

**MUNICIPAL ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING
COMMITTEE (MEA-DEC)
MEETING
MINUTES**

Date: Thursday February 27, 2025

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Location: Video Conference via Zoom

Item No.	Discussion Topics	
1	Opening Remarks: a) Welcome b) Land Acknowledgement: The Town of Wasaga Beach acknowledges it is located upon the traditional territory of the Anishnaabe people of the Three Fires Confederacy and the Wyandot Nation. We respect the spiritual interconnection among these nations to the land and to the water, and acknowledge that waterways were the lifeblood of the Indigenous people by trade and hunting routes. We are dedicated to inclusivity of First Nations, Inuit and Metis people in our future stewardship of the land. In the spirit of reconciliation, we welcome the opportunity of learning to be sustainable caretakers of the land and waterways for all future generations c) Meeting structure d) Introductions e) Review of previous minutes (too long to review – any comments / questions?)	Mike Pincivero Wasaga Beach
2	For those that are further along in implementing the CLI-ECA for stormwater & sanitary, how many new staff positions (FTE's – full time employees) have been / will be created? What are your initial estimates for the average annual budget impact for implementing the CLI-ECA for both staffing and other associated work (understanding the Monitoring guidelines are not out yet, so excluding that)? Stormwater - # of new FTE's Stormwater – estimated annual on-going budget impact Stormwater – estimated one-time costs for initial set-up (i.e. development of reports, O&M / SOP's, etc.) Sanitary - # of new FTE's Sanitary – estimated annual budget impact Sanitary – estimated one-time costs for initial set-up (i.e. development of reports, O&M / SOP's, etc.) Thunder Bay – Permission to hire two new staff and additional \$400,000 in funding.	Aaron Ward Thunder Bay

	Wasaga Beach – Hired 1 additional staffer, Project Engineering Technologist, also does development review. Richmond Hill – Didn't hire specifically for CLI-ECA, hired 1 FTE/ Engineer. Manage reporting, support for Dev Applications and support for capital projects. Milton – Repurposed existing staff. Roughly 25-30 applications per year for stormwater. Town of Milton: 1 SWM Manager and 1 resources Engineer - Milton is implemented and if municipalities want copies of SOPs please reach out directly to rachel.ellerman@milton.ca. Link to SWM By-Law 095-2022 Stormwater Infrastructure Bylaw Monitoring program in Milton. Brampton – Hired a number of staff. Toronto- Has not signed agreement and is in negotiation. To follow up with colleagues in Toronto water. Vaughan – Public works does the reviews; did hire 1 person to look after the CLI-ECA and may be hiring one additional.	
3	Does your municipality have a formal policy around “no cuts” in new pavement following road re-surfacing / reconstruction? If yes, can you share details? In Thunder Bay, we only have an informal practice to “strongly discourage” cuts in new pavement for 5-years, but no formal policy / enforcement tool. We send out letters in advance / as part of capital work so that owners can request / coordinate service connection (or utility connection) works, but don’t have a formal tool to penalize / stop an owner from requesting new services after the capital construction is complete. Thunder Bay – Does not have a policy for road cuts in new pavement. Despite best efforts, it appears as though one or two years later someone wants to cut up new asphalt. Wasaga Beach – Sends out a letter advising of the proposed works and notifies the residents that for a 10 year period, there would be a \$25,000.00 penalty. Area serving by-law, example: While a developer is installing a new external watermain, the existing residential property is obligated to connect to the watermain within a 1 year period. An area servicing by-law is passed spelling out the cost per service to the resident and the resident is only obligated to pay for the cost of the service, not the cost of the watermain (which is a developer expense). Milton – No asphalt cut policy – difficult to enforce. A proactive approach was implemented for planned road cuts within 2 years prior to or after capital project completion.	Aaron Ward Thunder Bay

