencerows in rural Ontario. The following reference was added to support this habitat flexibility: COSEWIC (2018) notes that Black Ash "can tolerate open sunit conditions and is occasionally planted or regenerates in hedgerows and disturbed moist soils." No wetland communities were identified in the ELC, and this discrepancy has been acknowledged and explained in the updated section.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	The Ecological Land Classification has not been completed appropriately, and documentation of the ELC Data Cards has not been provided. The vegetation communities within the study area are to be described based on the current conditions, not based on previous site activities. The presence of large trees indicates that polygons are not actively disturbed. Vegetative species are noted for disturbed communities, thus an ELC code needs to be assigned. Similarly, an ELC code needs to be assigned to the identified Poorf feature, as an individual community or as an inclusion within Polygon 4. As noted above, ELC completed from the roaddee or limits of subject property is required for vegetation communities within the 120m study area. Please complete the ELC and provide a how easens (sping) and usummer) botanical inventory for all vegetation communities in the study area.	Assign missing codes (pond, disturbed areas); add ELC card details to summary table.	Sections 3.2.6, 3.2.7, and 4.11 were updated to confirm that Ecological Land Classification (ELC) surveys were conducted based on current site conditions, not historical land use. Fieldwork was completed across multiple visits from May through July 2024, capturing both spring and summer vegetation. Each polygon was assigned an appropriate ELC community type, and the pond feature was evaluated and included within Polygon 4 based on size and context. Each polygon was assigned an appropriate ELC community type, and the pond feature was evaluated and included within Polygon 4 based on size and context. Each polygon was assigned an appropriate ELC community type, and the polygon feature was evaluated and included within Polygon 4 based on size and context. Each polygon was assigned an appropriate ELC data cards, included within Polygon 4 based on size and context. Each polygon was assigned an appropriate ELC data cards are retained on file and are available upon request to support agency treview. A two-season botanical inventory has been completed, and findings are reflected in both Section 4.11 and Appendix A.

EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Discrepancies were noted between the aerial imagery provided in Figures 12 and 16. The aerial imagery provided displays the presence of shrub and tree species within Polygon 4. Nower, Figure 16 depicts harvested corn crop. The description of Polygon 4 within Pable 3 notes disturbance, with large woody vegetation species still present. Please provide calification on the existing conditions of Polygon 4 including updated site photographs representative of the polygon		Section 4.11 and Figure 17 were updated to clarify the existing conditions of Polygon 4. The aerial imagery discrepancy was addressed by updating the photo caption to read* Tolygon 4 - Disturbed Area - Woody Debris* to better reflect the current vegetation structure observed during friedwork. This ensures the image is clearly linked to the described conditions, which include scattered mature trees, woody vegetation, and evidence of past disturbance.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Species at Risk (Monarch, Hoary Bat, and Silver-haired Bat) were identified within the subject property, however, their presence is not property discussed. Discussion of the presental impacts to the species or its habitat is required. Additionally, policy implications, and mitigation recommendations are to be included in the report where appropriate.	Will update to incide newly added species from Jan 2025.	Sections 4.2.6-4.2.9 and Section 5.0 were updated to provide a clearer discussion of the observed Species at Risk: Monarch, Hoavy Bat, and Silver-haired Bat. Each species now includes a summary of potential impacts, including habitat use (e.g., foraging vs. breeding) and likelihood of site utilization. Policy implications under the Endangered Species Act (2007) and Species at Risk Act (SARA, 2002) are noted where relevant. Mitigation measures have been in corporated into Section 5.0, including: Habitat restoration with native milkweed for Monarch Bat box installation and tree inspections prior to removal for bats Timing restrictions to avoid sensitive periods for both species groups
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Section 5.0: Mitigation Due to the inadequacies of the survey methods identified in the previous sections and tack of results provided, the mitigation recommendations provided in Section 5.0 are not setficient. Once the appropriate surveys, istend above, have been completed and the results analysed, the mitigation measures identified in this section will need to be reviewed and revised. Observation or detection of a Species at Risk will require correspondence with the MECP through the submission of an Information Cathering Form.	Add site history, rationale for clearing, and define 120 m study area in Section 1.0.	Section 5.0 was updated to reflect the expanded survey results provided in Section 4.0 and to incorporate mitigation measures specific to observed Species at Risk, including Monarch, Hoary Bat, and Shee-haired Bat. Recommendations now include: Timing restrictions for vegetation clearing Exclusion fencing for turtles Milkseed preservation and native pollinator planting Tree inspections and bat box installation to offset potential roost loss Acknowledgement that any SAR observations during construction will require submission of an MECP information Gathering Form and cessation of work until reviewed by a qualified biologist. These updates align miligation with the results of current fieldwork and provincial compliance expectations. A note has been added that miligation should be re-evaluated if future studies or project phases reweal additional SAR.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	If SAR is detected in the area of disturbance all works are to cease immediately, and MECP contacted. Only an Ecologist/Biologist identified through an approved Scientific Collector's authorization (MNRF) is to handle any SAR that observed within the area of works.	Revise language from "modify" to "cease" in response section.	