

Appendix "C"

2023 Development Charges Comments and Questions

#	DC #	Comment or Question	City Response
2	DC 1	The Background Study prepared by Hemson Consulting, April 21, 2023, proposes a 29% increase in City-wide development charges, and an 97% increase in area-specific development charges for the Annexed Area (Salem and Hewitts). Similar increases of 35% and 80% respectively were implemented by the City just four years ago in 2019.	The total increase (both the City-wide and Area-Specific charges) per single-detached unit is 28% for the Former City Boundary and 39% for Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan Areas. Importantly, the calculated rates will be phased-in over a 5-year period thus once the by-law is enacted, the increase per single-detached unit will be 2.5% for the Former City Boundary and 11.5% for Salem and Hewitt's, respectively.
3	DC 2	The Background Study proposes that the City impose among the highest development charges in the GTA, at over \$126,000 for a single detached unit.	The City of Barrie is a fast growing municipality which provides a range of municipal services and the development charges calculated as part of the 2023 DC Background Study are based on the legislative requirements of the Development Charges Act. Other municipalities in the GTA have higher DCs than the City of Barrie, examples include the cities of Vaughan, Brampton, Mississauga, Markham and East Gwillimbury.
4	DC 3	Hard Service Cost Estimates – The methodology used starts with calculating construction costs using up-to-date unit rates provided by a cost consultant retained by the City, and then increasing those costs by 87% across the board to account for possible soft costs and a 30% "contingency".	As noted in our workshops and previous correspondence: The 87% includes soft costs from all project phases from preliminary design to construction and contingencies for the construction estimates. This is derived from industry best practices to date and has been adopted in the City's budgeting exercise to ensure project cost certainty. Those costs including but are not limited to: - Project management - Technical works (e.g. study, design, review) - Survey and other investigations - Contract administration - Site inspections The 30% contingency is for design progression and will be reduced as more design questions have been answered and thus the Construction Cost increases. This % reflects industry best practice and is recommended by the City's cost consultant. At the time of tendering, the construction contingency will be reduced to as low as 10% as most of the unknowns at the start of the project have been found and rolled into the Construction cost.
5	DC 4	Hard Service Cost Estimates – The use of this inflated contingency and soft cost amounts treats every project as conceptual, and ignores the completion of environmental assessments, detailed design, contracts and project cost reports for many of the projects, especially those in the Annexed Area.	Special considerations have been given for few projects where EA is not required or has been completed (i.e., road projects 1401, 2208, 2212). As noted previously, for projects that have been progressed through implementation, the most recent available costs (e.g. EA estimates, preliminary design estimates, tender price, project cost reports) are used in the update. Additional notes have been provided in the latest package that was sent on May 2, 2023.
6	DC 5	Hard Service Cost Estimates – The methodology also fails to recognize that even for projects that have not reached the detailed design stage, the construction estimates are based on a fairly advanced understanding of project scope and very current costing information.	For projects that have not been advanced since the master plan, the construction estimates would be conceptual with many unknowns where soft costs for future project phases and the associated contingencies must be considered to ensure cost certainty and project success.
7	DC 6	Hard Service Cost Estimates – Finally, the soft cost amounts used (50% of construction costs) are entirely out of scale with the amounts that the SLG has incurred for the projects they are building in the Annexed Area (which amount to about 20% of construction costs).	Conceptual construction cost estimates will be increased as the project progresses and most of the unknowns at the conceptual stage have been found and costs of which are rolled into the NEW construction cost. Therefore it is possible that near the end of the project implementation, the soft cost % will be less as the denominator increases.
8	DC 7	Phased Road Projects - We also note that the City approach to the costing of potentially phased road projects seems to be unreasonable. The City adds a 20% premium to these projects to account for the increased costs of the second phase, compared to if they were constructed as a single phase. However, the 20% premium is applied to the entire project cost, and not just the second phase, which has the effect of inflating the second phase by 40% and it not reasonable. The City's standard 87% markup including contingencies is also added to the 20% premium. Finally, some of the projects costed as if they were phased are actually being designed and constructed as a single project.	Staff have reviewed the cross section line items and it is found that an average of 18% of the hard cost will be occurred at each phase of the ProjEt. Example of those items include curb/sidewalk removal and replacement, catch basins, boulevard and driveway restorations, etc. In addition, there will be some temporary lane transitions between project limits that will add cost to the previous phase of the project, as well as some miscellaneous work re-occurring at subsequent phasing (e.g. mobilization).