	Welland – When development applications come in, in a newly constructed road through pre-consultation, they notify applicant that they want the value of the full width and length of their property frontage for restoration at the tie-in location. Toronto- Street use by-law, it does not apply to developments. Section 743-28: Toronto's Street Use By-Law: https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/municode/1184_743.pdf Loyalist Township- Have become much stricter on use of hot rubberized sealers being used for road cuts - they are required for all cuts under Development Engineering control. City of Orillia - Have a municipal consent process that restricts road cuts for utilities. For other infrastructure services we have a 3 year moratorium. City of Orillia will locate the information and send.	
4	Development Review “course synopsis” status? Milton – Will need to revise the course and prepare for the group. Anita would like a sub-committee to give feedback on the contents of the course. Town of Wasaga Beach – Mike Pincivero would like to receive an email from all those who are interested in taking the course. Please send an email to: Mike Pincivero pwengineer@wasagabeach.com to form the sub-committee.	Mike Pincivero Wasaga Beach -Anita Sparre Milton
5	Infill by-law to deal with 1-10 units – a brief summary Whitby – By-Law # 8067-24 (Infill Development): Grading, Drainage and servicing Permit (GSDP) were the greatest area of concern. Exemptions include: Renovations that do not alter the building foot print and changes to the existing drainage pattern, the total lot coverage does not exceed max lot coverage per the zoning by law, the post development flows do not exceed the originally designed flows for the subject property, and existing receiving storm sewers are not running under surcharge conditions OR development construction where the finished grade is established through a Development Approval Process such as Site Alteration Permit, Site Plan, Draft Plan of Subdivision, Approved Subdivision Grading Plan, or a Consent under sections 41, 51, or 53 under the planning act or as a requirement of a Site Plan Agreement, Subdivision Agreement or Letter of Undertaking entered into under those sections. All four must be met. Permits (GSDP) 1 year duration and a one-time extension is extra (50% of the original fee). Online application portal – new feature in Town Website. Application review stage: Security Deposit is taken for various items such as retaining walls (have an additional 30% contingency for this item), infiltration / LID, Grading / Drainage / Erosion works or External Works (ROW) which include extension of road, streetlight, sewers, cul-de-sac and deposits would be taken from these items as well.	Rollie Orial Whitby

Town of Whitby Presentation by Dan Polak – Infill Development By-Law #8067-24:



DanPolak_Presentation to MEA DEC Group

Link to By-law No. 8067-24:



By-law No. 8067-24
Infill Development By-

Link to Town of Whitby – Guideline to Infill Developments:



Guideline to Infill
Development v1.1

Town of Whitby Grading, Servicing and Drainage Permit Pre-Screening Questionnaire and Permit Application Form:



Grading Servicing
and Drainage Permit

Town of Whitby Grading Servicing and Drainage Permit LOC doc.:



Grading Servicing
and Drainage Permit

Vaughan – Similar process in Vaughn, curious on securities you take?

Take securities for damage to ROW – they do not get involved in the private side

Whitby – Now take securities on the private side, previously only took securities on the public side. Take deposit (20k) for sod, LID's, stone trenches and now charge a grading drainage and erosion works deposit. Covers any potential grading, drainage or deficiencies.

Vaughan- Wants to implement something like Whitby because of now they have not been able to go onto private property to do work in specific scenarios.

Mississauga- Municipal protection (public) and overall grading deposit (internal / private) Up to \$10,000.00 to ensure there are no adverse effects on adjacent lands.

Wasaga – We do not go onto private property and use securities to rectify any damage or issues between neighboring properties. CBO issues “Order to Comply” and gives direction to act.

Wasaga – Whitby you take these securities for all new building (properties) permits?