Section 5.0 was updated to include a clear directive that all work must cease immediately if a Species at Risk (SAR) is observed within the area of disturbance. The report now specifies that MECP must be contacted, and that only an Ecologist or Biologist authorized under a valid Scientific Collector's Authorization (MNRF) may handle SAR individuals, in compliance with applicable legislation.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	The EIS does not provide any recommendations for the restoration of vegetative species considering removal of nearly the entirety of the existing vegetation communities. A Restoration Plan, utilizing appropriate tree, shrub, herbaceous, and grass species is to be completed by a qualified professional for areas considered as fleen Space and within the Stormwater Management Block.	Add general recommendations; indicate full plan to come at detailed design.	Section 5.0 was updated to includes egetation restoration recommendations for green space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, shrub, great space areas and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, and the Stormwater Management Block. The ES now outlines the use of native tree, and the use of native tree, an
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	identified through field investigations. Clarification is needed on how the proponent aims to develop responsibly by ensuring the protection and conservation of local natural heritage features when the proposed subdivision will require the clearing of the entire property, and that clearing of vegetation has occurred in the past. This conclusion is not acceptable.	Revise to show compliance with PPS, GP, and EIS standards; highlight avoidance and mitigation.	The Montague Township Official Plant (2023) The conclusion now references the results of field investigations and desktop screening, and emphasizes that no confirmed Significant Wildlife Habitat, no wetstands, and no candidate SAR habitat requiring registration under the ESA were identified. It also clarifies how the project will proceed responsibly through implementation of a full suite of mitigation measures (outlined in Section 5.0), including timing restrictions, exclusion fencing, and vegetation restoration. The updated conclusion confirms that, with mitigation, the proposed development is not anticipated to result in negative impacts on natural heritage features and complex with referent policy framework.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Section 7.0: References All web sources need to include the date accessed.	Add access dates to web-based sources.	Section 7.0 (References) was updated to include access dates for all web-based sources, as requested. Appendix A was updated to include the results of all avian point counts, along with species-specific observations from both field-based surveys and passive
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Appendices Appendix A will need to be updated to include the results of the additional required surveys noted above. Including results of the data obtained through point counts. Dates, time periods and weather details of APIL data used to assess breeding bird species needs to be identified. Species sofibilized possible, probable or confirmed breeding evidence over two point-counts are to be identified as breeding within the study area.		Appends A was update to include the relates of all awar point counts, along wan species-specie conservations from norm net-based surveys and passive accounts recordings. Species observed on two or more visits with appropriate breeding behaviour were classified as possible, probable, or confirmed breeders following OBEA guidelines. While detailed ARIV weather data was not included, the report confirms that accounts curveys were conducted during optimal weather windows, including early morning and crepuscular periods, and during full moon phases to increase detectability. All updates align with the intent of documenting breeding species within the study area using industry-accepted standards.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	ELC cards for each polygon with abundances of all vegetation species identified and soil assessments are to be included as an appendix.	Break down summary table; add ELC code, dominant species, and soil types.	A summary of ELC card data for each polygon, including vegetation species abundance and soil assessments, has been provided in Section 4.11 (Table 3). The original field data cards have been retained on file and are available upon request to support regulatory review.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Amphibians were identified in the Herps portion of Appendix A; however, it was noted that the purpose for the ARU's was to detect amphibian calls. Please confirm whether amphibians identified were detected through the ARU. If so, identify the species and call code level associated with each ARU. This information is also to be provided in each in Section 4.0 Results.	Clarify no amphibians were detected through ARU, only through visual survey.	Section 4.0 and Appendix A were reviewed and updated to carify that no amphibians were identified through ARU recordings. All amphibian species listed (e.g., forgy Treefrog, Cereb Frig. Leopard Frig) were documented through incidental visual and auditory field observations during digitime site visits, particularly in and around the pond in Polygon 4. ARUS were deployed primarily for bats and nocturnal birds, and while the acoustic microphones captured ambient sound, formal amphibian call analysis and call code assignment were not conducted as part of this EIS.
EIS Peer review (Aboud & Associates)	Monarch was identified within the species list. As this species is listed as Special Concern location of observation is required and mitigation measures need to be provided. Assessment of potential for SVM*-Special Concern and Rare Species needs to be provided in Section 4.0 and the assessment of policy compliance.	Will describe Monarch observation context and evaluate against SWH criteria; include mitigation measures.	Section 4.2.8 was updated to include the location and context of the Monarch observation, which was recorded foraging in Polygon 3 during the summer survey period. Multiple milkweed plants were examined, but no eggs, larvae, or chysalides were observed, and no breeding activity was documented. Based on ONNR (2015) Significant Wildlife Habitat Cirteria, the site does not meet the threshold for SWH – Special Concern and Rare Wildlife Species, as fewer than the Vehorant-were observed and no breeding was confirmed. Section 5.0 includes miligation measures such as preservation of existing militweed patches and native pollinator-friendly planting to support potential future habitat use. These updates ensure policy compliance and appropriate precautionary recommendations.