9	DC 8	Local Service Policy - Comments have been provided regarding the Local Service Guidelines, which we believe lack clarity. These comments have not been addressed in the Guidelines included in the Background Study. It is not in the City's or the Landowners' interest to have Local Service Guidelines that cannot be clearly applied. We request a separate meeting be convened so that they can be discussed.	A meeting has been held with you on May 29, 2023 to discuss your concerns. Some clarity has been added to the Guidelines for passage of the by-law expected on June 21, 2023. The City's Infrastructure Team has committed to further review and refine the Guidelines subsequent to passing of the DC by-law and expect to bring something forward in the later part of 2023.
10	DC 9	Parks and Recreation - Indoor Recreation Facilities Land Area - Historical Level of Service: Please explain the difference in the land area of the indoor recreation facilities when comparing the information circulated in February (3.579 ha) and the information in the April 21 Development Charges Background Study (13.16 ha).	The land area included in the draft historical service level data dated February 2023 was inadvertently understated. Following the release of draft material circulated to the development industry, the land areas associated with each site was adjusted based a review of assumptions on the 2019 DC Study and crossed checked with site measurements.
11	DC 10	Parks and Recreation - indoor Recreation Facilities Land Area - Historical Level of Service: Please provide the total land area of the Sadler /Molson Centre-we wish to confirm that similar to the building area , the total area (shown as 2.2 ha) in the Background Study has been reduced by 40% to reflect the non DC eligible use of the facility.	The total land area associated with the Salon Centre is 3.70 ha. Only 60% of this area (2.22 ha) is included in the historical inventory calculation.

12	DC 11	General Services - Historical Level of Service Calculations: For many facilities the City has estimated the replacement cost of existing facilities based on recent tenders of new facilities. The Act and Regulations require that the historic service levels be calculated based on the replacement cost of the existing facilities, which should be based on the quality of those existing facilities. Using the cost of new state-of-the-art facilities would overstate the quality of the existing facilities which may not have all of amenities associated with, or may not have been constructed to the same standard as, the recently built/tendered facilities. Hence the historic level of service calculations would be too high as a result. How as the City determined that the quality of existing facilities is the same as the new facilities used as a proxy for replacement costs.	To meet the requirements of the DCA, quantity is expressed in various units (land size, etc.), and quality is based on the current replacement costs of the facilities. Estimated replacement costs most often include a review of most recent tender costs and other applicable data. As per Section 4 of the DCA, the quality is expressed in replacement costs of what it would cost to replace the asset today. The costing reflects current building code standards, requirements and how facilities are constructed in the City. This is aligned with best practices of municipalities across Ontario.
13	DC 12	Water - Debt Payments: We understand that the discount rate that the City / Hemson has utilized to present value debenture principal payments that extend beyond 2041 is the inflation rate 2% - we would suggest that the more appropriate discount rate should be City's cost of capital (5.5%) consistent with standard financial theory. Also please confirm that the date the future principal payments are discounted back to.	To provide greater clarity, both principal and interest payments beyond 2041 have been present valued back to 2041 at a rate of 3.5%. This rate is the cash flow assumption for interest earned on positive balances. In the cash flow analysis, the principal and interest debt payments are not indexed, but the calculated rate is subject to indexing.
14	DC 13	Services Related to a Highway - Interchanges: In applying the Roads BTE/PPB Methodology, new interchanges that do not replace any existing infrastructure are typically considered 100% growth related. However, for project #3000, the Mapleview DDI interchange, there is an existing diamond interchange which is proposed to be re-configured to be a diverging diamond interchange (DDI). This represents at least a partial replacement of existing infrastructure which will improve movements to/from the highway and improve safety, and requires a benefit to existing development allocation. The 2019 TMP (section 4.2.3.2) confirms that this project will mitigate capacity deficiencies, eliminate delays and improve safety.	Project #3000 Mapleview DDI is a reconfiguration to support growth for 2031 per MTO 2017 TESR. The project would not occur in the absence of growth and is fully necessitated by development. There is no structure cost associated with project. Therefore no BTE adjustment has been made.
15	DC 14	Services Related to a Highway - Interchanges: We noted that no BTE has been assigned to the new McKay Interchange. There will be traffic from existing development attracted to this new Interchange once opened, diverting existing traffic trips and improving congestion at existing interchanges. Can you please explain the rationale for assigning no BTE to this project?	A 9% BTE was assigned to McKay interchange but was incorrectly applied to project #2205 McKay Road improvements. This has been corrected with the 9% BTE being applied to the Interchange project (#2128).
16	DC 15	Local Service Policy - Comments have been provided regarding the local service guidelines, which we believe lack clarity. These comments have not been addressed in the guidelines included in the Background Study. It is not in the City's or the Landowners' interest to have local service guidelines that cannot be clearly applied. We request a separate meeting be convened so that they can be discussed.	This is same as comment #9/DC 8. See response above.
