



## CHANGES TO THE COUNCIL AGENDA

March 16, 2021

- CORRECTION -
- 6. A) Staff Report 21-21  
Re: Appeal
  - 6. B) Staff Report 21-19  
Re: LPAT Appeal
  - And 6. C) Staff Report 21-20  
Re: LPAT Limited Appeal

Corrected use of section 239 (2) to enter in-camera:  
Pursuant to section 239 (2) (e) of the Municipal Act as the subject matter pertains to litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board.

ADD- 7. E) Additional four correspondence items regarding Sidewalk options Cockshutt Road & Dover Mills Road – Port Dover

PULLED FOR DISCUSSION by Councillor Van Paassen - 7. F) Released materials - Normandale Crown Access Point

ADD- 7. G) Additional correspondence item regarding Normandale Crown Access Point Sale

ADD- 7. H) Additional correspondence item regarding Brand Strategy – Cinnamon Toast

ADD- 7. J) WAVELINE RECREATION INC. (“Waveline”) Submissions on Proposed Business Licensing By-Law – Personal Watercraft Rentals (PWC)

ADD- 7. J) WAVELINE RECREATION INC. (“Waveline”) Submissions on

Proposed Business Licensing By-Law – Personal Watercraft 11  
Personal Watercraft Rentals (PWC)

CORRECTION- 9. A) Resolution 13 in Council-in-Committee minutes  
CIC Resolutions pulled for further discussion:

Councillor Martin – Resolution 6

Councillor Martin – Resolution 11

Councillor’s Van Paassen & Martin – Resolution 20

ADD- 9. C) Councillor Van Paassen request - (Item 4. A) from March  
16, 2021 Info pack) – February Agricultural Advisory Board Minutes 16

ADD 10. D) Staff Report EIS 21-16 **(to be distributed)**  
Re: Port Dover WTP – 3<sup>rd</sup> DAF Unit 19

CORRECTION – 15. B) Staff Report 21-17  
Re: COI Review

Corrected use of section 239 (2) to enter in-camera:  
Pursuant to section 239 (2) (b) and (f) of the Municipal Act as the  
subject matter pertains to personal matters about an identifiable  
individual, including municipal or local board employees and advice  
that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications  
necessary for that purpose.

Thank you in advance for any Counsel members who came out on Saturday to the proposed Cockshutt road sidewalk stretch of road. As I will not be able to attend with my husband and two children (7 and 10 yrs), I do hope you see the alarming concern with extending the pavement as a stop gap measure. Currently, we have lived in our home for 4 years. We love to get out and walk to downtown for dinner, shopping or visits with friends (pre Covid-19). Our concerns are valid for the currently proposed extension without any barrier for pedestrians. With the reality that many cars are speeding out of town and the known increased rates of distracted drivers, putting pedestrians along side the road will not increase safety but potentially increase the dangers. Please stop and consider doing what's right for this stretch of road. It comes down to "DO IT RIGHT OR DON'T DO IT AT ALL".

Yours truly,  
Angie Auther and family

March 14, 2021

Dear Mayor and Councillors

I am writing to strongly support the sidewalk and curb project on the Cockshutt Road in Port Dover.

My family enjoys walking to the town core from our Pine Ridge Crescent home in the Inglewood housing development and we find walking along the Cockshutt Road to be very dangerous. The Cockshutt is no longer a rural county road but a residential street, with many housing developments built over the past 20 years.

As you walk along the edge of the paved or unpaved edge of the road, trucks, cars, motorcycles and transport trucks are driving over 50 kms per hour only 3 feet beside you. As you walk along the bend of the road, you pray that the vehicles that are driving directly towards you will make the curve.

Any municipal government has a duty and obligation to assure that all of their residents are SAFE from harm. All budget initiatives are evaluated and SAFETY is given the highest priority when approving a project.

By installing sidewalks and curbs on the Cockshutt Road, it will demonstrate that this area is residential, with awareness for pedestrians and speed control.

Please pass the motion for sidewalks and curbs in our neighbourhood for the SAFETY of your residents you are obliged to protect. It will be tax money well spent.