Comment Source	Concern	Response Updated Document Reference
Lanark County Public Works	Only expected generated traffic shown at intersections. We would like to see the following detailed: Only expected generated traffic shown at intersections. We would like to see the following detailed: 2 0204 Existing Traffic Conditions 2 0204 Existing Traffic Conditions 2 0204, 2 0204, 2 0205 Fature Background Traffic 2 0204, 2 0204, 2 0205 Total Traffic	o 2024 Existing Traffic Conditions, Infrastructure is outlined briefly in section 2.2: Existing Conditions (pg. 5) while tarffic count data is located in appendix A: Traffic Counties (pt. 7–28) and A and PM peak analysis for each Intersection with current traffic only is present in Appendix B: Operational Analysis Work Sheets (pg. 28, 29, 36, 37). o 2034 & 2039 Future Background Traffic, By definition after the implementation year of the Subdivision, all generated traffic becomes background. The generated traffic may be a subdivision in these years can be obtained by removing the subdivision in these years can be obtained by removing the generated number present in section 4.1 Detailed Trip Generation (pg. 9). Generated Traffic, Present in section 4.1 Generated Trip Generation (pg. 9) outlines all generated traffic in the AM and PM peaks in accordance with ITE Trip Generation (pg. 9) usines all generated traffic in the AM and PM peaks in accordance with ITE Trip Generation (pg. 9). o 2024, 2034, 8, 2039 Total Traffic, Put reports including total traffic in all directions present in Appendix B: Operational Analysis Work Sheets (pg. 24-44), ILCS reports are categorized by intersection and year and include Current 2024 Traffic, 2024 Traffic with subdivision additions, 2034 traffic and 2039 traffic.
Lanark County Public Works	Assess requirements for right turn tapers at Rosedale Rd. South access and Matheson Drive, since the percentage of traffic turning vs. through traffic is expected to be high.	Changes to existing infrastructure would only be required or assessed should a significant change to LOS occur, specifically if the LOS should exceed a level of "D" indicating a significant reduction in traffic flow and intersection functionality as a whole. If this comment is referring to the entrance/exit from the subdivision onto Rosedale Road, the access is not considered an intersection and not included in the reports in depth analysis however the Z numbers present are a prediction or taffic trends from the subdivision interfect from current traffic data and flows as well as are predicted for the entire peak hour. Therefore, the total right turns of 15 in the AM peak is " 1 car/ 4 minutes (15 cars/ 60 mins). Far too low to result in significant delays or result in the need for infrastructure changes.

Comment Source	Comment	Regione Updated Columnia Minimate Columnia Columnia Columnia Columnia Columnia
	reference and reflect the most current land use poticies.	The Principle Control to Library against to Library against and the control to the purposed to Addressive against the Control to The Control C
		At A contract of an authors been removed and contracted action the reduction processing of a referring to proposed a contraction, the Proposed and contraction to the reduction and action and action action and action act
Lances County	studies that you can draw from that have a similar noise contest." Smith Pattins connectived a Single Year managedity.	The difference of the fill the company of the company
Lanaria County		MC with a shift is ables to some grad-uponly A. List Appropriate Control of the C
Martague Planning Department	Device reports submitted by the Applicant in support of their Subdivision Application witewace the 2000 Proximal Public Statement, which insystem benchmether at the Same-certain imports and/or shadow series statistical. Novement, continuation that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the justices of the Provincial Planning Statement, 2012, will be required.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER
Martigue Planning Department	guillace that MSE catalistics are not required for brestock buildness bettlement Awas, acknowledgement of the repair of neutring brestock buildness in the proposed development is important to reduce judinistic matanior comparator.	Assurance production and the control of the Principal States of the Control of States and the Co
Mariague Planning Department	proposed Stormacke Management Pand, will require in Justing to Open Space (CRS to ensure Stall Steep Stock reflect the appropriate permitted uses attributable to the CRS Jorning designation.	TO ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRAT
Marcague Planning Department	The Planning Radionate contains a statement that 20% of the units will be designated as affectable bouring afficing filtere dies not appear to be clarify as how this would be activised. The Township is seeking additional standardise from the Applicant or this region.	Novel shows 3 Media Novel per Ferry Missa.
Martague Planning Department	Trichmical documents submitted are based on the construction of origin benefit get. The Trisenthy's Zoning by two premis distillations for detential critic vettors the MX zons, adaptitis specific processors. Constructions in detentive this team of conversions at autological, expensition for the energial specific analysis of Zonald AMAs write autologisted, no zoning only be required to entere this described place.	Michaelist Littles unetigen (and playing places and this big (and playing places and this big (all all the found big big (all and and playing big (all and and playing big (all and and and playing big (all and

Comment Source	Comment	Response	Updated Document Reference
Lanark County	The sufficiency and legal entitlement of the stormwater conveyance pathway needs to be assessed and verified all the way to its outlet at natural waterbody or water course.	TR to fill out. MONUMENT ACTION ITEM Add Section to SWM Report.	MONUMENT SWM REPORT CIVIL DRAWINGS (2 sheets)
Lanark County	Either the Planning Rationale or the Serviceability Options Report should be reviewed and updated to more fully address the documentation/justification requirements of D-5-3 Servicing Options Statement and the PPS's servicing hierarchy.	TR.	same
Lanark County Public Works	Entrance culvert required for PIN 987	Entrance culvert will be required during detailed design as a condition of draft plan approval.	Sunc
Lanark County Public Works	Confirm positive drainage from Rosedale Rd South & Matheson to OF-1	No longer relevantexisting ditch to remain in existing condition. Alternate SWM outlet provided see comment response 1	1
Lanark County Public Works		Existing drainage patterns result in closed depression within the right of way that could impact free drainage from the existing ditch and proposed development. The proposed culvert is to improve Level of service and ensure adequate drainage within the receiving right-of-way.	