	Whitby – Yes, but, there are some minor exemptions, where there are scenarios that would never affect the neighbouring property. The hope is that by holding securities they can encourage the permit holder to fix any issues. Richmond Hill - In the absence of a Site Plan Agreement, are you requiring the applicant to enter into a Development Agreement? Whitby – At the time of pre-consultation, determination is made and to date most have required to enter into a Development Agreement. By-law was mainly to give Engineering the ability to ensure compliance (for grading and drainage) items that used to be covered under Site Plan Agreements. The hope is that by holding on to the securities, we can "encourage" the permit holder to fix any issues... not necessarily to fix them ourselves. Does not encompass anything such as streetlight and parking conditions. Mississauga – grading plan, certification, and security and use condo application process to follow through with any engineering requirements. Use the Condo Application process to follow through with any Engineering Requirements. Welland – Take securities through servicing agreement. 7 – unit Town house block which is new to the municipality. Town of Wasaga Beach – Updated the infill lot grading and drainage policy to speak to SWM brief required if there are more than 2 units. Vaughan – Identify (with planning) and add minimum agreement fee (fee by-law) in the development agreement for the “10 units or less”. Mississauga – Standard connection has connection permits (fees) Municipality has rights as owners to be built to the municipal standards (development /servicing agreement /etc.)	
6	Public and Council want to be consulted on Development projects (where they have no such right). What are others doing to combat what could be viewed as NIMBYism preventing the construction of housing (in the middle of a housing crisis)? Blue Mountains not present during the meeting – topic pushed to next MEA DEC meeting.	Brian Worsley Blue Mountains
7	How are other municipalities dealing with providing Conditional Site Plan Approvals? Clearview – How are others dealing with reduced timelines for providing comments?	Patti Kennedy Clearview

	Engineering staff is coming up with conditions of approval and “stops the clock” to continue review and clear conditions to enter a finalized agreement. Mississauga – Allow for conditional building permit approvals to help with the timelines and get “shovels in the ground”. Toronto – 2 step process. Notice of approval conditions. All site plan drawings must be completed and have no comments left to address. Conditions need to be satisfied before final site plan approval Conditional “below grade” permits and conditional “above grade” permits. Currently reviewing site plan process. Recognize that it can take a long time to get to a position to enter full site plan approval. Have been refusing permits during bill 109. Clearview – Planning department has been rejecting site plan approvals driven by bill 109. 90 days for zoning / 60 for site plan. Toronto - Issuing a lot of refusals, mainly driven by the requirement to return application fees. A more recent bill has eliminated the requirement to return funds, therefore, the pressure has been relieved, and refusals are diminishing. Thunder Bay - Items built within site plan agreement. They require preliminary documentation and must provide satisfactory construction related details (grading plans, etc.) that are included within site plan agreement. Similar to conditions but not categorized as conditions. Clearview – Some design items have to be completed before an approval can be given, therefore, that’s where these conditions come into effect and the reason for compiling a list of pre-determined conditions to be met. Wasaga Beach – Planning department’s conditional permits will enter site plan agreement and shall provide Engineering Drawings that are Accepted for Construction. It allows to make the “decision” within time frame and conditional approval, but still requires all typical site plan approval materials. Bradford West Gwillimbury - ensures high level items are in place (SAN / STM outfall, adequate Existing water capacity demonstration, acceptable TIS, etc.) at Draft Plan Approval and creates Draft conditions to be dealt with through Site Plan.	
8	Various recent emailed queries from the DEC and outcomes:	(various)
8.a	Development Engineering Review fee results Clearview – Implemented an Engineering Review Fee, asked the group for their input and 15 municipalities responded. Ended up going with a fixed rate of 5%, which will be reviewed on a yearly basis. Clearview only has a staff of 3 in the Engineering Department, therefore, cannot bring everything in house. Clearview created a comparator chart based on the response from the 15 municipalities. Clearview has shared a copy for the group. Clearview – Engineering Review Fee Comparison Chart: 1-Engineering Review Fee Comparison Char	Patti Kennedy Clearview

	Clearview – Comparison Table:  2-Comparison Table - Schedule B.docx <u>Wasaga – Take your 5% and use the fees to pay your consultants?</u> Clearview - Policy is set up into stages: a fixed fee for pre-consultation, fixed fee for planning applications (OPA or ZBA) and 5% of estimated construction cost for the project. If the project has a stage 1 or Stage 2 it would be deducted from the 5%. During pre-consultations, staff spent too much time reviewing docs before it became an actual application.	
8.b	Standard minimum diameter of tree trunk (DBH = diam. at breast height) to define the size / significance of trees that are to be included in a tree inventory plan for development. • Not a specific legislation identified • Town requirements - WB = 10cm at 1.2m up from base (generally DBH) Wasaga - Tree inventory process from other municipality? Most municipalities that replied that they used the same 10cm at breast height. • 8cm is for black ash in accordance with the ESA.	Mike Pincivero Wasaga Beach
8.c	Sanitary sewer service cleanout / observation ports at property line Wasaga – Town is only responsible for the sanitary sewer laterals from P/L to the trunk. As such, TWB required 8” cleanout/ observation port at P/L. Our policy currently states that the cleanout can be buried 6” below grade, with a metal detectable cap. Currently looking to change our standards to have the cap for the cleanout flush with the surface grade. Previous responses received generally had any cleanouts be flush with surface. No responses provided during the meeting by the group.	Mike Pincivero Wasaga Beach
8.d	How other municipalities deal with rock blasting within City limits on private development projects; do municipalities: a) Issue permits and / or approvals for blasting within City / town limits for private developments. or, b) Do not issue permits and / or approvals for blasting within City / town limits for private developments. c) <u>If permits / approvals are issued, can a link be provided to learn more about the approval and permitting process that is used?</u> Mississauga – Has by-laws to deal with when certain construction activities can take place with dust, noise, vibration, etc. When it comes to blasting,	Aaron Ward Thunder Bay

