

AGENDA

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting No.2 Northeast Vaughan Water and Wastewater Servicing

Project Numbers 75530 and 75310, Contract Number P-13-62

1. Meeting Details

1.1 Date, Time, Location and List of Invitees

- Date of Meeting: April 8, 2015
- Time of Meeting: 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm
- Location: Vaughan City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario
- Room Number: Committee Room 246, located on second floor
- Invitees:
 - Tammy Silverstone, Beata Rancourt and Jeff McNeice - York Region
 - Michael Frieri, Andrew Pearce and Deepak Panjwani - City of Vaughan
 - Al Steedman – Schaeffers Consulting Engineers, Building Industry and Land Development Association
 - Robert Kenedy – Mackenzie Ridge Ratepayers' Association
 - Ken Schwenger – Kleinburg and Area Ratepayers' Association
 - Gilbert Luk – York Region District School Board
 - Christine Hyde – York Catholic District School Board
 - George Guglielmin – Resident
 - Michael Testaguzza – Resident
 - Gerry Lynch – Cole Engineering Group
 - Rosemarie Humphries – Humphries Planning Group Inc.
 - Joe Csafordi – York Region Woodlot Association
 - George Godin, Chris Hunter, Ian Dobrindt and Erika Brown – Conestoga-Rovers & Associates

1.2 Facilitator

The meeting will be facilitated by Ian Dobrindt from Conestoga-Rovers & Associates.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to obtain feedback on the recommended water and wastewater servicing solutions and new water and wastewater infrastructure prior to Public Consultation Centre No. 1.

2. Meeting Discussion Topics

2.1 Introductions

Tammy Silverstone and Ian Dobrindt will lead the meeting introductions which will include the following topics:

- Welcome and Meeting Purpose
- Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1 Summary
- Homework Review, including Study Area Considerations and Filling Vacant Memberships

The duration of this agenda item will be approximately twenty (20) minutes.

2.2 Water and Wastewater Service Areas

Chris Hunter will lead the meeting agenda item, Water and Wastewater Service Areas, which will include presentation and discussion of the following topics:

- Update, Description, and Rationale

The duration of this agenda item will be approximately ten (10) minutes.

2.3 Water and Wastewater Servicing Solutions

Chris Hunter will lead the meeting agenda item, Water and Wastewater Servicing Solutions, which will include presentation and discussion of the following topics:

- Screening Assessment Results
- Recommendations (Optimization and Upgrades/Enhancements)

The duration of this agenda item will be approximately twenty (20) minutes.

2.4 New Water Infrastructure

Chris Hunter will lead the meeting agenda item, New Water Infrastructure, which will include presentation and discussion of the following topics:

- Alternative Storage Sites and Watermains

The duration of this section will be approximately twenty (20) minutes.

At this time the meeting will break for approximately ten (10) minutes.

2.5 New Wastewater Infrastructure

Chris Hunter will lead the meeting agenda item, New Wastewater Infrastructure, which will include presentation and discussion of the following topics:

- Alternative Sewer Routes

The duration of this section will be approximately twenty (20) minutes.

2.6 Proposed Evaluation Methodology and Criteria for Assessing Alternative Sites/Routes

Ian Dobrindt will lead the presentation and discussion of the Proposed Evaluation Methodology and Criteria for Assessing Alternative Sites/Routes, which will have a duration of approximately ten (10) minutes.

2.7 Public Consultation Centre No. 1

Ian Dobrindt will lead the presentation and discussion of Public Consultation Centre No. 1, which will have a duration of approximately ten (10) minutes.

2.8 Project Status and Schedule

Tammy Silverstone will lead the presentation and discussion of the project status and schedule, which will have a duration of approximately ten (10) minutes.

2.9 Next Steps and Future Meetings

Ian Dobrindt will lead the meeting agenda item, Next Steps and Future Meetings, which will include presentation and discussion of the following topics:

- Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting No. 3 (recommended alternative water and wastewater sites/routes)

The duration of this section will be approximately five (5) minutes.

2.10 Homework, Additional Questions, and Discussion

Ian Dobrindt will close the meeting with a discussion of homework and will open the floor to additional questions and discussion.

The duration of this section will be approximately fifteen (15) minutes.