Lanark County Public Works	Access to CR23 (Rosedale Rd South) is too steen at 5%	TR to fill out Crozier Response. 6% is supported by TAC. Grade transition from CR23 has been provided.	y Civil Drawines
Montague Building Department	Outlet Location OF#1: The outlet at the lot line between 1053 Matheson Dr. and 877 Rosedale Rd. S. could pose issues with the increased flows. The flows an		Civit Drawings
Montague Building Department	Easement Requirements at 877 Rosedale Rd. S.: Draining water onto someone else's property without a registered easement is generally not permissible. A registered easement (and F.Eng design) to Rosedale Creek may be necessary to legally manage the increased flows from OF41 to Rosedale Creek. There does not appear to be a registered drainage assement there. Typically, with new developments there is a need to obtain approval from property owners for the municipal drain. This ensures that the increased flows are managed legally and effectively.	See above Comment #1 wrt Sufficient and Legal Outlet Proposed.	
Montague Building Department	Straw Bale Flow Dams: There are 7 proposed straw bale flow dams. It is unclear if these would be a permanent sediment and flow control for the stormwater management or a temporary measure until the vegetation grew in the dich. Section 4.2 indicates Enhanced Grass Swales which does not specifically state the check dams but they then appear on C102 Sediment and Erosion Control Pani. In have included the debail OPSD 213.Eld which is the Ontario Standard Debail OPSD 213.Eld which is the Ontario Standard Debail OPSD 213.Eld which is the Ontario Standard Debail OPSD 41MISIOS (p.g. 10) which states that the straw bales need to be replaced every 45 days. If year a permanent method used for the sediment control the maintenance to the Township would be huge. If temporary during construction developer responsible.	Noted. Plans have been updated accordingly.	Bovisori FSC Plans (Svon)
Montague Public Works	The stormwater plan shows water being directed to the ditch on Matheson Drive, flowing west to Rosedale Road South and then South to OFF1, which uses a existing culvert to direct water under the road to a ditch. This existing ditch and culvert system would need upgrades to accommodate the additional water from the proposed subdivision. The ditch on the west side of Rosedale Road South at OFF1 overflows during the spring thaw and floods the neighboring property at 877 Rosedale Road South. Improvements to ditch and the swale that directs water to Rosedale Creek would be required. Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) shows this swale as a watercourse on their mapping. Further discussion with the RVCA on any improvements or modifications to this watercourse would be required.	1	nemeed Coor units (typin)
Montague Planning Department	The proposed Stormwater Management Plan and Drainage design has resulted in comments of concern from Staff. In consideration of the subdivision infrastructure being assumed by the Township, as well as the potential impacts on neighbouring property owners, Staff are keen to receive and review the peer review comments to ensure that Township interests, as well as those of the nearby property owners, are adequately considered and addressed.	See above Comment #1 wrt Sufficient and Legal Outlet Proposed.	
Montague Septic Department	Nitrate Loading Calculations: According to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks D-5-4 Individual On-Site Sewage Systems: Water Quality Impact Risk Assessment, a nitrate to admig of at least 40 grams/10/day per residential dwelling should be used for predicting potential groundwater impacts. The calculations by Cambium, which used 1 dwelling per lot and 2000 L/day (four-bedroom dwelling), intrate concentration at the property boundaries resulted in a nitrate level of 9.97 mg/l at the lot line. This is very close to the maximum threshold of 10 mg/L. Additionally, he property is located in a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) with a vulnerability score of 6 and within a Well Head Protection Area D. Bedrock is at or near the surface in most test pits. Recommendations: * Minimum L/d for Onsite Sewage Design: It is recommended to change the minimum L/d for onsite sewage design to 3000 L and restrict to one dwelling per lot. Potentially increase lot sizes to decrease the nitrate levels at the property line. * As per the report detectable nitrate in the existing wells suggest that there isincomplete hydraulic separation between the surface and the water supply aquifer. It appears none of the adjacent properties (gericultural) and housing developments were taken into consideration for the nitrate concentrations and potential impacts. Land and water use conflicts within 500 meters should be evaluated for the potential for adverse impact on the development and be addressed. Septic System and Well Locations: Septic system and well locations should be added to the lot grading and drainage plan if approved. A site evaluation by the Township of Montague will need to take place. Lots are to be staked out prior to site evaluation.	L Refer to HivistoG	
RVCA	The subject lands are not identified as having the presence of any regulated natural hazards, and while there are no watercourses present on the property, RVCA notes that the site is located within the Rosedale Creek drainage catchment which discharges to the Rideau River. Rosedale Creek forws outleast and is located immediately west of Rosedale Road S and the subject lands. The site tultimately drains to, and in-part controls, the broad floodplain and wetland system immediately downstream along the Rideau River. Any development activity within RVCA's Regulated Area, including 15 metres from a watercourse, would be subject to a permit pursuant to 28.1 of the Conservation Authorities Act. In accordance with Section 23.1 of the Conservation Authorities Act. In development activity may be permitted in the Regulated Area, where it can be demonstrated to RVCA's satisfaction that the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, or unstable soits and bedrock will not be affected.		
