

## APPENDIX 'A'

### Comments Received from External Stakeholders

#### DC Project Criteria and Local Service Policy

Comments received from the London Development Institute:
--

##### Overview

##### Clear Language

A substantial amount of the language of the current DC project Criteria and local service policy has been updated to provide enhanced clarity and to provide improved formatting.

- **LDI Comment** *LDI comments on the Local Servicing Policies are attached (as Schedule 1). We support understanding and clarity as a basis for a workable DC By-law.*

##### Oversizing Provisions

A comprehensive update of the claimability of water, sanitary, and storm oversizing has been completed. A review is underway to reduce the local service standard for sanitary sewers.

- *When can we have a copy of or a discussion on the comprehensive review mentioned above?*
- *The LDI supports the reduction in the oversizing service standard for sanitary sewers to a 250mm pipe and we have provided information to staff to support this change.*

##### SWM Major Works

**Scope of claimable SWM Works broadened to include any municipally owned stormwater management work required to facilitate growth, which satisfies a regional benefit, and is identified through the Environmental Assessment process.**

- *Please provide the policy that broadened the “scope of claimable works... which satisfies a regional benefit” for review.*
- *Please define “municipally owned” and “satisfies a regional benefit”.*
- *How do you determine the size of the area for a regional benefit or a localized benefit?*
- *The scope of Major SWM works has been completed to show ponds that have a regional benefit and a review was conducted with staff of the UWRF SWM ponds that have a localized benefit. These facilities should be built by the developer as part of the development.*
- *The City controls the design and construction of all UWRF SWM facilities so UWRF facilities should be left in the UWRF.*

##### Advantages:

**Aligns with municipal best practices.**

- *Clear, concise and transparent language should always be municipal best practice.*

**Clear language should lead to improved understanding by both City staff and external clients.**

- *A review of the March 2010 Procedural Manual contains very precise procedures and language and should continue to guide the UWRF.*

**Ensures growth pays for growth with respect to water oversizing.**

- *Growth always paid for the growth component of water oversizing but the language was not included in the DC By-law.*
- *Will the water rate be adjusted to allow for the oversizing being paid from the CSRF?*

## Disadvantages:

May marginally increase the scope of claimable works which may marginally increase the Development Charge rate.

- *The change to the oversizing standard pipe to 250mm will be a minor increase to the DC rate but it will be fairer to the developer installing the larger pipe that benefits upstream development.*

## Staff Recommendation:

### Proposed 2014 DC Project Criteria and Local Service Policy Change Summary:

#### 1. Water Oversizing

Watermain Oversizing, now financed by Water Rates, will be financed by City Services Reserve Fund.

- *Will the water rate be revised down to reflect the oversizing costs now being paid from the CSRF?*

#### 2. Storm Sewer Open Channel Oversizing

Claims would now be entertained from the Urban Works Reserve Fund - Minor Storm Works for the oversizing of open channels when an open channel design is required for the reason of inherent site drainage constraints.

- *Please provide an example and a figure to show what is intended to be claimable from the UWRF.*
- *How was channel oversizing "entertained" in the past for claims?*
- *Will there be a non-growth component in channel oversizing to correct existing erosion or flooding issues?*

#### 3. Sanitary Sewer Oversizing

DC master planning consultant will review the cost of moving from the current 300mm diameter for oversizing to the 250mm limit. Will also include a "Municipal survey" to determine "cut-off" levels in other municipalities.

- *The LDI has provided information on the flow capacity of a 300mm and a 250 mm pipe and the flows from a standard residential subdivision for review.*
- *The LDI supports a reduction in the pipe size for the oversizing calculation to a 250mm pipe.*

#### 4. Stormwater Management Works

Stormwater Management related infrastructure will now be referred to as Stormwater Management Works. These works would include facilities, remediation or any other work identified through the Environmental Assessment (EA) process that is considered to satisfy a regional benefit to growth. In the event that the EA has not been completed at the time of the Development Charges Background Study individual contingency projects will be identified for SWM works in areas that are to be serviced within the 20 year growth period. Upon completion of the applicable Environmental Assessment (i.e. no outstanding Part 2 orders), a review of the related area specific contingency and the development charge rate will be undertaken and, if required, a revision to the development charge by-law will be made.

- *Will the remediation of existing erosion conditions or flooding be included as a non-growth component in the costing of the works in the EA?*
- *Will the EA specify if the SWM work satisfies a regional or localized benefit?*

- *Define “satisfy a regional benefit to growth.” The localized facilities should stay as UWRF SWM works.*
- *The contingency amounts for SWM works not included in an EA should be based on the best available information from completed CSRF and UWRF projects.*
- *SWM facilities that do not have a completed EA should be reviewed in the annual GMIS Update and be added to the GMIS as the EA’s are completed.*
- *Will the SWM EAs for road works include monies for future construction and cleanout of storm sepiers if added as part of a road project?*

<b>Comments received from the Urban League:</b>
---

The Urban League has the following comments on the policy recommendation presented at the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**1. Project Criteria and Local Service Policy**

- The Urban League is generally supportive of the Draft Development Charges Project Selection Criteria and Local Service Policies as presented to the DC Stakeholder Group on March 8, 2013. We believe the document provides clearer direction which will benefit both administration and the development industry.
- We have long encouraged the city to reduce the number of projects that are included in the Urban Works Reserve Fund as this fund reduces the city's ability to financially manage necessary infrastructure investments. It also has resulted in road widening projects lagging behind other infrastructure investments due to the timing of new growth. We continue to encourage the city to regularly update the GMIS so that growth can continue at an orderly pace, where growth pays for growth.
- We support shifting Watermain Oversizing to the DC from the water rate. It is a growth work and while small in dollars, it ensures consistency once more that growth pays for growth.
  
- Submitted by: S. Levin and G. McGinn-McTeer