MEETING MINUTES

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting No.2 Northeast Vaughan Water and Wastewater Servicing

Project Numbers 75530 and 75310, Contract Number P-13-62

1. Meeting Details

1.1 Date, Time, Location and List of Invitees

- Date of Meeting: April 8, 2015
- Time of Meeting: 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm
- Location: Vaughan City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan
- Room Number: Committee Room 246
- Participants:
 - Tammy Silverstone (TS), Beata Rancourt (BR) and Jeff McNeice (JM) – York Region
 - Saad Yousaf (SY), alternate for Michael Frieri – City of Vaughan
 - Al Steedman (AS) – Schaeffers Consulting Engineers, Building Industry and Land Development Association
 - Robert Kenedy (RK) – Mackenzie Ridge Ratepayers' Association
 - Ken Schwenger (KS) – Kleinburg and Area Ratepayers' Association
 - Gilbert Luk (GLu) – York Region District School Board
 - Christine Hyde (CHy) – York Catholic District School Board
 - George Guglielmin (GGu) – Resident
 - Michael Testaguzza (MT) – Resident
 - Gerry Lynch (GLy) – Cole Engineering Group
 - Rosemarie Humphries (RH) – Humphries Planning Group Inc.
 - Joe Csafordi (JC) – York Region Woodlot Association
 - George Godin (GGo), Chris Hunter (CHu), Ian Dobrindt (ID) and Erika Brown (EB) – Conestoga-Rovers & Associates

1.2 Facilitator

The meeting was facilitated by Ian Dobrindt from Conestoga-Rovers & Associates.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to obtain feedback on the recommended water and wastewater servicing solutions and new water and wastewater infrastructure prior to Public Consultation Centre No. 1.

1.4 Supplemental Material

A copy of the slide presentation is attached.

2. Agenda Topics

2.1 Introductions

Tammy Silverstone and Ian Dobrindt led the meeting introductions and presented the following:

- Welcome and Meeting Purpose
- Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1 Summary
- Homework Review, including Study Area Considerations and Filling Vacant Memberships
- Review of Action Items from Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1

The following questions, comments and responses were provided during this portion of the presentation.

- **Question 2.1.1 (AS):** Is there anything the Stakeholder Advisory Committee should be made aware of from Technical Advisory Committee meetings No. 1 and 2 and vice versa? **Response (TS):** Technical Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1 minutes are currently available on the project webpage and minutes from Technical Advisory Committee Meeting No. 2 will be made available online as well. There is nothing of significance for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee to note from Technical Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1. At Technical Advisory Committee Meeting No. 2 the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority asked that the Project Team meet with them to review the recommendations prior to going back to the public for Public Consultation Centre No. 2. The City of Vaughan also asked for a similar meeting.
- **Comment 2.1.2 (CHy):** Christine noted that she attended the Block 27 mobility hub meeting last week.

- **Question 2.1.3 (AS):** Will this project be using the growth number from the York Region Official Plan review? **Response (TS):** A decision was made at the start of this project to use the Region's 2011 growth projections, which were generated by the Region's Long-Range Planning group in accordance with the Province's 2006 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. While Amendment 2 of the Growth Plan (2013) was issued prior to project commencement, York Region was still developing its updated local forecasts when the project began. After comparing the amended forecasts with the previous forecasts, the project team decided to proceed with the previous forecasts in lieu of delaying the project. With that said, updated growth numbers for the Official Plan review will be reviewed once available and the validity of project work completed to be date will be confirmed (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Comment 2.1.4 (JM):** Jeff recommended a few Humber environmental groups following last meeting, but mentioned they may not interested in this area of Vaughan. **Response (ID):** Ian confirmed that the team was unable to find any individuals interested in joining the Stakeholder Advisory Committee within these environmental groups.
- **Comment 2.1.5 (RH):** Rosemarie recommended an environmental consultant as a representative. **Response (ID):** Ian advised that this recommendation was discussed as a Project Team, and it was determined that an environmental consultant would not be a suitable representative for this stakeholder category.
- **Comment 2.1.6 (JC):** Joe would like natural environmental features, such as effects on forests, forest cover, etc. to be included in the comparative evaluation. **Response (CHu):** Chris confirmed that this feedback will be considered by the Project Team, and that we are seeking additional feedback of this nature on the preliminary evaluation criteria, which will be discussed further later in the presentation.
- **Question 2.1.7 (GLu):** Has the Project Team been in contact with TransCanada regarding the pipeline that is proposed within the City of Vaughan to determine whether it is within the service areas? **Response (TS, CHu):** The Project Team is aware of the TransCanada pipeline project and will follow up with TransCanada and review the proposed pipeline locations being considered in Vaughan and evaluate their potential effect on the project (**ACTION ITEM**).