	we ensure that the applicant provide the municipality proof of insurance coverage for any proposed blasting on/or adjacent to this site. Orillia – No blasting, but Oro Medonte does have criteria for blasting, may want to reach out to them or see if they have anything on their website.	
8.e	Sanitary flow monitoring – sharing I&I data with developers? (FOI request) Woolwich – Received a response and information from Clearview. Milton – FOI requests related to all of engineering data that would typically be disclosed under a data licensing agreement, the response is that FOI request is that if data is available, the applicant is instructed to go into the office for data licensing agreement. Wasaga Beach – Are there incentives / benefits if developers can demonstrate that they have no or low I&I relative to existing? Why else is the developer asking for this info? Woolwich – Developer wants to use pump station at max capacity as a way to by-pass other developments because they are ready to do so, and Township is hesitant to share information.	Bryan Bishop Woolwich
8.f	1. Has any municipality allowed cisterns as part of private servicing for residential properties where new lots were being created? 2. Has any municipality allowed lands to be subdivided knowing that there may be insufficient ground water to service the lots created? 3. What Liability would the Municipality face if they allowed the creation of lots without sufficient private ground water source? 4. Would the Municipality be responsible to provide water for the cistern, if they allowed the lots to be created knowing there maybe insufficient groundwater for private servicing? Clearview – Developer would like to create a draft plan in an area that does not have any municipal services. The developer would like to use cisterns, however, there is concern with liability. Some municipalities responded and Clearview is concerned that the potential property owners will come back and fight the town for allowing the lot creation in an unserviced lot. Thunderbay & Bradford – Have a similar scenario and are interested in the outcome. Clearview – Planning states that you can't create lot without municipal servicing available. Municipality staff have doubts that they have the ability to install viable wells. Bradford – Put it to the consultant / developer to prove that there was sufficient flow and capacity to service the development and meet the flows. The fine details were to be worked out via Building department. Adequate water needs to be identified and need to complete a well survey along with all required works to ensure that the available water is adequate for the development type.	Patti Kennedy Clearview

	Clearview – Have you allowed the developer to proceed on the premise that they would be using cisterns? Bradford – Has tasked the developer's consultants with proving how they will provide water for the lots. Woolwich – Believes there is a ministry document that dictates the requirement for lots to be provided with a drilled well or watermain connection (per below). https://www.ontario.ca/page/d-5-5-private-wells-water-supply-assessment Wasaga Beach – Planning policies do not allow for the creation of lots that are not connected to municipal services.	
8.g	What authority does the municipality have to require an on/off-street parking and sidewalks in a plan of condominium? Who is responsible to ensure fire access routes are not obstructed? Toronto – Issue is tied to transportation department. They identified the need for off street parking through site plan control application. The draft plan of condominium application was preceded by Site plan application and the transportation staff identified the requirements for parking layout (parking stall number, zoning compliance, etc.). During the site plan stage, Fire Servicing staff, reviewed the site plan and identified if fire access routes were required for the development. As a condition, developers are to designate the fire access route as private roads / fire access roads and have a by-law written.	Nhat-Anh Nguyen Toronto
8.h	Letter of Credit requirements (amounts and forms) Markham – Asks for 110% of the cost estimate if we are doing an Agreement. 99% of the time we do a pre-servicing agreement, where we get 20% of the above ground and 20% of the underground as part of the pre-servicing. 110% is only if they come with the subdivision agreement. Mansoor shared template for LC and the other is the comparison of other municipalities. City of Markham - Letter of Credits – Standard Wordings document:  LC std word City (June 30 2012) - Agree City of Markham – MEA LC Comparison between Municipalities – Excel document:  MEA - LC Comparision.xlsx	Mansoor Ali Markham

Toronto & Thunder Bay – Has anyone accepted a surety bond in Lieu of LC to guarantee the works?