Thank you,  
Chris and Dean Vallis

Dear Mayor Chopp

In regards to the issue of pedestrian safety on the Cockshutt Rd. I believe that a sidewalk on the east side complete with curb should be installed. The shoulders on both sides should be paved to accommodate cyclists. Traffic speed along this stretch of road is also a big problem so therefore speed bumps should definitely be considered.

Regards,  
Paul Creighton

Good afternoon,

As a Port Dover resident and Prospect St home owner, I believe it is crucial to have a sidewalk on Cockshutt Road. The safety of our residents should be first and foremost the top priority of council. Port Dover is known to have minimal parking downtown, and yet with only a 15-20 minute walk, residents are able to get downtown to support local, but cannot do it safely. They cannot bring their families. They cannot walk their dogs. There are residents who want to support local yet can't, because there is no parking and there is no safe alternative.

Please reconsider putting a safe passage to downtown. Port Dover is expanding rapidly, and not finding safe ways for its residents is only asking for accidents to occur.

Allison Huszczo

Hi

I am a resident of Simcoe. Please reference the response below from Mr. Barrett. This statement is especially disturbing

***In May 2018, the property was posted to the circulatory portal. Norfolk County submitted an Expression IO. However, the municipality later rescinded that EOI so the property went on the open market.***

***In January 2021, Norfolk County informed IO they would not be proceeding.***

The public is very upset and immediate action is required by Council.

Regards

Geoff Saldanha

Mayor Chopp, Councillors, Mr. Burgess and Norfolk County staff,

I've spend the last several days following the online conversation around the recently presented Norfolk County Tourism re-branding proposal and with over 350 facebook comments (and counting) on the Simcoe reformer article alone, it is clear that as with other important and somewhat contentious issues this one has struck an nerve on several levels. I am writing this note to offer what I hope will be seen as constructive criticism as well as a sharing some of the experience I have gained over 20 years of working in the branding, advertising, design & PR worlds.

In addition to that, not only am I writing this as a new member of TEDAB (as of last week), I am also writing this note as a new business owner investing a large amount in the Norfolk tourism industry. Specifically in bringing additional overnight accommodations to the area.

So while this may seem like a long email, I sincerely hope you will take a few minutes to hear me out.

There seems to be 3 key areas that are eliciting comments from the general public and I hope to touch on all of them because there are some important things that I hope will be kept in mind as the County continues to move forward with this undertaking.

1. The logo/design itself
2. The use (or lack thereof) of local talent
3. The importance of remembering who we're speaking to, how we're speaking to them and making sure the campaign delivers on the brief

### **Is the logo my favourite...?**

Right off the bat I will admit it's not. It has its strengths. Namely, a bold, clear & legible word mark that offers the flexibility and legibility required for a well executed brand logo. A level of simplicity and clean lines that align with the current design trends seen as attractive by a large number of consumers...

Are these things enough to justify setting aside other complaints, no. But one thing we have to remember is that logos have to work on many levels, in many situations and for many purposes. Pretty scripts with lots of character can be lovely but often have legibility issues. Rustic treatments and textures are charming but may not reproduce well in all circumstances. Not to mention that they may not necessarily represent all that Norfolk has to offer and may in some ways contribute to Norfolk's offering being perceived as one dimensional.

The logo also needs to work on small screens and giant billboards. It needs to work in black and white and in colour. It needs to be legible and recognizable to the visually impaired. And most importantly it has to be unique and ownable. There have been many comments made about how easy it is to source logos on the web or that "even I could do better", but keep in mind, the last thing we want is for some or all of our new logo to end up licensed by some other brand that does not align with us (ex: that perfect stock photo you sourced for your new wellness brand also showing up in an ad for Herpes medication...)

In regards to the proposed logo...

- Is it the most unique typographic treatment showing the full character that we all know exists in Norfolk; maybe not.
- Are the icons particularly inspired or for that matter as clear in what they represent as they could be; not really.



- Does the combination of the earthy and more toned down colour scheme (which in isolation, I actually like) combined with the type choices and simplified iconography result in something that feels more institutional and reliable rather than fun, inspiring and attractive to the travelling public; unfortunately, yes.