17	DC 16	Services Related to a Highway - Project Estimates: #1 The project by project road estimate tables of the 2019 Master Plan were partially updated as of the meeting on March 6, 2023 and final versions not yet ready for the May 1st meeting. [Item A1] We will review technical information received subsequent to the May 1st meeting and may have additional comments at a latter date.	No actions required by City staff.
18	DC 17	Services Related to a Highway - Project Estimates: #2 The Prior Growth amounts are not shown in the DC project tables. Can a column containing this information be included on the DC project tables to understand DC eligible amounts. [Item A2]	Due to the nature of the capital projects (including the phasing of work) makes it extremely challenging to identify specific projects which have prior growth allocations. In order to address this, we have deducted the shares of projects previously funded from DCs as a bottom line adjustment. We note that the results are the same under either approach. Additional information on the funding of individual projects is provided in the annual treasurers statement.
19	DC 18	Services Related to a Highway - Project Estimates: #3 The estimates for the DC roadworks projects are being updated for the 2023 DC Bylaw. Many of the projects have known contract costs or else have project cost reports completed based on detailed designs. Other project estimates are informed by the 2017 EA Study covering the Annex road corridors. There are few if any designs at the conceptual level per se. Despite the improved quality of project cost information available for many projects, concerns were forwarded that the available costing information shows excessive soft cost and contingency percentage mark ups (e.g. 87%) being added to the updated hard cost estimates. While the percentage markups can be higher for projects smaller than the DC projects, typically the design, contract administration, and construction contingency costs would collectively sum up to 20% based on typical experiences and recent Developer led projects in Salem lands (which also had no additional EA soft cost expenditures). [Item A4]	See response for comment #4 above.
20	DC 19	Services Related to a Highway - Project Estimates: #4 Various staff responses have referred to 'Class D' estimates, 'Level D' estimates, and 'Class 3' estimates. Can information be provided to understand these estimates. [Items A4, C8, and C10.]	As recommended by the City's cost consultant, Class D estimate is used for projects at conceptual design stage (i.e. EA & Public Inputs). It represents the approximate magnitude of cost and is based on broad requirements used for preliminary discussion and long-term capital planning.

21	DC 20	<p>Services Related to a Highway - Project Estimates: #5 Can additional breakdown of the lump sum interchange costs be provided, also showing the estimated land area and cost. Can the project cost report already completed for proposed interchange projects be provided eg. the proposed McKay Interchange. [Items A10 and A11]</p>	<p>2128 McKay Interchange - the cost is based on EA estimates (completed in 2017 and available on City's website) and inflated to current dollars. Total project cost is from the 2022 PCR used for capital planning which includes a total of \$20.6M for land costs for the following properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 17 McKay Rd E (southeast quadrant) – acquired in full by the City - 36 McKay Rd E (northeast quadrant) - will need partial property (owned by non-participating landowner) - 20 McKay Rd W (northwest quadrant) – will need partial property (owned by non-participating landowner) - 45 McKay Rd W (southwest quadrant) – will need partial property (this parcel is owned by a participating landowner – DG Group) <p>1128 Dunlop SB On Ramp - the estimated cost in 2022 dollars is \$6M (detailed breakdown is shown in the Benchmark spreadsheet that was provided). Through finalization of the cost update, the inflated cost of \$4.7M was used based on 2019 TMP cost of \$3.8M. No land cost is assumed.</p> <p>3000 Mapleview DDI - inflated based on 2019 TMP cost. 2019 notes indicated "City provided a cost estimate of approx. \$8M. Estimate is based on the PDR and has been conservatively inflated for additional costs (widening of roadway) and all contingencies. No cost sharing is assumed with MTO. Cost shown here removes contingency factors to ensure the final total cost of the project adds to \$8M. No land cost is assumed.</p> <p>2101 Salem & Lockhart Rd Widening and Crossing - inflated based on 2019 TMP cost. 2019 notes indicated "Based on Construction Tender for Harvie/Big Bay Road Highway Crossing plus allowance for Highway Staging". No land cost is assumed.</p>
