



Off-site Levy Bylaw Review – Water Resources Working Group Stakeholder Consultation Meeting Notes

Date/Time: Thursday, March 24, 2022 / 1:00 pm – 1:30 pm

Location: MS Teams – video conferencing

Attendees:

Internal	External
Maggie Choi	Greg Bodnarchuk
Chris Tse	Shameer Gaidhar
Pam McHugh	Jay German
Patrick McMahon	Brian Hahn
Helena Nguyen	Jackie Stewart
	Richard Mackett
	Mark Wynker
Regrets	
	Chris Ollenberger

Agenda

1. **Current Rates and Modes (Chris Tse)**
2. **Catchment Balances/Shortfalls (Chris Tse)**
3. **Proposed New Methodology (Chris Tse)**
4. **Active and Planned Project List (Chris Tse)**
5. **Next Steps (Chris Tse)**

Feedback collected:

Question 1:

How do you feel about moving from a catchment-based levy to a City-wide levy?

- Beyond flexibility, how does the City reconcile the benefits to the various payers in the various catchments and transition to a different approach? For example, some catchments have a surplus, some a shortfall. For developers active in surplus areas only what is the benefit of changing to them and how will their surplus \$\$\$ be recognized?
- How do you deal with a catchment where costs increase and Developers in the area have proceeded based on a known cost base?
- Will you share a comparison between what the rates would be with the current methodology, proposed methodology with 6 catchments and proposed methodology with 1 catchment - have you done the mathematical models on this comparison - need this to properly evaluate.
- How will/have industrial lands be included or not included in the denominator?



General Feedback/Comments

- Curious to know, referencing 2015, about a fairly lengthy conversation about a similar evaluation of moving to a city-wide model and what came of these earlier discussions. The conclusion was to stay in the current format (of catchments) at that time; the conversation was between the city and industry members. Would be curious to know the outcome of that conversation and associated decision-making.
- One of the items previously discussed in comparing stormwater to other utilities is looking at the difference in the servicing. Sanitary and water, knowing there are unique typography considerations, have a lot of consistencies (feeder mains, pump stations). When considering on a City-wide basis they sort of even out. This approach provides flexibility to the city and industry. Stormwater could be significantly different as you move around the city and what is required to build up and out in terms of infrastructure. When you take targeted investment and spread it around more globally, does the rationale still apply fairly?
- Will different "kinds of lands" and related/corresponding infrastructure be provided for each catchment (i.e. New Communities, Industrial)? In the linear levy, we spoke of reducing the denominator and limiting industrial lands. Is that the same here?
- Does the model include historic projects that were previously built but not fully paid for? If so, are we assuming that the areas included in the denominator contain those lands that have not yet been serviced but currently benefit from now existing infrastructure? The model does not seem that it has currently undeveloped lands, but benefits from a past completed project, and that seems to not be included on the payment side of things. Could this be a problem in the future?
- Can we look at comparable numbers so industry can understand what the impact would be in what is being proposed compared to past rates?

Summary of Action Items

- **None captured.**