But do these things means the entire process is a failure? Absolutely not! The development of an own-able, functional and aesthetically pleasing logo that can effectively represent an entire area that is home to a wide variety businesses is not a one and done affair. We need to treat our chosen partners as partners and accept that this process may take several iterations to get to where it needs to be. So let's give them the chance to do that.

Cinnamon Toast as that partner (for better or for worse, but I'll touch on that in my next point) has done some *very good* work in the past. The brand they developed for Hamilton's tourism board is objectively excellent (<https://cinnamontoast.ca/work/tourism-hamilton-brand/>). It is fresh, eye catching and through the accompanying imagery treatments, does a wonderful job of communicating all that Hamilton has to offer to its visitors along with the duality of its identity as an urban and industrial centre. Unfortunately they haven't delivered for us to that level... yet. So let's go back to them and insist they do. After all, we are the client and they owe us that.

In fact, for twenty years, the best work my teams ever did was for the clients that pushed us. The ones that demanded better than our first shot. The ones that insisted on excellence and helped us get there. So let's be that client.

If we do it right, our partners (whoever they are) will thank us for it.

### **Local talent**

This is a touchy subject. We have a lot of talented individuals in this County and should we try where possible to use those talents? Yes, we should. Could staff possibly have promoted the opportunity to respond to the tender put out for this project to a broader audience? Absolutely. Will the County learn from this experience and approach it differently in the future? I certainly hope so. But we can't deny that the opportunity was out there, and as I understand it very few locals (if any) submitted themselves. The idea that anyone at the County would have purposefully denied the opportunity to locals or that there was some sort of conspiracy or bias to keep them away is unrealistic and frustrating to see even as an outside observer. Staff offered the project for tender through the channels they had at their disposal and selected a vendor from the choices they were presented with. They should not be punished for following established procedures.

Should those procedures be re-examined for flaws or possible improvement on a regular basis? An emphatic yes. But that still does not make how things were done fundamentally wrong.

What we do need to keep in mind when evaluating how we move forward with this, is that the development of a new brand and successful marketing campaign meant to reach a broad audience throughout the province and possibly beyond, is much larger than just a logo. The logo is in fact just the tip of the iceberg. There is so much more to do beyond that.

We may have lots of corn fields in Norfolk County but unfortunately we aren't Kevin Costner and this isn't about baseball.

We need a partner that can not only create that brand but ensure it is top of mind with consumers and the media on an ongoing basis. If we have local suppliers who can prove they are capable of the breadth of promotion and execution required to make the campaign a success, then wonderful. But should we sacrifice the effectiveness of the campaign in favour of a local supplier? I don't think so. Nor should we jump to starting over. We need to continue to move forward. We received funding for this and whether or not certain people believe it's worth it, that is what the money was

ear marked for, so let's make the best of it.

If our heart is set on local involvement then my suggestion is to speak to the agency and request that they bring on local talent on a freelance basis to work alongside their in-house designers and contribute to the options presented. That way we can involve local talent while still taking advantage of the experience, connections and resources that may be available to an outside firm. Because when it comes to our business (and as the future operator of 2 high end hotels in the area, tourism is very much our business) we will absolutely go local wherever we can but not if it means settling for less than what is needed to make the project a success.

### **Remember who we are speaking to...**

Lastly, I wanted to touch on something that is very important and that many have admitted has been a bit of a trap that Norfolk County has fallen into when promoting itself in the past... For many years, Norfolk County has focused on advertising to Norfolk (and at a stretch a few of the surrounding Counties).

But we have to remember that this is about tourism. Which by its very nature is about bringing in people from outside our borders. And while *technically* this campaign is all about us, we have to remind ourselves on the daily that ***this campaign CAN NOT be about us***. We are within 2 hours of 4 of the largest population centres in Canada and *they* are who we need to make this campaign about. What attracts them. What interests them. What will they identify with and what will inspire them to make the trek to Lake Erie instead of PEC or Lake Huron for their local travel. A local supplier may understand who we are and what is important to us. But are they the best supplier to get into the minds of the consumers we are trying to attract?