22	DC 21	<p>Services Related to a Highway - Phased Road Projects: #6 There are DC road projects that were estimated as being "phased" (ie. widened perpendicular to centerline in two steps), which result in an increase in estimated ultimate total corridor DC costs. 3 of the road projects that are estimated as though being phased, are in fact being constructed to ultimate location in only one phase eg. Project ID's 1215, 2203, and 2204. It is unknown if/why 3 other projects eg. Project ID's 1374, 2205, 2308 will be phased. Can the project list be revised to show the correct list of phased road widenings, and reviewed to confirm if any road projects will indeed be phased. [Item A9].</p>	<p>1215 Mapleview Dr - Phase 1 improvements align with the 2006 EA recommendations with 5-lanes with no pedestrian facilities on the south side of the road. Phase 2 includes the ultimate 7-lane configuration with improved active transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>2203 Lockhart - No construction has started. Phase 1 improvements included a semi-urban cross-section and interim active transportation facilities. The Phase 1 solution coincides with the Landowners request not to convey all necessary lands to achieve the necessary right-of-way width to allow implementation of all street elements.</p> <p>Phase 2 includes full implementation and ultimate active transportation facilities.</p> <p>2204 McKay Rd - Phase 1 improvements are based on a 5-lane cross-section. Phase 2 improvements are based on a 7-lane cross-section.</p> <p>1374, 2205 and 2308 - projects are phased to align with anticipated pace of developments / corresponding auto demand as well as consideration of forecasted cash flows from development charges.</p>
23	DC 22	<p>Services Related to a Highway - Phased Road Projects: #7 The calculation methodology to date for the phased road projects is such that 70% of the Gross Cost estimate (if the entire project were completed in one step) will be incurred in Phase 1 and then 50% of the Gross Cost (if the entire project were completed in one step) will be incurred in Phase 2. Can the basis for this overall assumed 20% increase in hard and soft cost be provided. It appears too high. [Item A9]</p>	<p>See response above for #8.</p>
24	DC 23	<p>Services Related to a Highway - Phased Road Projects: #8 Based on the materials to date, there was an additional 20% premium added onto the hard and soft cost percentage mark ups of each phase of the phased road estimates discussed above. This premium should only be applied to the phase 2 cost estimate. Can the rationale for this premium, if still being included in the final estimates, be provided. The combined phasing increases and phase premiums had effectively resulted in a combined 40% unsubstantiated bump up in project cost (relative to the cost if the entire project was completed in one step). [Item A9]</p>	<p>See response above for #8.</p>
25	DC 24	<p>Services Related to a Highway - Phased Road Projects: #9 Based on staff response, a phased right of way land acquisition is assumed at locations of Non-participating landowners, at which properties the land acquisition was estimated to occur in phase 2. This would be inconsistent with design staff direction to date, which is such that the centerline for a proposed arterial widening will be a straight line. For example, the estimate methodology would imply that there would be local lane tapers at a mid-block non-participant property, such that the number of lanes and boulevard would be reduced back to existing width on one side of proposed centerline at these properties. Also, technical staff have not yet agreed to design zigzags in both curblin and overhead/underground boulevard utilities implied for the initial "phased" land acquisition. It is assumed that the utility relocations on phase 2 widenings would be considered by staff to be DC eligible. Can the individual road project estimates be reviewed. [Item B7]</p>	<p>Although property costs are assumed to occur in two (2) phases, the total cost would be the same as if it occurred in one phase (i.e. no additional soft cost or contingencies are applied). As projects are estimated at conceptual level (unless an updated cost estimate is available as project progresses), details will be investigated and decided in the future when projects are progressed to design stage. Utility costs are part of the "hard cost" and could occur in one phase or two (2) phases, depending on the outcome of the detailed design and property acquisition process.</p>
26	DC 25	<p>Services Related to a Highway - Active Transportation Costs: #10 It is not clear how the Active Transportation (AT) unit rates are being applied to which quantities for the works proposed within individual DC road reconstruction project limits. Can AT costs be provided on a road project by road project basis.</p>	<p>Sidewalk infrastructure costs form part of the per metre unit rate for the applicable street cross-section. Cycling costs are calculated separately using a per metre unit rate and include adjustment to remove sidewalk costs (for one side) for instances where a multi-use path is being recommended.</p>

27	DC 26	Services Related to a Highway - Active Transportation Costs: #11 The AT unit rates 1.12 for new bike lanes are approximately 40% higher than if applying the road project cross sectional unit rates. Please apply lower unit rates for the Secondary Plan DC road project costs. [Item D7]	The AT unit rates 1.12 for new bike lanes (\$390/m) are approximately 64% lower than if applying the road project cross sectional unit rates (\$1,200/m). To account for the 2.0m buffered bike lane (WSP's AT unit rates only assumes 1.5m), the following items are considered (which are excluded from road projects): - Earth excavation (grading) - supply place and compact granular A and B - Supply and place top and base asphalt with tact coat - catch basin lead Further, this compared difference does not include additional costs for miscellaneous items which are typically based on total construction cost that should have included the cost of bike lanes.
