



MEETING AGENDA

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Meeting No. 4

Northeast Vaughan Water and Wastewater Servicing – 75530/75130

Contract No: P-13-62

Date of Meeting: February 7, 2019

Time of Meeting: 6:30 – 9:00 pm

Location: Vaughan City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

Room #: Committee Room 246, located on second floor

Invitees:	Padhye Mukund Nicole Radulovic Jeff McNeice Michael Frieri Andrew Pearce Deepak Panjwani Al Steedman Robert Kenedy Ken Schwenger Gilbert Luk Christine Hyde George Guglielmin Michael Testaguzza Nik Mracic Rosemarie Humphries Joe Csafordi Ian Dobrindt Steve Overend Emily Gallant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - York Region - York Region - York Region - City of Vaughan - City of Vaughan - City of Vaughan - Schaeffers - Building Industry & Land Development Association (BILD) - Mackenzie Ridge Ratepayers' Association - Community Associations within the water and wastewater service areas) - Kleinburg & Area Ratepayers' Association - Community Associations within the water and wastewater service areas - York Region District School Board - Local institutions - York Catholic District School Board - Local institutions - Resident - Interested residents living within the service areas - Resident - Interested residents living within the service areas - Cole Engineering Group - Businesses, Industrial & Commercial firms within the service areas - Humphries Planning - Businesses, Industrial & Commercial firms within the service areas - York Region Woodlot Association - Environmental/Special Interest groups - GHD - GHD - GHD
------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Facilitator:	Ian Dobrindt (GHD)
Meeting Purpose:	To present the proposed water pumping station and storage facilities and trunk sewer alignment for implementing the preferred water and wastewater servicing solution (refer to attached figures).

ITEM	TOPIC	TIME	DISCUSSION LEADER
1.	Introductions and Project Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and Meeting Purpose Project Update 	20 min	Ian and Mukund
2a.	Proposed Water Pumping Station and Storage Facilities and Watermains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope of Water Servicing Requirements PD8 Pumping Station: Preferred site and associated watermain Combined PD8 Water Storage Facility and PD9 Pumping Station: Preferred Site and Associated Watermain Pressure District 8 Second Elevated Tank: Preferred Site and Associated Watermain 	40 min	Steve
2b.	Impact Mitigation, Proposed Monitoring and Post EA Approvals	15 min	Ian
	Break	10 min	
3a.	Proposed Trunk Sewer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope of Wastewater Servicing Requirements Preferred Route, Alignment and Construction Methodologies 	30 min	Steve
3b.	Impact Mitigation, Proposed Monitoring and Post EA Approvals	15 min	Ian
4.	Project Status and Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project File Report (Class EA Report) Notice of Study Completion and 30-Day Review Period Detailed Design 	10 min	Ian and Mukund
5.	Additional Questions, and Discussion	10 min	Ian



MEETING MINUTES

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Meeting No. 4

Northeast Vaughan Water & Wastewater Servicing – 75530/75130
Contract No: P-13-62

Date of Meeting: February 7, 2019

Time of Meeting: 6:30 – 9:00 pm

Location: Vaughan City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

Room #: Committee Room 246, located on second floor

Participants	<p>Mukund Padhye (MP) Jeff McNeice (JM) Nicole Radulovic (NR) Diego Velasquez (DV) Gabe Dimartino (GD) Al Steedman (AS)</p> <p>Nik Mracic Richard Lorello George Guglielmin Rob Kennedy Ian Dobrindt (ID) Steve Overend (SO) Emily Gallant (EG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - York Region - York Region - York Region - City of Vaughan - Armland Group - Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD) - Schaeffers - BILD – Cole Engineering - Kleinburg & Area Ratepayers’ Association (KARA) - Resident - MacKenzie Ridge Ratepayers Association (MRRRA) - GHD - GHD - GHD
Facilitator	Ian Dobrindt	
Meeting Purpose	To present the proposed water pumping station and storage facilities and trunk sewer alignment for implementing the preferred water and wastewater servicing solution.	
Supplemental Material/Attachments	Appendix A - Slide presentation	