That being said, we also need to hold our partner accountable to the brief they were given. As I understand it, the task with this campaign was to encourage overnight stays as there is clear proof that overnight visitors spend significantly more than day-trippers. We need to evaluate the tag-lines, visuals and calls to action to make sure that they focus on achieving that goal. At every turn we want to make sure that the activities and attractions highlighted encourage people not only to come to Norfolk, but also to stay in Norfolk. Consider pushing for language and visuals that emphasize day & night activities for which you'd need to stay the night to enjoy.

*A few (very?) bad examples: ... "From beaches to bonfires", "surf's up to sunsets", "wine up and wind down" or "in Norfolk County, every night is a Harvest Moon".*

If you've made it all the way through this email then I thank you very much for your time and I sincerely hope that some of my observations and comments will be considered in how you choose to move forward with this important initiative.

**Regards,**  
Hélène Larochelle

## WAVELINE RECREATION INC. (“Waveline”)

Submissions on Proposed Business Licensing By-Law – Personal Watercraft Rentals (PWC)

### WAVELINE’S SUBMISSIONS

1. Waveline has been in the business of PWC rental since 1997 and has always been compliant with By-Laws. Waveline has always obliged with any/all requests made by Norfolk By-Law administrators.
2. Waveline’s position is that safety is paramount when it comes to the rental of PWC’s and would like to work with Norfolk County and Council to align with the 2019-2022 Strategic Plan and come up with made-in-Norfolk solution with respect to the licensing of PWC rentals.
3. Waveline’s position with respect to PWC license limits is that, **in the absence of any evidence that the number and/or duration PWC rentals at a given location is connected to any safety issue, there should be no pre-determined limit on the number of rentals and/or that the duration of a PWC rental should impact the number of rentals at given time**; however, Waveline is content with there being a limit of 25 PWC rentals (35 inclusive of larger craft such as pontoon boats) at a given location for 2021 so long as this issue can be revisited on a yearly basis with the ability to apply to the By-Law Exemptions Committee for an increase.
4. Waveline is prepared to voluntarily keep logs of rentals and maintain these records to ensure By-Law compliance. Waveline is prepared to create and/or change the format of such logs as requested by Norfolk By-Law administrators.
5. Waveline shall undertake to ensure that every person renting a PWC will view a safety video prior to the commencement of the rental. Waveline will provide the facility and equipment at its rental location(s) in order to ensure that renters view same prior to stepping on the PWC. <https://www.wavelineseadoorentals.ca/video> (“**Exhibit #1**”).
6. Waveline is prepared to make changes to the safety video at the suggestion of By-Law officials and/or as required in order to comply with any changes to Federal Laws/Regulations.
7. If the number of PWC rentals allowed can be set at 25 PWC rentals (35 inclusive of larger craft such as pontoon boats) at a given location for 2021 (and without restrictions/conditions as to the length of rental) for the 2021 season, Waveline will voluntarily undertake to fit each of its PWCs with ‘Jestski Buddy’ hardware/software devices which will serve:

- a. to prevent PWCs from entering zone(s) which could pose a safety risk to the public (i.e. swimming areas);
  - b. to control the speed of PWCs and restrict the speed of PWC's in certain zone(s);
  - c. to restrict the speed of PWCs when they are in close proximity (i.e. 50 feet) to each other so as to prevent collisions; and,
  - d. to obtain the location of the PWC if required and to ensure renters return on time.
8. Subject to the conditions set out above in paragraph #7 with respect to the number of rentals and terms, Waveline is prepared to provide By-Law administrators with a demonstration of the JetSki Buddy technology on its machines in advance of the 2021 season.
  9. It should be noted that Waveline is prepared to acquire a completely new fleet of PWCs for the 2021 season to ensure functionality with the JetSki Buddy technology, optimum reliability for PWC renters and to take advantage of any safety improvements made by the manufacturers of PWCs.
  10. Waveline is prepared to implement a **shuttle-transportation service from a location away from the Marina/Rental area** in order to process PWC and alleviate any potential issues of congestion/traffic at the marina/beach location.
  11. Waveline is prepared to have its staff conduct a daily garbage 'pick-up' along the street (in front of the residential cottages) leading up to the Marina parking lot where Waveline processes potential renters.