RVCA	RVCA technical staff reviewed the report titled "Preliminary Stormwater Management Report - Matheson & Rosedale Subdivision" prepared by EFI Engineering Inc., dated November 26, 2024 and provide the following comments: 3. The report refers to several civic addresses for the drainage patterns at both Rosedale Rd S and Matheson Drive. For example, "majority of the development will drain to the west side of the site through the developers private owned land at houses 987 and into the south dict of Matheson Drive S. "Please lated these key addresses and Wood Poad of and and a support of the south dict of drawing number ST1 showing the pre-development storm catchment areas.	n Drawing ST1 by Monument has been annotated as requested.	
RVCA	B) Post-development areas are not clear to the RVCA. There are catchments labeled as PR and ST; please provide details about what these areas refer to. Please also provide updated drainage areas for each of the three outlets under post-development conditions.		
RVCA	C) It is understood that stormwater generated from post development conditions will be conveyed via a 1.0m wide bottom ditch to a stormwater management (SVMM) facility and that alteration to the existing ditch within the Matheson Road right-of-way is required to accommodate the lower elevation of the proposed SWM pond (as shown on drawing number ST3). Please provide more design details about the proposed reditching alongside Matheson Road.	See above Comment #1 wrt Sufficient and Legal Outlet Proposed.	
RVCA	D) Culverts at specified locations within the site will need to be sized for sufficient conveyance capacity. This analysis should be completed at the detailed design stage of development.	Noted.	

RVCA	E) The overall imperviousness ratio is calculated to be only 14% for the total development. The impervious ratio suggest that more Low Impact Development options within a treatment train approach could be explored to potentially minimize the use of the end-ofpipe facility.	Noted. To be included in detailed design.	
RVCA	The design of the stormwater management system, including the detention pond, should account for its location within an HVA. With respect to SWM pond lining, consideration should be given to the use of Geosynthetic Clay Liners (GCLs) rather than compacted clay liners which often leak.	Noted. Consideration will be given at detailed design.	Reference made in SWM Report (Monument)
SWM Review - Jewell Engineering	d. A Hydrogeological Assessment Report is noted in Section 1.2 of the SWM report but does not appear to be referenced in the LID discussion. The LIDs proposed by Consultant do not rely solely on infiltration and offer litration benefits and therefore their buffers from groundwater (GW) and bedrock (BR) are not as critical. However, it is recommended that high GW and BR be referenced in the quality/LID section of the Preliminary SWM Report. If this information is not yet available, then a statement acknowledging they will be identified and accommodated in detailed design would be sufficient.	Noted. To be identified and accomodated in detailed design.	Reference made in SWM Report (Monument)
SWM Review - Jewell Engineering	Conveyance & Quantity Control: 2. Page 8 of the SWM report states the proposed outlet "offers a sufficient outlet to municipal right of way ditch directly to Rosedale Creek". a. There is a 220m flow path through private property between Rosedale Road (OFF1) and Rosedale Creek. This drainage path would need an easement and be sized to convey the post-development receiving peak flow and runoff volume. The Owner would need the Municipality to obtain an easement or modify theexisting easement if one already exists.	See above Comment #1 wrt Sufficient and Legal Outlet Proposed.	Reference made in SWM Report (Monument)
SWM Review - Jewell Engineering	3. The Consultant believes that "runoff in major storms will spill from the ditch in two different directions" which are then described as a spill over Matheson Drive towards OF #3 and another spill over a driveway towards OF #1.a. The quantity of spill towards OF #3 and OF #1 does not appear to be presented in the report. However, the report suggests it was included as part of the Q-pre calculations.	This has been updated	Reference made in SWM Report (Monument)
SWM Review - Jewell Engineering	b. The Consultant's pond sking is based on the 100-yr, 24 storm which has the largest rainfall volume of 117mm. The EX-1 area is 15.97 ha. The external drainage area to OF #3 to be 74 is not identified in the report, but we estimate the total drainage area to OF #3 to be 24.3 ha in existing conditions. Appendix C of the report identifies a runoff coefficient (RC) of 0.33 for EXT-1.	This has been updated	Reference made in SWM Report (Monument)
SWM Review - Jewell Engineering	 Please note that the availability of a Municipal Road Allowance does not guarantee a sufficient outlet. This is because Municipalities are subject to many of the same responsibilities as private land owners. No owner (including municipalities) has the right to collect surface water via artificial ditches and convey this runoff to a downstream property. 	See above Comment #1 wrt Sufficient and Legal Outlet Proposed.	
SWM Review - Jewell Engineering	4. In addition to downstream private property, the re-directed drainage with the pond's outlet path may cause a localized increase in peak flow between the pond outlet ditch and OF #1 even if the total peak outflow at OF #1 is met.	See above Comment #1 wrt Sufficient and Legal Outlet Proposed.	
SWM Review - Jewell Engineering	5. The report recommends a 400mm culvert for OF #3. The sizing of this culvert should include the external drainage area. Please note that the Municipality is not required to provide a culvert at OF #3 (Matheson Road).	See above Comment #1 wrt Sufficient and Legal Outlet Proposed.	
SWM Review - Jewell Engineering	 It is understood that the Township's Planning Consultant will not accept rear-yard drains due to long term operational concerns particularly for rural subdivisions. During detailed design and grading, please ensure no rear-yard drains. 	Noted.	

