

# MINUTES

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

**PUC BOARDROOM  
325 GRAND AVE E**

**MAY 26, 2005  
4:00 PM**

---

PRESENT: Chairman Bryon Fluker, Commissioners Janet McGuigan, Jim Brown, Tom McGregor, Joe Faas, General Manager, Water & Wastewater Services, Jack Sonneveld, Director, Scott Prail and Facility, Systems Manager, Rob Bernardi.

ABSENT: Commissioner Frank Vercooterren, Mayor Diane Gagner and Acting CAO Gerry Wolting.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Bryon Fluker called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM.

**2. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

NONE

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a) April 21, 2005

**Moved by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner McGregor.**

**“That the minutes of April 21, 2005 Regular Meeting be approved.”**

**Motion carried**

**4. REPORTS**

a) Creek Road Waterline Extension

MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**TO:** PUC Chairperson and Commissioners  
**FROM:** Jeannie Medeiros  
Technical Assistant/Projects Co-ordinator,  
Water & Wastewater Services  
**DATE:** May 26, 2005  
**SUBJECT:** Creek Road Waterline Extension  
(Former Township of Dover)

---

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that:

1. The proposed Creek Road Waterline Extension Project not proceed at this time.
2. The property owners along the Creek Road are informed by letter of the vote results and the PUC action.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Creek Road petition was submitted to the Chatham-Kent Public Utilities Commission in October 2004 from residents along Creek in the former Township of Dover.

## **COMMENTS**

The service area would see the construction of a 150 mm waterline to be connected to the existing main on Creek Line, just west of Bear Line and extend to the existing main on Creek Line at the Pain Court limits for a distance of 3225 meters.

A total of eighteen (18) residential land parcels and seven (7) vacant agricultural parcels exist along this portion of the petitioned area.

Dillon Consulting Limited prepared an estimated cost for the proposed waterline. The estimated cost for the project, including engineering but excluding GST is \$185, 730.00 The estimated cost per connection for the proposed Creek Road waterline extension, including the 2005 Part 12 Charge is \$8395.25.

**Details of the project and the estimated cost per connection were presented to the benefiting property owners at a public meeting held on March 1, 2005 at Immaculée Conception Presbytère Church Hall in Paincourt and by mail using a ballot page and information package.**

It was indicated that the PUC and Council would require that a majority were in favour of the project and, that as a guideline, 66% of the returned votes should support the project before administration would recommend that the project proceed to construction. The wording on the ballot page indicated that the project would be evaluated based on the number of returned ballots.

An information and vote package describing the proposed extension project and costs associated was distributed to the benefiting owners on March 2, 2005. A ballot was included with the return date of May 16, 2005. Eighty - five percent (85%) of the property owners returned the ballots. The ballot results were forty-seven percent (47%) in favour of proceeding with the project.

Based on the approved Waterline Assessment Policy requiring 66% support, it is our recommendation that the PUC not proceed with providing water servicing to the residences along the Creek Road at this time and that the property owners are notified by letter, of the vote results and the PUC action.

## **COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN**

The recommendations in this report support the following objectives and strategic directions:

A: Health- We are a healthy community

A1: Provide sufficient capacity to sustain community health and economic growth

B. Economy-We are a prosperous community

B3: Maintain and enhance new and existing infrastructure to support economic and smart growth opportunities

C. Environment-We are a green community

C2: Establish standards for environment excellence

### **Desired Outcomes / Proposed Activities**

- Advocate for essential provincial and federal investment and equitable tax policies to support financing and effective operation of sustainable transportation systems, water, sewer and waste management services.
- Support new infrastructure investments and modernize existing infrastructure.
- Maintain and improve the quantity and quality of ground and surface waters
- Increase the number of homes, businesses and farms on municipal water and sewage
- Establish proactive approach to maintain integrity of our lakes and rivers

**The recommendations will not adversely impact the remainder of the Community Strategic Plan.**

## **CONSULTATIONS**

Dillon Consulting Limited prepared the preliminary engineering information.

**A public meeting was held on March 1, 2005 at Immaculée Conception Presbytère Church Hall in Paincourt.**

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no associated costs with the recommendations of this project.

Prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeannie Medeiros  
Technical Assistant/Projects Co-ordinator

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Sonneveld  
General Manager  
Chatham-Kent PUC

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerry Wolting, B.Math, CA.  
Acting CAO

**Moved by Commissioner McGregor and seconded by Commissioner Faas.**

**“That the proposed Creek Road Waterline Extension Project not proceed at this time.**

**The property owners along the Creek Road are informed by letter of the vote results and the PUC action.”**

**Motion carried**

**b) Bates Subdivision Waterline Extension**

**MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT**

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**TO:** PUC Chairperson and Commissioners  
**FROM:** Jeannie Medeiros  
Technical Assistant/Projects Coordinator,  
Water & Wastewater Services  
**DATE:** May 26, 2005  
**SUBJECT:** Bates Subdivision Waterline Extension  
North of Kent Bridge Road  
(Community of Harwich)

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that:

1. The proposed Bates Subdivision Waterline Extension (North of Kent Bridge Road) proceed.
2. All property owners in the Bates Subdivision area are informed by letter of the vote results and the PUC action.