**\*\* It has come to the attention of Waveline that the proposed By-Law amendment (specifically with respect to the number of PWC rentals and/or number of PWC rentals as it relates duration of rental) is attempting to address congestion/traffic/garbage concerns notwithstanding the fact that there is no evidence to suggest that this related to PWC rentals. Regardless, Waveline is prepared to process potential renters at a location away from the marina/beach area and provide a bus/shuttle service to the PWC launch point in order to allow Norfolk to better evaluate the traffic/congestion issue.**



THE CORPORATION OF NORFOLK COUNTY

RESOLUTION # 13

DATE: March 9, 2021

MOVED BY Councillor Rabbits

SECONDED BY Councillor Martin

THAT Staff Report CAO 21-12 regarding The Council Strategic Initiative Fund be received as information;

AND THAT staff incorporate Council comments or input and provide subsequent amendments to the terms of reference at the following;

AND THAT Staff be directed to formally develop a document outlining the principles and guidelines for the fund based on the following:

- The core principles of the fund and initiatives being funded should be guided by the following:
  - The intended use should have a multi-year positive impact on the County.
  - The intended use should have a broad impact – meaning that the use impacts many residents.
  - The intended use should be aligned with the stated strategic plan for the County
- The following represent the guidelines for areas of use for the fund:
  - Driving internal operational efficiencies
  - The dollar value spent is specified. If the dollar value is unknown then the upset spending limit is specified and notified to staff
  - Spending decisions on the fund must be resolved in open session
  - Undertaking strategic long term planning studies to advance municipal asset development, developing new services or to assist with other strategic or planning matters
  - To advance economic development initiatives
  - To advance the health and safety of residents of Norfolk County
  - Any other matters Council deems appropriate with a two-thirds majority;

\_\_\_\_\_  
Defeated

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carried

- That Council set an annual funding amount for the fund during the 2022 budget process.
- That Council set the maximum level of the fund to be \$1.2 million and any annual excess be directed to the Capital Reserve.
- Council is the sole manager and decision maker on the use of this fund. Staff will report at a minimum annually on the use of the funds and the balance.
- That recommendations for the use of the fund should be brought to Council as a report from staff following normal procedures.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Defeated

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carried

Councillor Martin has pulled CIC resolution 6 for further discussion:

**6. (Rabbitts/Chopp)**

THAT Staff report PD 21-15 respecting the Tourism Brand Strategy and Visual Brand Identity Concept Designs, be approved;

AND THAT Council direct staff to proceed with the development of a final Visual Brand Identity and Brand Strategy rollout plan.

---

Councillor Martin has pulled CIC resolution 11 for further discussion:

**11. (Taylor/Rabbitts)**

THAT Council receives Staff Report CAO 21-03 Friday the 13th 2021 as information;

AND THAT Council deems the August 13, 2021 Friday the 13th as a “non-event”, including the initiation of strategic communications and planning to deter attendance and participation.

---

Councillor Van Paassen and Councillor Martin have pulled CIC resolution 20 for further discussion:

**20. (Chopp/Van Paassen)**

THAT Report PW 21-01 Sidewalk Options – Cockshutt Road and Dover Mills Road – Port Dover be received as information;

AND THAT in 2021 staff include a project for paved shoulders along Cockshutt Road from Dover Mills Road to Silver Lake Road, to be funded from the annual approved budget for asphalt resurfacing;

AND FURTHER THAT in 2021 staff be directed to install an additional five new cobra lights on existing hydro poles along Cockshutt Road from Dover Mills Road to Silver Lake Drive, with funding to be provided from the 2021 LED streetlight retrofit program;

AND FURTHER THAT staff give consideration during preliminary engineering design in 2022 for the installation of a new sidewalk and additional lighting along Dover Mills Road between Cockshutt Road and Golden Meadows Drive.

Councillor Van Paassen comments on this item:

Just to add clarity to what I believe was the intent I would like to add the following to the last recommendation:

“And that Option C as listed in the addendum to Report PW 21-01, Sidewalk Options Cockshutt Road, be included as part of that Project.”