C	Comment	Response	Updated Document Reference
I	t may be prudent to discuss with the Township if Block 44 for the future road extension is		
b	pest aligned to the south-east as currently illustrated in the draft plan, or would be better		
а	aligned to the north-east over Block 43 given the greater area of land within the Settlement		
A	Area designation in that direction.		
		These blocks have been combined and adjusted	Draft Plan of Subdivision
T	The submitted planning rationale references affordable housing. Please review Section 51		
(17(f.1) of the Planning Act in relation to the illustration of affordable housing units on a		
c	draft plan.	Removed reference to Affordable Housing	
1	13m from CL of Rosedale Rd South required for road widening on Lot 18/Green Space	This has been included in the revised Draft Plan of Subdivision.	Draft Plan of Subdivision

Public Comments	Comment #	Full Comment	Summary	CFI Response
		I valeb to be legs informed of any further progress to the application of County File No. OH 7-506St. One thing as I am reviewing at the documentation of the application is looking for an agricultural mody — this is take exceeding the contraction of the application as in the county of the county	Askx whether an agricultural study was completed, given nearby Evertock operations (cartie, horses,	As Apricultural impact Assessment was not required for this application, as the lands within and surrounding the subject property are designated primarily for such residential development under the Township and County Official Plans. However, the planning transvesor continues to protect existing applications and leverous operations, including borne farms.
		Abbit to equal This special personney. Et its breature constructed, there would be a percentage that may have children, those children may work to gerimmhore indig which we would be a papoidin taxcommodes as we have as indicer riding were and mywhat to accombine man proper to the complete	donkey). Concerned about future ability to expand horse riding operations on their own property jadding more horses,	The proposed subdivision will not remotic your ability to maintain or expanding an equation operation, subject to applicable storing permissions. Guiding next such such such such surface, training, and issues remain permission remain permission of storing designation, and not change any proposed to surrounding soupering rights should the facility of the supplicable storing designation.
		top us from separating the number of horses on surfand and servicing the ess community, become the call for an agricultural study. Please advise via email.	offering lessons). Wants neasurance that the subdivision will not restrict. Their ability to avend series that because the same	
			anni anni si kapina agri anna mapaninini sami.	
Jeff Grace	1			
		Potential Durage ou Deleting Homes from Blancing	Mineting Concern of potential damage to existing	Bitanting and Home Protection:
		Meant design des des design des design des des design des des des design des des des designs des des des designs des des des des des des des des des de	homes on/hear bedruck; asks/for pre- and post-blast sunwys and mitigation plans. Water Table / Wells Concern about sufficient water	Except demonstrations: The product demonstrate of the contemp of age (control, in, with transported sourcition with all plantage principal control, in all the control of age (control, in, with transported sourcition with a global principal control, in all the control of age (control, in, with transported sourcition). The production is a control of the control of the control of age (control, in, with transported sourcition) and in a special control of age (control, in, with transported source). The production is an expected ending of the addition of age of age (control of age (cont
		o With the addition of \$1 new forms, there is a valid concern about whether the water table can sustain the increased demand without negatively impacting current wells. Has a hydrogeological study been conducted to determine the long-term sustainability of the water supply for both relating and new formewhere? Government impact on Sustainability inference:	supply after 61 new homes. Wants confirmation of HydroG study and long-term sustainability. Groundwater Flow Concern that site grading could	A Ally desposing of Standy was compared to sease a groundware supply and sustainability. The stady concluded that the aquitle has sufficient capacity to support both the proposed development and surrounding properties without set cipated negative impact. On going promotion are incorporated through the subdivision design and approval process. Geographical Standards (Incorporated Standard
		o Changes in land gooding and distinspercoid alter groundwater flow, potentially leading to flooding or water damage to winting properties. How will these risks be managed, and what assurances do current homeowners have that their properties will not take all schools. When the contraction of instrusions and instrusions.	change groundwater patterns, causing flooding or water damage. Stormwater Management Book 1 Security Section	A Stormwater Management Plan and gooding design have been prepared to ensure that poin-development of along yearness do not regularly affect adjacent properties. These plans will continue to be reviewed and refined as part of detailed angleweing exclusionistics. Sommatic Management Plans State; A reviewed result is along. A reviewed result is along. A reviewed result is along the second of the Administration of the amendment of interment and interment of interment and interment of interment
		whites desired The control of the c	land caping for child salety, and a clear maintenance plan. Traffir Solety (Motheron & Bosset de Internacion) (Sto	Demonstration of the control of the
Lot & Andrew Johnson	2	be implementation unitation sustem? © Tradit's Safety at Matherion and Repediate:	signs currently ignored. Asks whether a Traffic impact Study was done and if a 6-way stop or traffic measures.	Condition of Swisting Claims: The capacity and condition of the cubert under Reseable Resed is under review. Should approxime, they would be conditioned with the relevant County department through the subdivision servicing process.
		o Tak current op op ur the control of the current op op ur the current op ur the current op ur the current op ur the current op op ur the current op ur the curren	condition of Cultiert Salesing cultiert under Resedule Road may be undersized and needs evaluation for flood	
		o The current culeant does not appear to adequately handle existing water runoff. Will this be evaluated for potential evidening or initiativement to prevent floating and inhastracture failure?	protection.	
