



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

Date/Time: October 6, 2022 / 1:00 – 2:30 pm

Location: MS Teams – video conferencing and The Water Centre - 625 25 Avenue SE

Attendees:

Internal	External
Krista Campbell	Jay German
Maggie Choi	Guy Huntingford
Quinn Eastlick*	Chris Ollenberger
Angela Sedor	Jackie Stewart
Chris Tse	Mark Wynker
Regrets	
	Paul Battistella
	Greg Bodnarchuk
	Shameer Gaidhar
	Brian Hahn

*Note taker

Agenda

- 1. Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Overview** (Chris)
- 2. Meeting Norms (Hybrid)** (Quinn)
- 3. Treatment Methodology** (Chris)
- 4. Next Steps** (Chris)
- 5. Discussion** (Chris)

Feedback collected:

General Feedback/Comments

- There are some pretty wild swings in some of the catchment areas, and in some where interim business cases were built on an assumed levy. If the levy changes like that in those areas, it would have a big change.
- Would like to see is the next couple of levels of math behind the numbers in slide 7 and the numbers that drive them. Jackie sent questions to this end.
- Last time we did this, BILD had a lot of pushback to a citywide catchment, especially if certain sectors were being pushed up to support certain sectors.
- Deltas between some of these areas are massive, and the price for land in some of these areas would have included stormwater rates in these areas. People that would be subsidizing heavier hit areas would have reason to be pretty upset about this. Stormwater is one of those areas that can be defined.



- Can you go into the rationale behind Fish Creek?
 - Providence has been on the books for a long time. Were the costs not recognized until recently in terms of what would be required? Did you not account for the infrastructure required?
 - For all calculations, there is going to be heightened expectations for this catchment to understand those costs.
- Where did the citywide rate come from in slide 7? How did you come up with that number?
- Catchments pigeonhole you in terms of where you spend the money, whereas citywide gives you more flexibility on where you spend the investment.
- Could you help us understand what the catchment is? Is there quite a bit of hectares left in the unplanned land?
- Using the current methodology, is the 260 ha still legitimate?
- Using an average for 2016 forward accurate? I remember a lot of development agreements at the end of 2015 that might have skewed 2016 and possibly 2017.
- In the numerator, you were financing for 25 years, are you financing over a shorter rate now?
- Is the 15 year versus 25 year period up for debate? Is it possible to run the model under both scenarios so we can see the change? If the accelerated capital repayment is driving costs up, it will likely sway people toward staying with the current methodology.
- Water treatment in the next week or so?
- Fundamental question about project list is there are some very substantial increases. As we finish out these conversations and negotiations, it's important for us to understand the rationale behind those changes. Using North Ridge as an example, if the project is completed, how did this cost increase so drastically in four years? Will need some transparency there.
 - Acknowledge the rationale exists, but we need to understand this so we can explain this to our members.
 - Things like open channel and pond elevation.
- There was a higher level of detail in some of the past consultations on previous levies. BILD will provide example of the details provided. Population, overall growth, incremental growth. Done in 2016 for Water.
- Could we have access to the data from the previous bylaw consultation?
- Industry front-ending discussion.
 - We've heard comments from council as well. Would need something more specific than a general notion for front-ending. What does the city have proposed for how far up or down the pipeline would be proposed and what infrastructure would be?
 - Need an understanding of what the city would be willing to assist with and what the repayment would look like?
 - Admin needs to put some parameters around this. If that happens, we're welcome to have the discussion. Also need some idea of how people who front-end this get compensated by others who use the infrastructure.
 - Industry has been amenable to this in the past. There would likely be an openness to discuss this. There needs to be some certainty on payback.
 - I don't think an endeavor is enough of a certainty. I think increased front-ending should be connected to more certainty of payment. Agreed with Mark and Guy, but certainty of payment needs to be addressed. Endeavors aren't enough at the scale of front ending being discussed.



- There's only so much that the City can pressure someone to pay, versus using a CFA with the City.
- Discussion in 2016 was around extensions, and the decision was not to front end, because the cost in the levy was so small.
- Has the mayor given any direction on this?
- City has ability to set rates that account for changes is the certainty that has been given to developers. What mechanisms would developers have to adjust if they front-ended?
- Maggie--can you help us out by indicating the circumstances/cases where the City has not received payment for levy infrastructure?
- If citywide, Elbow River would be paying 17, 437?
- Help us better understand the delineation between Fish Creek and Pine Creek. Please look into this and let us know whether and why it's appropriate.
- Industrial lands are included in the new denominator?
- Please make sure that all the little bits of details and assumptions that go into these things, please make sure they are documented so future people engaging in this can be informed.
- If there is any unserviced industrial land, what's to say that at some point there will not be a desire to service those lands? They could potentially still be benefitting from infrastructure that developments are paying. Would there be an expectation that they would need to pay into things at that point?
- \$84/m frontage is staying the same for stormwater?
- Are we discussing established area at the next meeting? Or when?
- How would balances be incorporated?
- If you could provide us with the information behind slide 7, we could give you an opinion on this. Hard to provide an opinion without this.
- What do the years forward rates look like with the 2 year cycle?
- If I were on the developer side, I would want to get a sense of what would drive the 17,437 number. Would the next amount of land have a big cost associated with it, and would the rest of the group be subsidizing a very expensive set of infrastructure in one spot?