---



Working together with our community

**Agricultural Advisory Board**  
The Corporation of Norfolk County

Tuesday February 23, 2021  
9 a.m.  
Microsoft Teams

---

Present: Dusty Zamecnik, Mike Columbus, Sandy DeHooghe, Marc Wall, Hayden Dooney, Remi Van De Slyke, Jason Ryder, Ann Vermeersch, Anita Buehner

Absent with regrets: Trish Fournier

Also Present: Chris Garwood, Kristal Chopp, Chris Van Paassen, Jacob Robinson

---

**Ceremonial Activities (item 1)**

A) Welcome newcomers Marc Wall, Sandy DeHooghe, Jason Ryder

**Approval of Agenda/Changes to the Agenda**

A) Presentation by Kees & Hetty Meijaard  
Re: Norfolk Tree By-Law

K. and H. Meijaard made a presentation regarding the Norfolk County Tree By-Law and answered questions from the board. The presentation was accepted as information.

**Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest (item 2)**

**Presentations (Item 3)**

**Approval of Meeting Minutes (Item 4)**

A) AAB Minutes – Dec 11, 2020



Intention to have council approval to have letter forwarded, ask was to have two letters of support, one from AAB and another from Mayor and Council. Letter will go through Clerks department before being sent to Ministry of Agriculture among other officials.

The Agricultural Advisory Board meeting minutes of Dec. 11, 2020, having been circulated and no errors or omissions noted, were declared as adopted.

### **Communications (Item 5)**

#### A) Chair appointment

Councillor Columbus and H. Dooney nominate D. Zamecnik for chair. A unanimous vote declares Zamecnik AAB Chair for 2021.

A. Buehner nominated H. Dooney for Vice Chair. A unanimous vote declares Dooney vice chair for 2021.

#### B) Norfolk County Forest Conservation By-law Draft

### **MOTION (Vermeersch/Dooney)**

WHEREAS the Agricultural Advisory Board has reviewed the Norfolk County Draft Forestry By-Law and has raised significant concerns.

WHEREAS the Agricultural Advisory Board believes that public should be given the opportunity to comment on the existing forestry by-law before a new by-law is drafted.

WHEREAS the Agricultural Advisory Board believes that an independent third party should facilitate this process.

BE IT resolved that the Agricultural advisory board would request Jack Winkler a retired professional forester be engaged to facilitate this process

AND that the agricultural advisory board be consulted.

#### C) Haldimand Site Alteration By-law

### **MOTION (Dooney/Buehner)**

WHEREAS this has an effect on agriculture and Norfolk County should have procedures in place for proper soil requirements for all people wishing to perform this practice in Norfolk County and add transparency for all those wishing to perform these actions in Norfolk County

THAT the AAB present the document to appropriate staff

D) Healair – Brochure

The board discussed this and other air filtration systems that could help prevent the spread of COVID-19 in bunkhouses. The ad was received as information and the AAB will explore its benefits further with a local expert.

E) Future Meeting Times

Poll will be sent out for last week in March, first week in April.

F) AAB Action Items

G) AODA Compliance Forms

Jacob reminded newcomers to complete forms and send to him.

**Other Business (Item 7)**

A) NCERTF

Zvi asked if anyone on the Board would be interested in joining an Economic Recovery Task Force subcommittee – D. Zamecnik will join the group.

B) Wireless Internet Install

Members discussed details, background and if they would support a proposal by Rogers to install high speed internet infrastructure to thousands of previously underserved homes in Norfolk County. Dusty will craft a letter supporting the program and how integral high speed internet would be for local farmers.

**Adjournment (Item 8)**

12:23 p.m.

**Contact Information**

Jacob Robinson, Committee Coordinator

[Jacob.Robinson@norfolkcounty.ca](mailto:Jacob.Robinson@norfolkcounty.ca)





Working together with our community

## **Council Meeting – March 16, 2021**

Subject: Port Dover WTP – 3<sup>rd</sup> DAF Unit  
Report Number: EIS 21-16  
Division: Environmental and Infrastructure Services  
Department: Engineering  
Purpose: For Decision

---

### **Executive Summary:**

Environmental and Infrastructure Services have recognized the significantly favorable tender results for PW-E-21-45 for the replacement of the existing clarifier at the Port Dover WTP and have investigated and obtained a quote for the purchase of a third Dissolved Air Flootation (DAF) unit.