2.2 Water and Wastewater Service Areas

Chris Hunter presented the following:

- Update, Description, and Rationale for the Water and Wastewater Service Areas

2.3 Water and Wastewater Servicing Solutions

Chris Hunter presented the following:

- Screening Assessment Results (combination of optimization, upgrades/enhancements, and new infrastructure)
- Description of Recommendations (water and wastewater optimization)
- Description of Recommendations (water and wastewater upgrades/enhancements)

The following questions and responses were provided during this portion of the presentation:

- **Question 2.3.1 (GLy):** Do the optimization and upgrade/enhancement opportunities become more important for this project given York Region's deferral of capital? **Response (TS):** To first give context to those who might not be familiar with the "deferral," this year York Region delayed the construction of some new projects to assist the Region at managing its debt. The Northeast Vaughan Water and Wastewater Servicing project is one of these deferred projects. The Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design for the project will proceed as planned over the next few years, but the completion of construction will be delayed from 2021 to 2028. With respect to optimization and upgrade/enhancement opportunities, they were identified as key aspects of the servicing solutions for this project even prior to York Region's announcement of the capital deferral. Feasible optimization strategies and upgrades/enhancements can still be implemented upon completion of the Class Environmental Assessment study. Any new infrastructure will be deferred as identified.
- **Question 2.3.2 (GLy):** Is there a chance that the recommendations resulting from this Environmental Assessment could be staledated by the time the construction is allowed to proceed? **Response (TS):** The undertaking proposed within a Class Environmental Assessment is valid for 10 years following completion of the 30 calendar day review period, after which time a review would be required. York Region has considered this period of validity in the timeline for the capital deferral (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Question 2.3.3 (AS):** It appears that York Region's existing water and wastewater systems are quite far from the growth areas. Can the optimizations and/or upgrade/enhancement opportunities bridge this gap? **Response (CHu):** The opportunities for optimization and/or upgrades/enhancements will be discussed in the next section of the presentation.

- **Question 2.3.4 (JC):** Could the Project Team prepare a figure to identify where each optimization, upgrade/enhancement, and new construction is proposed and what year each opportunity will take the Region to in terms of servicing growth? **Response (CHu):** The Project Team does not currently have an illustration like this, but will prepare one following selection of the recommended sites/routes (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Question 2.3.5 (GGu):** Has York Region identified certain pressure districts or Blocks as priorities for servicing? **Response (TS):** This project is aimed at developing solutions to bring water and wastewater servicing to the northeast Vaughan area. The prioritization of particular areas for servicing is part of a formal allocation process that is conducted outside of this project, by the Region's capital planning group, in consultation with the City of Vaughan and proponents. The project team is not aware of any developments that have been identified as priorities at present.
- **Question 2.3.6 (RK):** Who will be responsible for providing water servicing to the GO station development in Blocks 34 and 27? **Response (CHu):** A water servicing strategy will be part of the GO station development applications to the City.
- **Question 2.3.7 (AS):** York Region previously installed a flow control mechanism in the wastewater system between Highway 400 and Jane Street, to enable surcharging of the sewer as an interim measure to allow growth within selected Blocks. Could something similar be done to service growth in northeast Vaughan during York Region's capital deferral? **Response (TS):** The Project Team will look into this possibility (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Question 2.3.8 (GLy):** If there is an opportunity to optimize the City's infrastructure within the growth areas, will there be sufficient capacity for it in the York Durham Sewage System? **Response (CHu):** Capacity in the York Durham Sewage System will be assessed at part of this Class Environmental Assessment process as well as the development of a capital improvement plan and schedule for implementation (**ACTION ITEM**).

2.4 New Water Infrastructure

Chris Hunter presented the following:

- Description of Recommendations (new water infrastructure – alternative storage sites and watermains)
- Approach for Developing Water Storage Sites and Watermain Routes
- Potential Site Areas for Pressure Districts 7, 8, and 9

The following questions, comments and responses were provided during this portion of the presentation.