Thunder Bay - No bonds, would only take LC's and cash/ cheque over the past 10 years.

Clearview – Bonds for capital works? – We are now legally required to allow developers to post surety bonds in lieu of letters of credit or cash.

No development agreements, however, have entered into agreement with 3 major developers to help fund capital work projects and they post surety bonds. Some municipalities are utilizing surety bonds for front-ending agreements. Subdivision and Site Plan agreements have been changed to accept surety bonds.

Milton – Surety bonds, being asked by entire development industry to accept bonds. Background research for processing, LC is a simple process, surety bonds is more cumbersome to deal with due to the paperwork required from insurance companies

Mississauga - O. Reg. 461/24 SURETY BONDS - SECTION 70.3.1 OF THE ACT | ontario.ca

Currently updating agreement process. Allowing for convenience of (digital) transactions from in-person / manual transaction. They are not drawing from letters of credit anyway.

London – Started accepting surety bond (trial basis) for a couple years and trying to match the language from LC's to Bonds to ensure it's similar to LC to avoid challenges.

Markham – Pay-on-demand by law this year, put out without consulting Engineering "good as an LC".

APPENDIX A

		<i>Pay-on-Demand Surety Bonds Policy</i>	
		Policy Category:	
Policy No.:		Implementing Procedure No.:	
Approving Authority: Treasurer		Effective Date: December 4, 2024	
Approved or Last Reviewed Date:		Next Review Year: 2030	
Area(s) this policy applies to: Development Finance Financial Services		Owner Department: Development Finance Financial Services	
Related Policies: • Expenditure Control Policy • Letters of Credit Policy			

Note: Questions about this Policy should be directed to the Owner Department.

1. Purpose Statement <i>(Outline why the organization is issuing the policy and its desired effect or outcome of the policy)</i> This document establishes a Policy to guide the operating practices with respect to the delivery and use of Pay-on-Demand Surety Bonds ("Surety Bonds") and outlines the requirements for a Surety Bond to be an acceptable form of security for Development Agreements, as hereinafter defined. The Policy also establishes minimum standards and criteria to protect the financial interests of the City and ensure the equitable and transparent administration of the use of Surety Bonds for Development Agreements. This Policy will define requirements for the uses of Surety Bonds that includes: - The terms and conditions (features) to be included for the instruments to be accepted - Standard wording acceptable to the City of Markham - Acceptable alternatives to Surety Bonds. - Acceptable circumstances or agreements eligible for use of Surety Bonds
2. Applicability and Scope Statement This Policy is applicable to all cases in which a Surety Bond is being offered as security for a Development Agreement. Surety Bonds may be provided for any Development Agreement where financial security for installation of municipal services is required and may be for the full amount of security required, or for a portion if supplemented with a Letter of Credit or cash.
3. Background <i>(Indicate any reasons, history, and intent that led to the creation of the policy)</i> The City requires developers/landowners to secure the performance of certain obligations by providing a financial security to be utilized if the developers/landowners fail to deliver on the requirements of their Development Agreement.

Page 1 of 5

Kitchener – Met with Planning and Legal Dept., right now the legal team is looking into the risk of implementation. Have not had the need to use or draw on LC's. Waiting on Legal for implementation in the use of bonds.

Clearview – Agreement states Cash on Demand surety bond. The insurance provider has a limited amount of days to provide the funds to municipality. Must be provincial regulatory authority or federal institution to issue the bonds.

Hamilton – Adopted acceptance for surety bond for the subdivisions 2 years ago.