		Administry diagnosed stata subdivision in the would be considered at the control of Ricondain and Humberson it's literally in the back yet of proper incomes. Propie who good money to move to the county. Will feet this as much as considered	Concern about impact on "sural living" lifestyle and	We understand and appreciate that change within note communifies can raise storag concern regarding character, steropie, and the initiativity between tree and exiding residents.
		Assistivity registed that audulitions the invasible beatfeated and the current disseases and Mathemas. It is instally in the lack yet of project horses. Proper who pad good money to move to the cavity, Web Optimis in with as I Can and how a helding redisposition. The propose design proper records and exercises required the contraction of the contraction	sense of place. Concern about quality of life for existing necidents. Concern about parential impacts to drinking water (wells). Concern about negative effect on propert	It is important to note that while the area maintains a multicitization, it is identified within the County and Township Official Plans as a designated Sentement Area. These area are intended on account nature for a constitution of the county of the coun
Anama-Reid	2		values.	bount mixed to properly value, while moughand an imported to indicent, an excitation that are evaluated though the Ortacli planning approximation. The County's neview focuses an constancy with the Provincial Policy Statement, Official Plan polices, and encoding infrastructure and evaluate protections are properly addressed.
		We are writing regarding the purposed incidental subdivision, Covery (sel 94 T-2005). Nywells and immedia to the area last this purchasing the small tarm in the connect control of the connect of the co	Use of "Vacant Land" Label Believes in's agricultural, not social securoping as documen.	Land the designation and "Vaccini" Liabit: The subject to do saw a designated a saw of a Saw Section sect is Real Section sect in Real Section sectio
		integries would be proceide to bald a supdision from tack york (in account the street succious). However, it is performed in a performance of the street succious the street succious). However, it is performed in a performance of the street succious the street succio	Growth Size (42 homes = 45% increase) Argues in's no "modest" growth per OP Section 2.6.1 and 2.7.1. Grownware Good Doodney."	not the absence of agricultural activity. The proposed everapower controls with the land as permission to Pauliferiate Health Securification and the absence of agricultural activity. The proposed everapower controls with the land as permission to Pauliferiate Health Securification and the activity and official Pauliferia. Social of Control Pauliferia.
		The same of the sa	easement, wet basement, masquito risk. Prukinity's Farms Livestock facilities nearby; world	These amore recommendations are recommendative and accommendation of the second of the
			about setbacks and future conflicts. Sichool Capacity Believes Montague Public School is overcrow-ded; questions accommodation plans.	Automative Processing and the even prepared to manage acord and costnot pion development dataget in motor or improve upon existing conditions. Examents those on the plans are intended to provide controlled cutent and will be regolated where recoverany, exemplication in our anticipated. Missayin controlled cutent and will be regolated where recoverany, exemplication are addressed through point develop (e.g., maintaining four, maintaining transpart water). Famility (by excitors and defendance.)
		this project were to more forwards the wasted the financiality exponential contributes homeowness should they encourse reclamments or financing of property for the way applicated prices in me plant transpresent for this large paned of segment water? A. Farmers with investor in facilities within 150Mod proposed site and 6 within 500Mod proposed	Water Protection (Septic & Redrock) Very shallow soil depth; fears contamination of downhill wells. Tree Planting and Natural Spaces Asks if there's a	Administration Separation (MSC) where its planned and will be complemed prior to favor inabilishino approval to confirm compliance with provincial agricultural land are comprehibility standards. School Capacity School Capacity in some view been directly inviewed as part of this application. Should circulation to the school board the deemed encensury, it will be coordinated through the County's melway process to ensure appropriate planning considerations are addressed.
Andrew and Angela Reid	4	accommodate another 200cm is tidd in the elicitarity immediate factor of this development exists in the place of the control of the proposed development point of septic operator con bandwisched with the development asset to a "in-placed interest of the proposed of the p	budget and plan for replanting and environmental enhancements. Traffic Study Accuracy Steatical than arti- Na-Art	Counterations and Septic Systems: Asking register Study assessed and conditions, including soil depth and groundwater protection. Suppic systems approach will be maken't to Ministryin Release Suppic Systems Office makes and applicable regulations to ensure origining striking water under, The Number and Conditional or Conditions or Cond
		Dudge for two planting and multilation of natural spaces for this proposed purpose "Rased on the 42 Sky (2) new born of piccusses in homes which the Rosados Settlement area how did the staffs; assessment determine these would only be an extra 26 which cut may in in the morning and all in the absence of the implying each home would have less than one which is asking less than one since a day. Clearly this is not the statistical average for the area. Would like to see a	tripolitayare forecasted; challenges whiche assumptions.	Lancincope plans, including the planning and nonunalization, will be finalized during the devalend design range, in consultation with the Township and approxim. Traits Code planning:
		Inclusions review. In the developer space states a the depresentation to state and a state of the state of th	Amorados Housing Heastly Seeptical that 1-acts homes are truly "affordable"; wants projected pricing. Precedent Setting Fears developers will exploit Land	A cross compact study (to) was preparationing incognision country transmission from the contract of the students of the contract of the contra
		within this proposed development there exists each object the subject of the subj	left sacant after farming ends. Third Party Review of Studies Asks if studies have beer independently peer reviewed.	Sino. Third Princip Newboars: Several to extrinct incordaint, including hydrogenizgical, recurrenced management, and environmental reports, have been independently per reviewed by external consultants metal ned by the County and Township.
		spir of "Modest growth" as collined in the Official plan of Montages. We also hope that every resident's concerns are considered and minimed. We would like to saywe feel expectably stad for our new neighbours across the street who will identify that this development feet from there back posther immeed of "country (sing at its friends" if this project was no more forward as proposed.	General Opposition Believes the project offers no community-value, only benefits the developer; urges consideration of residents' way of life.	