28	DC 27	Services Related to a Highway - Active Transportation Costs: #12 The AT unit rates 1.26 to 1.27 descriptions for cycle tracks have reconstruction cost inclusions which do not apply to new Annex DC road reconstruction. Also, the unit rates shown are well more than double the rates experienced in Salem land projects to date. Please apply lower unit rates for the Secondary Plan DC road project costs. [Item D9]	AT unit rates 1.26 to 1.27 are for informational purposes, and they are NOT used in any of the AT project costs calculations.
29	DC 28	Services Related to a Highway - Active Transportation Costs: #13 The AT unit rates 2.1 for sidewalks are approximately 40% above those experienced in Salem lands to date. The unit rates might be envisioned for stand alone project costs. Please apply lower unit rates for the Secondary Plan DC road project costs. [Item D11]	The s/w unit price as part of a road project provided by the City's cost consultant is 43% higher than what's used for AT s/w projects.
30	DC 29	Parkland Development -Trails: #14 Can a complete list of individual off-road trail projects and their assumed timings be shown in the DC Study. Refer to DC Study page 139, section 3.4. [Item A17 and D14]	Details for off-road trails are included in the trails tab as part of the costing spreadsheets provided.
31	DC 30	Parkland Development -Trails: #15. Can the trail bridges and trail underpasses shown on page 240 and 241 be moved from the DC Roads list to the DC Parkland Trails list on page 139. Can the structures be incorporated into the applicable trail project that they will be constructed and claimed together with.	After further review and discussion, the Trail Bridges and Trail Underpasses included in the Roads and Related capital program have been moved to the Parks and Recreation capital program.
32	DC 31	Parkland Development -Trails: #16. Can the Gross Costs of DC Trail projects include the estimated hard and soft costs.	Soft costs are included in the total project costs.
33	DC 32	Wastewater Services -Collection (Secondary Plan Area): #17. Concerns were previously forwarded concerning the available hard cost unit rate estimating tables. Staff noted that revisions were made. The final versions of the tables not yet available as of May 1st. We will review technical information received subsequent to the May 1st meeting and may have additional comments at a latter date.	No actions required by City staff.
34	DC 33	Wastewater Services -Collection (Secondary Plan Area): #18. The project by project wastewater sewer estimate tables (similar to the roads projects), that show how the unit rates were applied to quantities and summed, are not yet available as of May 1st. Can the final updated wastewater estimate tables breaking down the proposed DC Gross Costs be provided. [Item C21] We have very briefly reviewed the technical information received subsequent to the May 1st meeting and this information has not been provided.	Additional information was added to the costing tables to show pipe sizes and length, construction method. The updated table was provided on May 2nd.
35	DC 34	Wastewater Services -Collection (Secondary Plan Area): #19. The estimates for the DC wastewater sewer projects are being updated for the 2023 DC Bylaw. The sewers in the Salem lands are generally assumed to be constructed as part of an overall ROW improvement project or new road (ie. not a stand alone project). Many of the DC projects listed in Salem lands have known contract costs or else have project cost reports completed based on detailed designs. Other project estimates are informed by the 2017 EA Study covering the Annex road corridors. There are few designs at the conceptual level per se. Despite the improved quality of project cost information available for the most costly of the projects, concerns were forwarded that the available DC costing information shows excessive soft cost and contingency percentage mark ups (eg. 111%) being added to the updated hard cost estimates. While the percentage markups can be higher for projects smaller than the DC projects, typically the design, contract administration, and construction contingency costs would collectively sum up to 20% based on typical experiences excluding EA soft cost expenditures). [Item C20]	As noted in our workshops and previous correspondence: WW projects cost update utilized contract costs or EA estimates where available for projects that have advanced since the MP completion. Other projects that have not been advanced are costed using unit costs provided by the City's cost consultant, and necessary soft costs and contingencies are considered to form the total project costs. Soft costs include: - Project management - Technical works (e.g. study, design, review) - Survey and other investigations - Contract administration - Site inspections For water and wastewater linear projects, a total of 93% for soft costs and contingencies are considered, based on current City's project cost reports recommendations. Please also see response above for #4
36	DC 35	Wastewater Services -Collection (Secondary Plan Area): #20. There are tributaries external to Barrie and located in Innisfil affecting the size and usage of the following DC wastewater sewer projects e.g. the Hewitts Creek Trunk Sewer projects (Lockhart Road to Mapleview). Can the share of the external tributary be tracked for future recovery and captured in PPB assessments on these projects. [Item C6] Refer also to DC projects 2.1.9 and 2.1.10.	The City has recently made the decision to continue to upsize sewers on the Hewitts Trunk to allow for future external servicing. The cost in the DC is the cost of a pipe without external servicing. This will have no impact on the proposed DC rates. It is recognized that the share of future external servicing needs to be tracked for future recovery. However, the technical and costs requirements will have to be refined/confirmed through the next master plan and DC update.