Item 1	Introductions and Project Update	Discussion Leader (ID)
<p>The project team presented the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome 2. Safety Minute 3. Meeting Purpose 4. Introductions 5. Project Update 6. Overview of the Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Process and Current Phase <p>ID provided attendees with an overview of the work done to date on this project, which began over six years ago. Consultation started in January 2014 followed by the first round of Open Houses in spring 2015. The most recent Open House took place in June 2017. Since that date, York Region and GHD have worked with TRCA, City of Vaughan, developers and other stakeholders to accommodate stakeholder requests. There have been no wholesale changes from 2017, but enough of a change that it is important to communicate to stakeholders what those changes entail as part of this meeting. The filing of the ESR will most likely happen in March 2019, with the 30-calendar day review period ending in April 2019. If there are no Part II Order Requests following the filing of the ESR, then York Region can proceed to detailed design later in the year.</p> <p>Question 1.1: Will the slides from today's presentation be circulated following the meeting? Response: The PowerPoint slides will be circulated in tandem with the meeting notes from today's session.</p>		
<p>Conclusion: N/A</p>		
<p>Action Items: Ensure slides are included as part of the meeting note circulation</p>	<p>Person Responsible: Emily Gallant</p>	<p>Deadline: N/A</p>

Item 2	Proposed Water Pumping Station and Storage Facilities and Watermains	Discussion Leader: SO
<p>The project team presented an overview of water pumping stations, elevated tanks and watermains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scope of Water Servicing Requirements - PD8 Pumping Station: Preferred site and associated watermain - Combined PD8 Water Storage Facility and PD9 Pumping Station: Preferred Site and Associated Watermain - Pressure District 8 Second Elevated Tank: Preferred Site and Associated Watermain <p>See Appendix B, slides 6-14 for reference.</p> <p>The following questions and responses were provided during this portion of the presentation:</p> <p>Question 2.1: Are the landowners aware of the new locations of the stations and storage facilities? Response: Yes, individual meetings with property owners have taken place over the course of the project.</p> <p>Question 2.2: How is this new infrastructure being financed? Response: This is a growth project that is currently funded through Development Charges (DC).</p> <p>Question 2.3: Is York Region borrowing money to finance these programs? When I asked about it at the last meeting, York Region identified that it was borrowed – I would like confirmation on that. Response: We will look into it and provide you with more detail on how it is being financed and will confirm</p>		

what the borrowing situation is.

Question 2.4: Will any land be expropriated?

Response: No, we consulted with landowners and there will be no need for expropriation as part of this project.

Question 2.5: What does the green space in each of the sites represent?

Response: As part of the Environmental Assessment, we identified lands and environmental features in the surrounding area that should be avoided when siting the proposed infrastructure. The green shapes generated for the potential sites reflect offsets from watercourses and other variables. This process identifies areas of land that are appropriate to use. **Question 2.6: Is the dry pond on the site a stormwater management technique?**

Response: They allow for maintenance of the elevated tanks. If the tanks need to be taken off service, they need to be drained. The dry pond allows space to drain a portion of the tank, de-chlorinate the water, and then discharge it. The size of pond should allow the pond to be drained within 48 hours.

Question 2.7: How many stories are the pumping stations?

Response: All pumping stations are approximately 1-storey.

Conclusion: N/A

Action Items: York Region to examine funding structure and communicate back to Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Person Responsible: Mukund Padhye

Deadline: N/A

Item 3	Impact Mitigation, Proposed Monitoring and Post EA Approvals (Water)	Discussion Leader: ID
<p>The project team presented an overview of impact mitigation, proposed monitoring and Post EA Approvals:</p> <p>Once we confirmed the infrastructure – we delved into impact management measures to try to avoid any adverse impacts as much as possible, followed by mitigation, and finally compensation if required. We examined environmentally sensitive features at a federal, provincial, regional, and local level. This resulted in the selection of suitable areas for siting the proposed facilities, as well as elimination of areas that could not be considered based on the presence of sensitive features. As part of this approach, we considered the entire environment as defined by the Environmental Assessment Act, which includes the cultural, social, built, and economic environments, in addition to the natural environment. We also looked at existing and planned development in the area to minimize impacts to sensitive land uses. A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment was also completed.</p> <p>We originally looked at potentially siting the PD8 Elevated Tank in Block 27, but based on consultation with the City, it was moved outside of Block 27 north into Block 28. This was a better option from the City’s perspective. Additional separation of the proposed elevated tank from Block 27 has been added since the elevated tank is now being proposed in a more northern portion of Block 28 than what was previously proposed. The Project File Report (PFR) goes into further detail on this change as well as others made in response to comments received from stakeholders like the City, TRCA, and landowners throughout the course of the Environmental Assessment process. Any permits and approvals will be included in the PFR and will be confirmed as part of Detailed Design.</p>		

See Appendix B, slides 15-22 for reference.

Question 3.1: Can you please provide us with more information on the funding structure? Who is paying for it, how DCs enter into the picture. I am concerned that this could be a classic case of how other projects have gone. There are impacts here that go beyond environment.