		Further to our conversation this manning it are writing with regard to activity or the vaccentriand behind our home. I believe it is described as PLICEDCEN 3 Montagoe Township. In homs on both Matheson Drive and Rosedale Road South. This	Impact on Eastern Meadowlarks Concern that needing	Novamenths load she atheration or programsion work has been permitted to proceed at this clinic. The subdivision application remains under solvine by the Clumby of Linearit, and all works are subject to the appropriate environment classrances and approvin.
DebSmith	5	residence again this year. I have also reported my concerns to the Ministry of Natural Resources. Any information you can provide regarding this propertylproposal is appreciated.		The second of a grow of the long and the control of
Deb.Smith	s	Control of the contro		
DebSmite DoessaWorg	5	residence again this year. I have also reported my concerns to the Ministry of Natural Resources. Any information you can provide regarding this propertylproposal is appreciated.		
	s	residence again this year. I have also reported my concerns to the Ministry of Natural Resources. Any information you can provide regarding this propertylproposal is appreciated.		
	s	And the second s	Opposes tubdisdon secasis they moved to the Count for racifielling, away that dovelopment. Calciums dovelow selection provision of the Count count selection selection of the Count to support meet select. Calciums dovelowing project on personal well. Calciums dovelow selection selection selection count dovelow selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection (Calciums dovelow)	The content is the filter to t
	s	residence again this year. I have also reported my concerns to the Ministry of Natural Resources. Any information you can provide regarding this propertylproposal is appreciated.	Opposes tubdisdon secasis they moved to the Count for racifielling, away that dovelopment. Calciums dovelow selection provision of the Count count selection selection of the Count to support meet select. Calciums dovelowing project on personal well. Calciums dovelow selection selection selection count dovelow selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection (Calciums dovelow)	The content is the filter to t
	s	And the second s	Opposes tubdisdon secasis they moved to the Count for racifielling, away that dovelopment. Calciums dovelow selection provision of the Count count selection selection of the Count to support meet select. Calciums dovelowing project on personal well. Calciums dovelow selection selection selection count dovelow selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection (Calciums dovelow) selection selection (Calciums dovelow)	The content is the filter to t
	6	**Return day on the control of the c	Opport in challenge lineage his provide for Court for crossingle, may be adequated. Concern disease cesting treatment in challenge and the support have self. In support have self. Concern disease for present a self. Self. The self. The self. The self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self.	Against an extra control of the cont
	6	**Return day on the control of the c	Opport in challenge lineage his provide for Court for crossingle, may be adequated. Concern disease cesting treatment in challenge and the support have self. In support have self. Concern disease for present a self. Self. The self. The self. The self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self.	Against an extra control of the cont
	6	**Return day on the control of the c	Opport in challenge lineage his provide for Court for crossingle, may be adequated. Concern disease cesting treatment in challenge and the support have self. In support have self. Concern disease for present a self. Self. The self. The self. The self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self.	Against an extra control of the cont
	6	**Return day on the control of the c	Opport in challenge lineage his provide for Court for crossingle, may be adequated. Concern disease cesting treatment in challenge and the support have self. In support have self. Concern disease for present a self. Self. The self. The self. The self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self. Self.	Against an extra control of the cont
	6	**Return day on the control of the c	Opport in challenge lineage his provide for Court for crossingle, may be adequated. Concern disease seeking seek to be compared that seeking seeking the instrument ability compared that the country of the court of the country of	Against an extra control of the cont
	6	**Return day on the control of the c	Opport in challenge lineage his provide for Court for crossingle, may be adequated. Concern disease seeking seek to be compared that seeking seeking the instrument ability compared that the country of the court of the country of	Against an extra control of the cont
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the control of the contro	And the second of the second o
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the control of the contro	And the second of the second o
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the control of the contro	And the second of the second o
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the control of the contro	And the second of the second o
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the control of the contro	And the second of the second o
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the control of the contro	And the second of the second o
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the control of the contro	And the second of the second o
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the Control of the Contro	Response of the control of the contr
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the Control of the Contro	Response of the control of the contr
	5 6	The control of the co	Section of the Control of the Contro	Response of the control of the contr
	6 s	The control of the co	Section of the Control of the Contro	And the second of the second o
	6 s	The control of the co	Communication of the communica	The control of the co
	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Recognition of the control of the co
	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Recognition of the control of the co
	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Recognition of the control of the co
	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Recognition of the control of the co
	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Recognition of the control of the co
Decrease Visioning Kanadaning Maditio Laurent Carding Onto and Proof Service.	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Recognition of the control of the co
Contract World	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Recognition of the control of the co
Decrease Visioning Kanadaning Maditio Laurent Carding Onto and Proof Service.	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Requirements and the control of the
Donne Word Konducing Malitie Laura Carding Malitim And Strain	6 s	The control of the co	Comment of the Commen	Recognition of the control of the co

Little in any control and appropriate properties of the properties