



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

**Date/Time:** February 14, 2022 / 1:00 – 2:30 pm

**Location:** MS Teams – video conferencing

**Attendees:**

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

\*note taker

## Agenda

1. **Historical Debt** (Maggie Choi)
2. **Rangeview Example** (Maggie Choi)
3. **Project Timing** (Maggie Choi)
4. **Inputs that Impact the Levy Rate** (Maggie Choi)
5. **Project Updates** (Maggie Choi)

## Feedback collected:

### General Feedback/Comments

- How costs relate to the denominator and what costs to include within that is not always clear. There was a decision in 2000 (referencing timeline slide) regarding water rate could support growth and Council at that time had a direction to not recover costs through a levy program. How did we get to where we are now if that decision was made during the period of 2000-2010? Utility rate was thought to be the factor that would support this shift. There is a belief among industry members that the council elected to redirect funding to transportation via Mayor Bronconnier and there was a focus on transportation spending at that time.
- Are we paying back from payments that have already been made on principle and interest?
- Participant response to: *Difficult to confirm until the design of the community is quite advanced.* Industry concurs that it is difficult to estimate exact catchments and there are different hierarchies of cost estimates, but important to capture the information regarding growth area



so that current projects see benefits. At what level are we “comfortable enough” with what we achieve at the ASP level?

- Is Industry aware of the City’s approach to debt servicing going forward? Are they paying for debt servicing for, as an example, 2010? Is there more detailed information to this (slide 9) that industry members can look at when participating in broad engagement opportunities?
- There seems to be a gap between the approved projects and benefitting area. We need to confirm the balance of the blue and the green recognizing that the green area will have additional capital costs in the future while still benefiting from the phase 1 infrastructure that was put in place.
- Clarification needed regarding the capacity model and how it handles cost recovery. Has the City run different scenarios where more (or less) is collected in the beginning and then that is adjusted down the road? It will be important to fully explain debt terms and escalation rate to industry stakeholders in consultation and communication efforts.
- Annual reports are difficult for industry to understand regarding interest and principle payments. It is tough to tell what is outstanding, what project it is linked to and how that plays into the numerator.
- Many projects presented in slide 17 (Water Linear Extensions) seem to encounter large overruns. What is driving these overruns?

#### Summary of Action Items

- Industry has requested historical information and context regarding historical debt with particular attention to 2000-2010.
- Request for project lists that demonstrate the right lands pay for the right benefit beyond what is identified in the annual report. Deloitte identified that the DA’s were a difficult measure of benefit allocation. Annual report does not explicitly state “Project A” provides benefits to these specific areas and/or DA. Understanding how much debt is still outstanding for these individual projects (and how much has already been paid off) will be important and working group members would like to see more detailed information on this issue.