37	DC 36	<p>Wastewater Services -Collection (Secondary Plan Area): #21. There are tributaries external to Barrie and located in Innisfil affecting the size and usage of the following DC wastewater sewer projects e.g. Huronia sewers (Lockhart Road to south Annex limit. Can the share of the external tributary be tracked for future recovery and captured in PPB assessments on these projects. [Item C5] Refer also to DC projects 2.1.4 and 2.1.5. We understand the design of the Huronia sewers is now completed, and that the sewer shaft at the Huronia/McKay intersection will include a drop pipe to 11m depth, resulting in significant increased downstream sewer DC project costs (Lockhart to McKay). The need for this depth is not clear. Available project information is dated and incomplete. Can the project cost reports and latest complete sewer design drawings with design sheets be forwarded? We understand the minimum pipe size of DC project 2.1.4 Huronia sewer (Lockhart to McKay) has recently been increased due to minimum microtunnelling diameter considerations from that shown by the DC project description. Can the description be updated.</p>	<p>Previous response on Feb. 24, 2023</p> <p>We have reviewed the information from the 2019 Master Plan and the Ainley design currently underway for these sewers to determine if these pipes are planned to service land from Innisfil. This review is summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In 2019, while the design was in its early stages, the question was asked of Ainley, what changes would be required to service land from Innisfil. They provided feedback that lowering the grades of the sewers would allow a gravity pipe to service the lands. At that time, the City provided direction to Ainley NOT to make any design changes to service lands outside Barrie. -The current Ainley design does have a pipe size larger the specified in the 2019 Master Plan but this increase is to allow for the method of construction to be microtunnelling and not to provide additional capacity for lands from Innisfil. -The 2019 Master Plan, does not include any flow allowance for flows from Innisfil. -Innisfil's latest master plans and recent projects do not consider any servicing from Barrie. -No PPB is proposed to allow for servicing of Innisfil. 																																												
38	DC 37	<p>Wastewater Service -Facilities: #22. Can calculations be provided to support the 44% PPB assessed to the Primary Digester project whose capacity will be reached in Year 2064. Our memo of Jan 7, 2022 calculated there would be a 52% PPB applicable based on populations. [Item C6] Also refer to WW Facilities DC project 1.1.3.</p>	<p>Using the projected AD ww flows from Table 5-1 of the MP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From 2031 to 2041 (In-Period) flows: 19,024 m3/d - From 2041 to 2064 (Post-Period) flows: 14,690 m3/d - PPB %: 14,690/(19,024+14,690) = 44% 																																												
39	DC 38	<p>Wastewater Service -Facilities: #23. Can the calculations supporting phosphorous related BTE be provided. [Item C8] Refer to WW Facilities DC projects.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="950 730 1388 919"> <thead> <tr> <th>Flow</th> <th>(limit of technology) mg/litre</th> <th>Current WWTF Design</th> <th>TP Limit (kg/year)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>48.77</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>2314.14</td> <td>2774</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>2372.50</td> <td>2774</td> </tr> <tr> <td>55</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>2609.75</td> <td>2774</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>2847.00</td> <td>2774</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>3084.25</td> <td>2774</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>3321.50</td> <td>2774</td> </tr> <tr> <td>76</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>3606.20</td> <td>2774</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limit</td> <td>58.5</td> <td>2774.00</td> <td>2774</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Before Limit</td> <td>9.7</td> <td>36%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>After Limit</td> <td>17.5</td> <td>64%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Flow	(limit of technology) mg/litre	Current WWTF Design	TP Limit (kg/year)	48.77	0.13	2314.14	2774	50	0.13	2372.50	2774	55	0.13	2609.75	2774	60	0.13	2847.00	2774	65	0.13	3084.25	2774	70	0.13	3321.50	2774	76	0.13	3606.20	2774	Limit	58.5	2774.00	2774	Before Limit	9.7	36%		After Limit	17.5	64%	
Flow	(limit of technology) mg/litre	Current WWTF Design	TP Limit (kg/year)																																												
48.77	0.13	2314.14	2774																																												
50	0.13	2372.50	2774																																												
55	0.13	2609.75	2774																																												
60	0.13	2847.00	2774																																												
65	0.13	3084.25	2774																																												
70	0.13	3321.50	2774																																												
76	0.13	3606.20	2774																																												
Limit	58.5	2774.00	2774																																												
Before Limit	9.7	36%																																													
After Limit	17.5	64%																																													
40	DC 39	<p>Wastewater Service -Facilities: #24. Can PPB assessments be provided for the MBR Retrofit project. Refer to WW Facilities DC project 1.1.6.</p>	<p>See response above for #39. 76MLD is required for 2041 therefore there is no PPB for the MBR retrofit project.</p>																																												