### **Discussion:**

The 2020 Approved Capital Budget included a project for the replacement of the existing clarifier at the Port Dover Water Treatment Plant. This project has been designed to replace the clarification process with DAF units. The design of the DAF process has taken into account possible future expansion. Two DAF units are required for the clarification process, however, a third DAF unit can be installed with some modification to provide the treatment plant with filtration capabilities in addition to the clarification process. The installation of a third unit and conversion to a DAF-filter process would replace the existing filters which is also a limiting capacity process at the Port Dover WTP. The existing filters have previously experienced failures in 2019 which required extensive repairs and interruption in the ability to provide adequate treated water to the distribution system.

Two DAF units have been pre-purchased from AWC Water Solutions Ltd. and are currently being manufactured for delivery in mid to late April. The pre-purchased cost of the two DAF units was \$1,215,320 (excluding taxes).

Tender PW-E-21-45 – Port Dover WTP Clarifier Replacement closed on March 2, 2021. The tender analysis and recommendation for award is included in Report CS 21-17 Summary of Bid Award Report. The Engineer's estimate for this tender was \$3,000,000 and the County has received a very favorable low bid of \$1,524,938 (excluding taxes).

Recognizing the anticipated savings through this tender, staff have requested a quote from AWC for the possible purchase and supply of a third DAF unit. AWC has

confirmed that they have a manufacturing window available in April which would allow for completion and delivery of the third DAF unit in late June – mid July. This timeline is in line with the construction schedule for the installation of the units within the existing clarifier building. AWC's cost for the third DAF unit is \$702,000, however, they have provided a discount of \$214,000 if approval to proceed can be given by noon on March 18, 2021, resulting in a total cost of \$488,000 (excluding taxes). A delay in approval would result in the loss of the manufacturing window and therefore would not be able to meet the delivery timelines required to fit within the construction schedule. AWC has also proposed to take responsibility for the storage of the two DAF units if a third unit is purchased which would avoid double handling by the general contractor. Currently, through the tender specifications of PW-E-21-45, the general contractor is responsible to accept, unload, protect and store the two DAF units at a temporary storage location at the Cedar Street Water Works Yard in Simcoe and then further transportation to the Port Dover WTP in late June – mid July when the building is ready for the DAF installations. It is estimated that a credit of approximately \$10,000 could be obtained if this responsibility to the general contractor was removed from the contract.

Based on the tender prices received through PW-E-21-45, it is estimated that the additional installation costs of a third DAF unit would be approximately \$50,000 if installed within the building at the same time. Any future installation of a third DAF unit as a separate project would result in significantly higher installation costs as there would be a need to work around the existing two units, duplicate building modifications to get the third DAF unit into the building, and the potential of needing to take the full system out of service (requiring a future membrane trailer rental) because of the limited building space.

Staff is recommending proceeding with the purchase of the third DAF unit at this time. The benefits to the County would include:

- Significant discounted price for purchase of third DAF unit in the amount of \$214,000.
- Significantly lower installation costs if installed through current construction. Estimated at \$50,000 compared to future installation which is estimated at \$350,000-\$500,000 depending on requirements for temporary membrane rental.
- Ability for the County to convert DAF units to DAF-filter units in the future to replace the existing filters which have experienced previous failures.
- Anticipated cost savings of approximately \$10,000 through the contract for the storage and double handling of the two DAF units.

It is also noted that a future capacity increase for the Port Dover WTP will require the third DAF unit. The remaining future work for the capacity increase includes the conversion of the DAF units to DAF-filters, installation of UV disinfection and high lift pumping modifications.