- **Question 2.4.1 (SY):** Do the water storage requirements take into account employment as well as population growth? **Response:** Yes.
- **Question 2.4.2 (MT):** How big are elevated tanks? **Response (CH):** The size of the tank depends on the water storage requirement. They are of similar size and height of other elevated tanks in the Region.
- **Question 2.4.3 (AS):** Could being situated near an elevated tank be considered a negative from the perspective of a resident? **Response:** For some residents, yes, depending on their perspective. This will be taken into consideration in the evaluation of alternative sites.
- **Question 2.4.4 (GGu):** Would the best sites be those along major roadways? **Response (CH):** Those sites situated along major roadways with existing regional watermains would be advantageous compared to those sites not along or near existing regional watermains.
- **Question 2.4.5 (GLu):** Are there any land use requirements associated with siting elevated tanks? **Response (ID):** Yes, siting an elevated tank would require the submission of a site plan to the City for review and approval.
- **Question 2.4.6 (KS):** Would it make sense to choose locations for the new elevated tanks that would require construction of the least amount of new watermain (i.e., the cheapest option)? **Response:** Yes, the required length of watermain and associated costs is a consideration in the evaluation of options.
- **Comment 2.4.7 (RH):** The northern portion of Pressure District 7, Area 3 (north of Kirby Road), may be within the GTA West corridor. As such, these sites should be removed from consideration. **Response (CHu):** The Project Team will confirm the GTA West corridor plans, and revise Pressure District 7, Area 3 accordingly as part of the Class Environmental Assessment process moving forward (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Question 2.4.8 (GGu):** If an elevated tank were sited in Pressure District 7, Area 4 (southeast portion of Pressure District 7), could it service the northwest portion of Pressure District 7? **Response (CHu):** Yes.
- **Question 2.4.9 (SY):** Will the location of a new elevated tank in one Pressure District affect the pressure within other Pressure Districts? **Response (CHu):** Yes, this is possible. As such, the effects of the locations for each elevated tank

will need to be cross-checked with one another prior to selecting the final sties (**ACTION ITEM**).

- **Question 2.4.10 (CHy):** Will land use be weighted in the evaluation of the alternative sites? **Response (CHu):** Yes, land uses will be considered in the evaluation process.
- **Question 2.4.11 (AS):** Are elevated tanks permitted uses within the Greenbelt? **Response (ID):** Yes, however siting one within the Greenbelt requires specific additional study to demonstrate that the specified location is the only feasible option.

2.5 New Wastewater Infrastructure

Chris Hunter presented the following:

- Description of Recommendations (new wastewater infrastructure – alternative sewer routes)
- Approach for Developing Sewage Routes
- Alternative Sewer Routes

The following questions, comments and responses were provided during this portion of the presentation.

- **Comment 2.5.1 (RH):** Why is York Region only looking at gravity sewers and not pumping? **Response (CHu):** The topography of the service area allows for gravity sewers, which are less costly than pumping sewage. The existing York Durham Sewage System is largely a gravity-based system.
- **Question 2.5.2 (AS):** Given the expected growth in the northern portion of the City of Vaughan, would it make sense to have the new sewage pipe extending further north than Teston Road, closer to where the development will be taking place? From a developer's perspective, regional servicing is preferred to local servicing because it distributes the development charges associated with the sewer over a larger cost base. As such, having the sewage pipe starting point on Teston Road should not be one of the guiding principles. **Response (CHu):** The Project Team will revisit the guiding principles in light of this consideration; however, it is understood by the Project Team that servicing north of Teston Road is planned as part of the City of Vaughan 2014 Master Plan (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Comment 2.5.3 (AS):** It is surprising that endpoints 1 and 2 did not have sufficient capacity, as the existing sewer is twinned at the confluence of

segments 18 and 19. **Response (CHu):** The Project Team will revisit the model to confirm the capacity at endpoints 1 and 2 (**ACTION ITEM**).