41	DC 40	<p>Water Services -Distribution (Secondary Plan Area): #25. Concerns were previously forwarded concerning the available hard cost unit rate estimating tables. Staff noted that revisions were made but final versions not yet available as of May 1st. We will review technical information received subsequent to the May 1st meeting and may have additional comments at a latter date.</p>	<p>No actions required by City staff.</p>																																												
42	DC 41	<p>Water Services -Distribution (Secondary Plan Area): #26. The project by project watermain estimate tables (similar to the roads projects), that show how the unit rates were applied to quantities and summed, are not yet available as of May 1st. Can the final updated watermain estimate tables breaking down the proposed DC Gross Costs be provided. [Item C10] We have very briefly reviewed the technical information received subsequent to the May 1st meeting and this information has not been provided.</p>	<p>Information provided on May 2nd. No actions required by City staff.</p>																																												
43	DC 42	<p>Water Services -Distribution (Secondary Plan Area): #27. The estimates for the DC watermain projects are being updated for the 2023 DC Bylaw. The pipes shown in the Salem lands are generally assumed to be constructed as part of an overall ROW improvement project or new road (i.e.. not a stand alone project). However, in Salem lands, approximately 2km of stand alone watermain projects and approximately 2km of watermain contained in ROW upgrade projects have construction contract costs available. Other project estimates are informed by the 2017 EA Study covering the Annex road corridors. There are few designs at the conceptual level per se. Despite the improved quality of project cost information available, concerns were forwarded that the available DC costing information shows excessive soft cost and contingency percentage mark ups (e.g. 109%) being added to the updated hard cost estimates. While the percentage markups can be higher for projects smaller than the DC projects, typically the design, contract administration, and construction contingency costs would collectively sum up to 20% based on typical experiences and recent Developer led projects in Salem lands (which also had no additional EA soft cost expenditures). [Items C11 and C12]</p>	<p>The soft cost and contingency percentage was updated to 93%. For projects that have progressed (e.g. EA, detailed design, tender) since the MP, newest costs are used. Notes regarding those projects have been identified in the May 2nd costing table. For further details regarding the soft cost and contingencies, please see response above (#4, #7).</p>																																												
44	DC 43	<p>Local Service Policy: #28. A number of concerns with the wording and intentions of the Local Service Policy were forwarded on Feb 16, 2023 related to Transportation, Stormwater, Water Distribution, and Parkland Development. We request a meeting be convened to discuss the intentions and wording of the proposed Local Service Policy.</p>	<p>This is same as comment #9/DC 8. See response above.</p>																																												

45	DC 44	One Urban is concerned that the development charge rates proposed through the DC Study and the DC By-law are the result of an overestimation of the development-related capital costs identified in the study. In addition, we are of the opinion that the DC Study contains various inaccurate assumptions as related to post-period benefit and benefit to existing.	It is the City's opinion that the assumptions used in the Background Study are fair and reasonable.
46	DC 45	Notwithstanding these concerns, pursuant to section 26.2(1) of the Development Charges Act, the development charge rates applicable to the Development will be "frozen" at the time our client's the Site Plan Control application was made, being December 23, 2020. That frozen development charge rate is applicable up to two (2) years from the date One Urban's Site Plan Control application is approved by the City, which has not yet occurred. We understand that City staff share the above interpretation of the application of section 26.2 of the Act to the Development. In the event that this is not the case, One Urban reserves its right to pursue its concerns with the proposed DC Study and DC By-law as may be required.	The Site Plan was indeed applied for in December of 2020. The DC rates have been frozen plus indexing at the City's Weighted Average Cost since that time and are set to expire in June of 2023, 2 years after the Application had been approved with conditions in June of 2021.
51	DC 46	Hard Services cost estimates have inflated soft costs and contingencies: the inflation assumptions used by the City to estimate the soft cost and contingencies for water, wastewater and roads projects are overstated.	See responses above (#4 and #7)
52	DC 47	Costs associated with phased road projects are inflated: the City's 20% premium on phased road project is unreasonable as the premium is being applied to the entire project cost and not just the latter phases.	See response above (#8)
53	DC 48	Outstanding comments on Local Service Guidelines: outstanding comments on the local service guidelines have not been addressed by Staff.	This is same as comment #9/DC 8. See response above.