Response: The funding model we use is specific to York Region. We will get back to you with the funding details. The Region stepped back and examined if this infrastructure was needed – these are questions that the Region will always ask before considering construction of new infrastructure - we look at tweaking and upgrading the old infrastructure to maximize what we have in place.

Comment: I am not against development, but we are approaching a wall, and that wall needs to be addressed. We are financing this through debt. Your Chair indicated, “the debt is top of our mind, and our debt will need to be top of mind at budget time”. With all of this coming about, we need to understand how each of these projects are going to be dealt with. It is not acceptable to be talking about this and not be talking about the financial impact.

Question 3.2: What happened to the pipe that started where the original PD8 pumping station location is? Near Jane Street?

Response: That pipe is used for wastewater, which will be covered in the next section.

Conclusion: N/A

Action Items: N/A

Person Responsible: N/A

Deadline: N/A

Item 4	Proposed Trunk Sewer	Discussion Leader: SO
<p>The project team presented an overview of the proposed trunk sewer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Scope of Wastewater Servicing Requirements- Preferred Route, Alignment and Construction Methodologies <p>See Appendix B, slides 23-27 for reference.</p> <p>The following questions and responses were provided during this portion of the presentation:</p> <p>Question 4.1: If we are going to meet our 2041 projections, we will need this third addition at Langstaff road?</p> <p>Response: Yes. Keep in mind that these timelines are based on Regional projections, so they are not set in stone and there is room for movement one way or another. All design flows will need to be confirmed at detailed design to warrant the need for the infrastructure and appropriate sizing.</p> <p>Question 4.2: You are saying that these areas (blocks 41, 27, 34 and 35) will be serviced by the sewer coming down Jane Street?</p> <p>Response: Yes, this sewer will bridge the gap between the blocks and the existing YDSS. Similar to the water system, local sewers will route sewage flow to the proposed NEV sewer. The other issue is there is wet weather flow to consider. The sewer is sized to accommodate wet weather flow from a 25-year storm, which is a major storm.</p> <p>Question 4.3: In the current DC for the Region, we are looking at 360M (roughly) for water and wastewater. Do you have a breakout for the 2031 number?</p> <p>Response: We do not have that number now. We will need more detail on what is going to be built.</p> <p>Comment: Ultimately, these are high-level numbers but you need to plan the work first to solidify them.</p>		

Therefore, it is what the Region has been telling the industry, but then you examine what the real costs are in order to finalize it. The DC have the master plan numbers – that is what they pay today. If you reduce that number, that is good news.

Comment (GHD) - Our documentation will have specific numbers about these components, which will be included in the ESR.

Question 4.3: Is the sewer construction technology new?

Response: It is not new. Trenchless construction, especially tunneling, is prevalent in Europe. It has been further developed and refined over the course of many years. Both the size, and drive length (distance between shafts) has increased over time. By the time the Region tenders the project, the technology may have increased the drive distance again, which would reduce the amount of shafts required.

Question 4.4: Will you be buying these machines?

Response: No, the contractors that we would hire have these machines – there are four or five companies in Ontario that own this machinery currently.

Conclusion: N/A

Action Items: N/A

Person Responsible: N/A

Deadline: N/A

Item 5	Impact Mitigation, Proposed Monitoring and Post EA Approvals (Sewer)	Discussion Leaders: ID
--------	----------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

The project team presented an overview of impact mitigation, proposed monitoring and Post EA Approvals:

Looked at a large study area for how to get wastewater from the northeast Vaughan service area to the existing York Durham Sewage System (YDSS). Many corridors and routes were examined, first starting with avoidance of sensitive environmental surface features and land uses. Vertical and horizontal topography was then considered to avoid sensitive features. Although there are some areas along the trunk sewer route that are more sensitive, such as Connection Point Nos. 2 and 3, we will be working with the TRCA to minimize potential impacts. In addition, in some cases, additional follow up investigations will be carried as part of detailed design. For example, additional Archaeological Assessment work will be done around Connection Point No. 3 where there is a pioneer cemetery in close proximity. In this situation, there could be unmarked graves outside of the cemetery’s fenced boundary.

The schedule for constructing the new trunk sewer is different from the schedule for construction of the water infrastructure because the current plan is to implement it in segments over a longer duration. The first sewer segment, along Jane Street, is scheduled for completion by 2028, while the third and second segments would be completed by 2041 and 2051, respectively.

See Appendix B, slides 28-35 for reference.

Question 5.1: Right at the beginning you were talking about optimizing the existing system. Right now, they have a number for us in block 27 and 21 – I think it is 10,000. That is the number that has been around for 5 years. Through your work, have you been able to find more opportunities to increase that number? Have those numbers changed?