- **Question 2.5.4 (AS):** Will sewer construction be carried out via tunneling? **Response (CHu):** The sewer construction will likely be a combination of open-cut and tunneling, but construction techniques have not yet been examined. This will be a consideration in the next steps in the Class Environmental Assessment process (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Question 2.5.5 (AS):** Will this project include lots of soil sampling following completion of the Class EA? **Response (CHu):** Additional geotechnical investigation including soil sampling and ground water investigations will be completed as part of the design process.
- **Question 2.5.6 (AS):** Are sewage pipes permitted in the valley? **Response (CHu):** Sewer segments proposed for the valley features may be disadvantaged during the evaluation process because of environmental sensitivities. The Project Team is considering these existing pipe easements as potential alignments and will evaluate them accordingly in all categories.
- **Question 2.5.7 (JC):** Could new flow be split up so that some is sent through the existing York Durham Sewage System at an earlier starting point and then the rest joins the York Durham Sewage System at starting point 3? **Response (CHu):** While this option is technically feasible, it would require construction of two new sewage pipes instead of one, which would not be an economical option.
- **Comment 2.5.8 (AS):** In the preliminary evaluation criteria list, the financial criterion should be life-cycle cost over at least 50 years rather than only 25-years. **Response (TS):** The Project Team will revisit this criterion prior to finalizing the list of evaluation criteria (**ACTION ITEM**).

2.6 Proposed Evaluation Methodology and Criteria for Assessing Alternative Sites/Routes

Ian Dobrindt presented the following:

- Confirmation of the Preferred Water and Wastewater Servicing Solutions
- Identification of Recommended Water Storage Sites and Watermain Routes

2.7 Public Consultation Centre No. 1

Ian Dobrindt presented the following:

- Dates, Locations, Times, and Format for the First Round of Public Consultation Centres

2.8 Project Status and Schedule

Tammy Silverstone presented the following:

- Optimization Study, Class Environmental Assessment Study and Preliminary Design and Feasibility Study Schedule

The following question and response was provided during this portion of the presentation.

- **Question 2.8.1 (AS):** When will York Region have a recommended alternative?
Response (TS): A recommended alternative will be presented at Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting No. 3, following which it will be presented at Public Consultation Centre No. 2 (**ACTION ITEM**).

2.9 Next Steps and Future Meetings

Ian Dobrindt presented the following:

- Upcoming Project Activities i) confirm long list of alternative water storage sites and alternative sewer routes ii) undertake field investigations iii) assess alternative sites and routes iv) identify recommended water storage sites and sewer route
- Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting No. 3 (recommended alternative water and wastewater sites/routes) – September 2015

2.10 Homework, Additional Questions, and Discussion

Ian Dobrindt presented the following:

- Homework for Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members i) identify any sensitive environmental features within and/or in the vicinity of the long list of alternative water storage sites and alternative sewer routes for the Project Team's consideration and ii) provide feedback on preliminary evaluation criteria including any additional criteria or considerations that the Project Team should possibly apply to the alternative water storage sites and sewer routes (**ACTION ITEMS**)

The project team opened the floor to the Stakeholder Advisory Committee members for additional questions and discussion. The following comments and responses were provided during this portion of the presentation.

- **Comment 2.10.1 (RH):** Regarding the built environment, there may be opportunities for synergies with Vaughan's primary intensification corridor along

Rutherford Road. **Response (TS):** The Project Team will investigate any possible synergies with the primary intensification corridor (**ACTION ITEM**).

- **Comment 2.10.2 (JC):** There may be utilities that want to piggyback on York Region's construction. **Response (ID):** York Region is keeping local utilities up to date on the project and will look for synergies during construction (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Comment 2.10.3 (GGu):** It might make most sense to construct new infrastructure within the Highway 400 corridor. **Response (ID):** The feedback we have received from the Ministry of Transportation is that they prefer infrastructure to cross their highways perpendicularly rather than paralleling them. Ministry of Transportation requires a 14 metre buffer on either side of their highways.
- **Comment 2.10.4 (GLy):** The City's natural environment inventory is going to committee this week. The Project Team will likely want to review this information. **Response (TS):** The Project Team will coordinate with the City of Vaughan to obtain this information, once available (**ACTION ITEM**).
- **Comment 2.10.5 (AS):** Al understands that the TransCanada Pipeline is paralleling Highway 427 beyond the 14 metre buffer. York Region should consider this approach along Highway 400. **Response (CHu):** The Project Team will look into this option (**ACTION ITEM**).

This confirms the recorder's interpretation of the discussions which occurred and understanding reached during this meeting. Unless notified in writing within 7 days of the date issued, we will assume that this recorded interpretation or description is complete and accurate.