Surety Bonds – Section 70.3.1 of the Act

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/r24461>

8.i

1. Does your municipality have a Site Alteration/Fill By-Law?
2. If so, how recently has it been updated?
3. Is it aligned with the recent changes to the Municipal Act and new legislations (O. Reg. 153/04 and O. Reg. 406/19)?

Patti Kennedy
Clearview

4. Has it been tested in court?
5. Does your municipality have a “No Fill” By-Law?

Clearview – Currently in the process of updating our site alteration and fill by-law. Just questioning other municipalities/ the group for input on their issues and if they have a by-law and if it has been tested in court. Hoping to get ours to Council at the end of March and early April.

Whitby – Has a site alteration by-law, last updated in 2018. Has not been tested in court. Do not have a no fill by-law, but, do have restrictions in the alteration by-law.

<https://www.whitby.ca/en/town-hall/site-alteration.aspx>

London -

[Site Alteration By-law - C.P.-1591-279 | City of London](#) - updated Nov. 2024

Milton - Milton updated our SAP By-Law late 2022 and did the same review through legal. [094-2022 Prohibit and Regulate Fill or Altering of Grades or Drainage on any Lands](#)

Woolwich - <https://www.woolwich.ca/media/2dcf2q5q/51-2024-a-by-law-to-prohibit-or-regulate-site-alteration.pdf>

Created in 2018 updated at the end of 2024

Has a lot more types of permits, agriculture props struggle with standards. Also have a development permit for site that have already gone through planning process “pre-grading permit”. Have permit fees and “per cu. m fees” and it goes into a reserve account to other costs. (\$2.00 per cu.m) and there is a range where it goes to \$1.50 after a certain amount of fill. Included in the fees and charges by-law. Have added admin penalties for by-law and the By-law has not been challenged through court.

Markham - <https://www.markham.ca/sites/default/files/2024-07/Bylaw-2011-232.pdf>

Richmond Hill - <https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/shared-content/resources/documents/Community-Standards-By-laws/967---Property-Maintenance---Dumping---Fill---Site-Alterations.pdf>

East Gwillimbury - Town of East Gwillimbury has an existing site alteration/fill by-law, last updated in 2018. We are in the midst of an update planned to be issued later this year. [Fill By-law - The Town of East Gwillimbury](#)

Richmond Hill - <https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/shared-content/resources/documents/Community-Standards-By-laws/967---Property-Maintenance---Dumping---Fill---Site-Alterations.pdf>

8.j	- What are the current unit rates (\$/m3 per unit of sediment removed) used by your municipality in contracts with contractors for cleaning out stormwater management ponds - Please advise if your municipality charges a Stormwater Pond Maintenance Fee, or anything similar, to developers building these ponds in a subdivision agreement and provide the fees details Town of Wasaga Beach – Received table indicating it costs roughly \$250/m3 of sediment removal. Details are attached below. City of Oshawa attachment: 3.0 Executive Summary The unit rate used by the City of Oshawa for stormwater management cleanout contracts should be updated to match market rates for this activity, as determined from input from surrounding municipalities. This unit rate should be \$247 per m³ of sediment removed from a stormwater management pond. The current unit rate used by the City for stormwater pond cleanouts has been calculated by applying a yearly inflation rate of 3% to the prior year's unit rate. As of 2024, this unit rate, under this methodology, is \$203 per m³ of sediment removed. Increasing the cost only by considering yearly economic inflation rates may no longer be sufficient to cover the actual cost of cleaning the pond. This report considers both market rates of this cleaning activity, as well as the various factors contributing to the actual costs of cleaning a stormwater management pond. Associated items for consideration include changing weather patterns and movements of sediments associated with these changes, costs incurred by contractors that fluctuate and increase over the course of completing this work over time, the requirement of conducting specific types of work for pond cleanouts, such as surveys, to quote how much sediment is required to be removed from a pond, and the cost of works contingent on the quantity of materials (such as the costs associated with completing dewatering works for a large quantity of excavated soil). Costs of handling contaminated soils in these ponds may also need to be accounted for. A comparison of historic contract costs for stormwater pond cleanouts with actual costs for cleaning out these ponds across local municipalities further justifies the need to increase the unit rate, aside from keeping the unit rate in line with market rates.	Chris Lato Oshawa
-----	--	----------------------