Table 1 – Project Costs

<b>Committed Costs to-date (including construction award for PW-E-21-45), excluding taxes, rounded costs</b>	
Engineering	\$420,000
Pre-purchased 2 DAF Units	\$1,215,000
Temporary Membrane Plant Rental	\$350,000
Construction (PW-E-21-45), including \$200,000 contingency	\$1,725,000
Proposed 3 <sup>rd</sup> DAF unit (per this report), including anticipated additional costs for construction	\$538,000
<b>Total committed costs</b>	<b>\$4,248,000</b>
<b>Future anticipated costs required for capacity increase (assuming purchase of 3<sup>rd</sup> DAF unit through this report), excluding taxes</b>	
Engineering	\$500,000
DAF-filter conversion, UV, High Lift	\$5,700,000
<b>Total future costs</b>	<b>\$6,200,000</b>
<b>Total Project costs</b>	<b>\$10,448,000</b>

Based on the table above, to complete the full capacity increased to 7.3 MLD (future 2041 demand) for the Port Dover WTP, it is estimated that a total cost of approximately \$10.5 million is required. The existing approved budget for the Port Dover WTP Clarifier Replacement including engineering and construction is \$8,368,000. If direction is to proceed with the Port Dover WTP capacity increase, a budget amendment increase of \$2,080,000 would be required to cover these remaining costs and it is anticipated that this remaining construction could be completed by the end of 2022.

#### **Financial Services Comments:**

The Approved 2020 Capital Plan includes a total budget of \$8,368,000 for the Port Dover Clarifier with funding to be provided from the issuance of debentures. The Certificate of Treasurer for this project was previously provided in Council Report PW 20-38 Port Dover WTP Clarifier Replacement – Preferred Technology.

Given, the Port Dover WTP is presently operating under maximum capacity this budget was established to replace the current Clarifiers with a new Dissolved Air Flotation's (DAF's). In addition, since it was unknown at the time what solution and path Norfolk County would be taking related to the supply of water, the remaining budget was intended for any further expansion needs approved by Council.

Given, there is an opportunity to purchase a third DAF at a discounted price, this report is seeking Council's approval to purchase an additional unit which will be required to expand water capacity at the plant in the future. Purchasing this unit at this time is expected to reduce overall project costs.

At this time, there is no requirement to amend the budget and any future changes will be determined after Council has had the opportunity to determine the direction Norfolk County will be proceeding with in order to increase capacity at the Port Dover WTP.

**Interdepartmental Implications:**

Corporate Initiatives and Strategic Acquisitions

Purchasing staff have reviewed the report and advises that Norfolk County Policy CS-02 Section 4.8.4 requires all single source procurements to be authorized prior to the purchase through resolution of Council. Single source supply is defined where there is more than one vendor able to supply the goods or service but for reasons of function or service, one supplier is recommended for consideration and the purchase will be made without a competitive bidding process.

**Consultation(s):**

Not applicable

**Strategic Plan Linkage:**

This report aligns with the 2019-2022 Council Strategic Priority "Build and Maintain Reliable, Quality Infrastructure".

**Explanation:**

Build a strategic approach to managing facilities, addressing deferred capital maintenance and divesting assets and buildings that are no longer strategic for this County's long term needs.

**Conclusion:**

As a result of receiving favorable tender results for the replacement of the existing clarifier with DAF units at the Port Dover WTP, staff is recommending the purchase of a third DAF unit as significant savings can be experienced if the third unit is installed through the current construction.

The third DAF unit is required for the capacity expansion of the Port Dover plant. The expansion of the plant is intended to be undertaken under all options of the long term water strategy for Norfolk County as this assists with short term constraints and provides longer term options for the County.

**Recommendation(s):**

THAT Staff Report EIS 21-16, Port Dover WTP – 3<sup>rd</sup> DAF Unit, be received as information;

AND THAT Council permit a single source supply as outlined in Norfolk County Purchasing Policy ECS-02, section 4.8.4 with AWC Water Solutions Ltd. for the purchase of a third DAF unit;

AND FURTHER THAT the General Manager, Environmental and Infrastructure Services be authorized to execute a purchase order in the amount of \$488,000 (excluding taxes) to AWC Water Solutions Ltd. for the purchase of a third DAF unit.

**Attachment(s):**

None

Submitted By:  
Jason Godby, BA, CET  
General Manager, EIS  
For more information, call:  
519-582-2100 ext. 1200

Reviewed By:  
Mike King, CET  
Director Engineering  
For more information, call:  
519-583-2100 ext. 1600

Prepared By:  
Jeff Demeulemeester, CET  
Project Manager, Engineering  
For more information, call:  
519-583-2100 ext. 1613