Response: Those numbers will be reviewed in 2021 as part of the Master Plan review. Currently, approximately 3000 units could be accommodated. The unit number is limited because of the constraints associated with existing infrastructure. We are looking at things from a Regional point of view; we are not looking at the local system. If there is opportunity to squeeze more into the area, the City Master Plan will detail that.

Question 5.2: Will the ESR be posted?

Response: There will be a notification sent to you and other stakeholders to let you know that the 30-day

public review period has started.

Question 5.3: Did you look at the existing lifespan of the current system?

Response: Yes – that is why it is a staged process, because the current infrastructure can manage the demand as it is right now. Recall that the actual solution is multi-faceted and includes reducing wet weather flows through I/I reduction program to increase system capacity. There are options now to extend the service life longer with other technologies available, such as Cure In Place Pipe (CIPP).

Question 5.4: The 10% increases per year tell people that this is immediate need. No one can provide an answer to why rates have gone up by 10%. You would think that we have an imminent problem, but this is telling me that it is not immediate? Can you confirm – the water money collected on our bills – does that go into these upgrades?

Response: We have to replace the aging infrastructure. The new infrastructure will all be concrete or PVC – it has a higher shelf life and does not break down or leak as much. The increases are not a result of the need to upgrade the existing infrastructure. The other issue is that the actual demand of water per person is dropping, but the cost to provide it and to treat it will continue to go up.

Question 5.5: I am in block 27. Block 41 and 27, to build out two concession blocks in two years. We are trying to align the growth with the Kirby GO. Is there an ability to reduce the timeline to better align with other projects? 2024-2025? That is when we will realistically be constructing.

Response: The planning estimates we used were based on 5-year intervals. By 2031, the NEV area needs the water infrastructure; the population numbers used for this assignment do not support it until then. It may be possible for the Region to tender multiple parts of the project at once, especially for the water system. However, a decision about this has not been made at this time.

Question 5.6: Is there any impact to this if Kirby GO does not happen?

Response: I do not believe so. This is still based on the planning process. If there is an issue with the Kirby GO, that will have to be reflected in the planning numbers given to the design consultant.

Comment: These three things all require each other. These are big dollars, and the infrastructure does not get build overnight. Is there any opportunity to attempt to reduce the schedule? We are appreciative of the process, but we want to continue to push timelines.

Response: If we see any opportunity to reduce that timeline during Detailed Design, we will do it.

Question 5.7: The costs involved, which we will eventually have to deal with, but the model is that DCs are collected afterwards, whereas in Halton they are collected upfront. With a 2.7 billion dollar debt, this is a bit of a problem. There is no money for it. If the landowners do not want to pony up, then the citizens are the bank. This is always ignored and eventually needs to be addressed. Do we need the growth?

Response: It is obvious – if you do not have the money, you should not be doing it. The landowners have broached this with the Region. The Region had stopped front-ending project for the last 10-15 years. However, they have recently started looking at that again. Not to put words in anyone's mouth, especially at the Region.

Question 5.8: Can the landowners do it?

Response: The landowners want to know if they can do it. I believe there have been 1-2 projects where the Region has done this on a small scale. Most developers would prefer this option - most would want to sign up to quicken the process. We will soon to be able to put numbers to it and get people in a room and put their heads together. If we as landowner's front end it, they see that as Regional Debt too – it is a matter of how the Region is required to show the debt. We have conveyed that message to the Province and Region. We, as

landowners, are open to funding it, but it is still Regional debt.

Question 5.9: What is the life of a concrete pipe?

Response: 60-70 years is a reasonable estimate. The pipe may last longer depending on actual soil conditions.

Conclusion: N/A

Action Items: N/A

Person Responsible: N/A

Deadline: N/A

Item 6	Next Steps and Submission of Project File Report	Discussion Leaders: ID
<p>The project team presented overview of next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Project File Report (Class EA Report)- Notice of Study Completion and 30-Day Review Period- Detailed Design <p>The draft Project File Report will be sent to the City, MECP, TRCA, and MRNF for review this month. Next, the plan is to finalize the draft Report in March based on comments received from the review agencies. Finally, we are looking to issue the Notice of Completion in mid to late March with the review period ending most likely in April.</p> <p>No questions were asked during this portion of the presentation.</p>		
<p>Conclusion: N/A</p>		
<p>Action Items: N/A</p>	<p>Person Responsible: N/A</p>	<p>Deadline: N/A</p>

This confirms the recorder's interpretation of the discussions which occurred and our 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.