Table 2 - 2024 Stormwater Management Pond Cleanout Unit Rate Comparison

Municipality	Year of Rate/Study	2024 Rate (\$/m ³)	Population
Ajax	[Inflationary increase from 2016 rate]	190	126,666
Pickering	2023	288	99,186
Whitby	2023	443	138,501
Oakville	[Inflationary increase from 2016 rate]	253	213,759
Guelph	[Inflationary increase from 2016 rate]	177	143,740
Aurora	[Inflationary increase from 2016 rate]	146	62,057
Uxbridge	[Inflationary increase from 2016 rate]	190	21,556
Mississauga	2025	265	717,961
Woolwich	2024	275	26,999
Vaughan	2024	130	323,103
Ottawa	2024	405	1,017,449

Average

\$251.09

\$246.83

Excluding municipalities with populations less than half, or more than double that of Oshawa's

2024 Oshawa Population = 175,383

Calculations that result in the contents of this table can be found in Appendix B.

The calculation of the new proposed unit rate aligns with the calculation used to develop the 2016 unit rate (an averaging of values of unit rates used by surrounding municipalities, excluding those with populations less than half or more than double that of Oshawa's).

8.k Inverted crown cross-sections

Not present at the time of discussion.

Marcus Wahrstaetter
Niagara Falls

8.l Minimum water service size

Thunder Bay – Reached out to the group to understand what the minimum water service size being used in other municipalities. Asked the question because of the size of the dwellings being proposed nowadays and now because there can be up to 4 units as of right. A survey went out that received about 20 responses and the census was that the minimum water service size is 1" amongst 17 of the poll participants.

Orillia - <https://www.orillia.ca/en/city-hall/siteservices.aspx> link to Orillia's by-law, Permit, FAQ's

1"

Bradford – 1"

Richmond Hill – 25mm minimum

Milton - Item 8j (SWMP Cleanout) (Milton) - included in development

Aaron Ward
Thunder Bay

	agreement is a cleanout fee (120K) that's added to the Subdivision LC. Also, local monitoring program (inlet, outlet flow rates and TSS removal). If ponds are not operating to the design specs, consultant investigates and implements improvements prior to acceptance. In general 10% of ponds are shown to have monitoring issues. Ponds are required to be cleanout out just before issuance of Assumption. =\$185/m3 Richmond Hill - https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/learn-more/resources/Design-Standards/Division-I-Erosion-and-Sediment-Control.pdf	
9	Foundation Drainage Discharge Policy Pickering: (high-rise developments with below ground levels extending into the groundwater table) Requests for long-term and short-term dewatering into the storm sewer system are increasing. The City does not have a Sewer Use By-law and is in the process of formalizing a Council-endorsed Policy which regulates groundwater discharge to the storm system. <u>Does your municipality have some sort of policy regulating groundwater discharge to the storm or sanitary sewer system?</u> York Region - Dewatering flows need to be subtracted from (verify) flow York Region – Has a sewer use by-law, which states that for temporary dewatering you must discharge to a storm or sanitary sewer. If in non-compliance, the region can issue hefty fines. As far as permanent dewatering, it is permitted if required, however, it must enter the on-site stormwater facility (upstream of OGS) prior to entering the public facility. Bradford - https://www.townofbwg.com/en/town-hall/sewer-use-by-law-2013-68.aspx Orillia– In a situation right now where historically we do not have a sewer use by-law, but, have an application right now for a subdivision where there is a high groundwater table. The development would like to have foundation drainage tie into the storm sewer. Any information from the group is appreciated. <u>Does anyone have a foundation by-law? Developers have previously used overland flows and it is creating a huge issue.</u> Richmond hill - you can find dewatering policy in section I5 of our standard. https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/learn-more/resources/Design-Standards/Division-F-Development-Application-and-Capital-Project-Requirements.pdf	Bob Trajceski Pickering
10	INVERTED CROWN – Woolwich - Water eroded the inverted crown at the joint and costly maintenance issues follow. Some contractors are saying that they could complete the inverted crown in one pull / without a joint. Toronto – The city's laneways are all concrete.	