54	DC 49	Library Services: #1 - Please provide additional information as to why the Downtown Branch library has increased in size in the level of service calculations from the materials circulated in February (41,204 sf to 46,000 sf).	The information provided in February 2023 was circulated as a "draft" and subject to further review. The size of the libraries included in the inventory was reviewed further based on new information provided by RBL following the release of draft information which resulted in the gross floor area associated with the Downtown Branch being corrected. This is the most recent evaluated square footage for the facility, whereas it was previously an outdated assumption.
55	DC 50	Parks and Recreation: #2 - Please provide further details as to why the land area associated with indoor recreation facilities has increased from 3.6 ha (February circulated materials) to 13.16 ha in the Barrie DCBS.	See response to Question 10.
56	DC 51	Parks and Recreation: #3 - Can the City please provide further details which underpin the size assumptions for the Hewitt's and Salem indoor recreation facilities? From the correspondence provided by the City, the Hewitt's Recreation Center is proposed to be 224,554 sf, which is approximately 72,000 sf larger than the next largest indoor recreation facility in the City (East Bayfield Community Centre at 152,331 sf). Are there special amenities/uses that are expected to be included in these facilities?	As identified in the 2017 Hewitt + Salem Mixed-Use Recreation Centre and Library Conceptualization Study, recreation space required between the Hewitt and Salem recreation centres based on anticipated population growth. The Hewitt recreation centre will be the city's larger premier facility, with the Salem recreation centre being a smaller community-based centre, similar in size to the Peggy Hill Team Community Centre. The functional programs identified a gross floor area (GFA) of 239,946 sf (Rec: 224,554 sf; Library: 15,392 sf) for the Hewitt Recreation Centre + Library. The facility will include space for aquatics (10 lane swimming pool), fitness centre, gymnasium (double), multi-purpose rooms, facility support, arena as well as rental/partner space.
57	DC 52	Parks and Recreation: #4 - Why has the replacement cost of "Neighbourhood Parks" increased by 180% (\$436,000 vs. \$800,000) when compared to the materials circulated in February 2023? This has contributed to an increase of the maximum funding envelope for Parks and Recreation services by \$16.3 million when compared to the materials circulated in February.	After reviewing recent tenders it was determined that the \$436,000/ha value was significantly understated, the \$800,000 reflect recent tenders. In addition, the updated cost was benchmarked with similar municipalities to ensure reasonableness.
58	DC 53	Parks and Recreation: #5 - Can further project specific details (timing and capital costs) be provided for the projects which are included in 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 (off-road and hiking trails) of the Parks and Recreation development related capital program?	Please refer to the City's ATMP and the relevant chapters for trail planning. The timing is ultimately subject to the pace of development. Our current budget includes a future forecast based on the best information that has been received from the development community but is something that is revisited annually.
59	DC 54	Roads Level of Service: #6 - When compared to materials circulated in February, arterial and collector road unit costs have increased from \$3.6 million and \$4.3 million to \$12.0 million and \$8.9 million. Can the City please provide an explanation for this increase as it has impacted the overall funding envelope.	As part of the 2023 DC Background Study, the roads and related historical inventory costs were examined and updated (similar to the capital program costs). The qualitative replacement costs reflect the latest information arising from the cost review analysis prepared by the City's consultants. The funding envelope has been calculated based on the new legislative requirements of using a 15-year historical planning horizon as opposed to the 10-year historical planning horizon previously required as per the Development Charges Act. The 2023 Roads and Related funding envelope is a result of the updated qualitative and quantitative unit cost assumptions, the 15-year historical planning horizon requirement and historical population and employment growth in the City.
60	DC 55	General Services - Historical Level of Service Calculations: #7 - The Development Charges Act and implementing regulations require that the historic service levels be calculated based on the replacement cost of existing facilities, which should be based on the quality and quantity of those existing facilities. How has the City determined the quality of existing facilities is the same as new facilities used as a proxy for replacement costs?	To meet the requirements of the DCA, quantity is expressed in various units (land size, etc.), and quality is based on the current replacement costs of the facilities. Estimated replacement costs most often include a review of most recent tender costs and other applicable data. As per Section 4 of the DCA, the quality is expressed in replacement costs of what it would cost to replace the asset today. The costing reflects current building code standards, requirements and how facilities are constructed in the City. This is aligned with best practices of municipalities across Ontario.