11	Woolwich – Invasive Species: <u>How do they follow in creeks, ponds, and open spaces?</u> <u>How do you enforce developers for the removal?</u> <u>Do you follow the Weed Act?</u> Milton – Have something that we can provide. To be provided	Bryan Bishop
12	General Milton – Seem to be under targeted attack for width of rights-of-way. <u>Wondering if other municipalities have faced the same issues and how they are addressing them?</u> Wasaga – Reference and stick to standards. Engineering Standards state that public roads are a minimum of 20.0m Milton – Problems internally to keep ROW width pushed down for a max of 16.0 meters for local roads Mississauga – Constant battle. Official policy should note the public vs private and make sure it's built into the OP to clearly define where local and Public roads are required. Engineering cross section standards are up-to-date to included multi-use trails, wider sidewalks, bike trails, etc. to push the need for each element to ensure that the feature is included, not necessarily a set dimension. Don't look at just ROW, but safety, functionality, parking etc. "stick to standards, say no and if appealed it has 'political influence' not necessarily done internally because staff sticks to standards".	Anita Sparre (Town of Milton)
13	Round Table / Open Mic	All attendees
14	Next Meeting – Mid / late 2025 (TBD)	

Q Find a participant

JP Jason Peters - Town of Wasaga Beach (Me)

MP Mike Pincivero-Wasaga Beach (Host)

DP Dan Polak - Town of Whitby

1C 1. City Saleem Khan

1L 1. Lukasz Pawlowski

AW Aaron Ward - Thunder Bay

AB Abdul Barakzay - County of Brant

AS Adam Santos

AD Alex Donn - County of Brant

AL Alex Lee - City of Markham

AV Alex V

AM Amy Mejia - ToWB

 Anita Sparre (Town of Milton)

AK Annie Kwok (Richmond Hill)

AR Ary Rezvanifar

BT Bob Trajceski - Pickering

BB Bryan Bishop - Township of Woolwich

Invite

Q Find a participant

BB Bryan Bishop - Township of Woolwich

CM Calvin Mollett

CL Carl Leung - Town of Whitby

CR Carlos Reyes - City of Kitchener

CB Christine Bactol - Town of Whitby

CT Christine Taggart - Clearview Township

CG Cory Grant (Loyalist Township)

DC Don Cunningham - County of Brant

DL Doug Lyons (County of Brant)

FS Frank Suppa

HM Hamid Mazaheri

H hoodad.abootalebi

IM Irina Marouchko - City of Pickering

J jeremy.wychreschuk

J- Joe - Mississauga

JT Joe Thompson - City of Welland

JS Jon Stumm

Invite

Q Find a participant

JS Jon Stumm

JT Julie Tot - Woolwich

KB Kevin Brake - Town of East Gwillimbury

LF Lori Fox - WOOLWICH

LN Luigi Nicolucci (City of Toronto)

MD Matt Davenport - London

MD Matt DHondt - Brant

 Michael Stewart, City of Waterloo

MH Mike Harrison - City of London

MK Mohamed Kharbeche - City of London

NM Neil Miles - County of Brant

NN Nhat-Anh Nguyen - CoT

PH Paal Helgesen - Pickering

PK Patti Kennedy Clearview Township

PG Paul Guerreiro

RN Rob Nicoll - City of Richmond Hill

RO Rollie Orial - Development Engineering Supervisor, Town of Whitby

Invite

Q Find a participant

- NN** Nhat-Anh Nguyen - CoT
- PH** Paal Helgesen - Pickering
- PK** Patti Kennedy Clearview Township
- PG** Paul Guerreiro
- RN** Rob Nicoll - City of Richmond Hill
- RO** Rollie Orial - Development Engineering Supervisor, Town of Whitby
- RF** Ryan Furtado - Thunder Bay
- SY** Saad Yousaf (Town of Bradford WG)
- SM** Scott MacKenzie (City of Markham)
- SW** Sean Wren (Toronto)
- S** SmithC
- ST** Stefanie Thorne (Collingwood)
- TW** Thomas Watkins (Ajax)
- TN** Tom Newbery - City of Peterborough
- TW** Tom Wheeler
- TB** Tracy Blanchard City of Orillia
- ZD** Zairo De Chavez - Town of Whitby

Invite