**BACKGROUND**

Originally, the Bates Subdivision area was included in the Southeast Kent / Rondeau Bay Waterline Project. The project area showed support, however, water servicing in the Bates Subdivision area was not able to proceed due to insufficient support in the area.

Taking into consideration the continued requests from Bates Subdivision since February 2005, the area required further review for the possibility of servicing. These requests have been addressed in our previous report dated February 24, 2005. In that report, we promised to review the water service area in the Bates Subdivision and report back to the Chatham-Kent Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

**COMMENTS**

A total of sixty-three (63) residential land parcels exist in the petitioned area. From February 2005 to May 2005, twenty-six (26) of the properties in the petitioned area have contacted the PUC with a request for water servicing. A site plan of the respective area is attached.

Dillon Consulting Limited prepared an estimated cost for the proposed waterline. The estimated cost for the project, including engineering is \$129, 002.00 but excludes GST. The estimated cost per connection for the proposed Bates Subdivision waterline extension is \$6,142.95 based on an area rate policy which includes a total of twenty-one (21) water service connections.

Details of the project and the estimated cost per connection were presented to the benefiting property owners at an informal meeting held on April 14, 2005 at the Blenheim Fire Hall. An information package was also sent by mail to the affected property owners. The intention of the meeting and information package was to discuss the cost of servicing all interested property owners at full cost without assessing non-participating land owners, what the later connection cost would be, and how long that premium would be in effect.

It was indicated at the meeting and in the information package that if there are twenty-two (22) or more properties interested in the water servicing policy, the assessment will not be any less than \$6,128.00, which is the estimated assessment for the Southeast Kent / Rondeau Bay waterline project.

The following table summarizes the connection cost information provided to the participating property owners.

<b>Typical Water Service Connection Charge</b>	
<b>Scenario</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Total Cost of Project	\$129,002.00
Number of Connections	21*
Cost per Connection	\$6,142.95
Number of Connections	22*
Cost per Connection	\$6,128.00

\* Potential connections

It was indicated to the participating property owners, that the PUC and Council would require that a majority were in favour of the project and that as a guideline, seventeen (17) or more of the returned connection request form should support the project before administration would recommend that the project proceed to construction. The wording on the connection request form indicated that the project would be evaluated based on the number of participates.

An information and request form package describing the proposed extension project was distributed to the benefiting owners on April 17, 2005. A connection request form was included with a note stating that the forms be mailed out to the PUC by May 6, 2005. Twenty-one (21) possible property owners returned the request forms requesting water.

**CONSULTATIONS**

Property owners of the proposed area attended an informal meeting on April 14, 2005 to discuss proposed water servicing costing.

Dillon Consulting Ltd. prepared the preliminary engineering information.

**COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT**

The recommendations in this report support the following objectives and strategic directions:

- A. Health: Providing a safe, caring and healthy environment
  - A2: Health: Providing adequate infrastructure to support, enhance and sustain existing and future growth.
- C. Environment: Sustaining and Enhancing our Environmental Assets
  - C3: Environment: Establish standards for environmental excellence.

**Expected Results**

- Increase user satisfaction.

The recommendations will not adversely impact on the remainder of the Community Strategic Plan.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no costs related to these recommendations, all costs will be recovered from participating home owners, or the projects will not proceed.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Jeannie Medeiros  
 Project Coordinator, Chatham-Kent PUC

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Scott J. Prail, CET B. Comm.  
 Director, Chatham-Kent PUC

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Gerry Wolting, B. Math., CA.  
 Acting CAO

**Moved by Commissioner Faas and seconded by Commissioner McGregor.**

**“That the proposed Bates Subdivision Waterline Extension (North of Kent Bridge Road) proceed.**

**All property owners in the Bates Subdivision area are informed by letter of the vote results and the PUC action.”**

**Motion carried**

c) Bloomfield Industrial Park

**MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**TO** PUC Chairperson and Commissioners  
**FROM** Jack Sonneveld,  
General Manager, Chatham-Kent PUC  
**DATE** May 26, 2005  
**SUBJECT** Bloomfield Industrial Park  
Internal Servicing Phase I

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that:

1. Contract T05-142, Internal Servicing (Phase I) at the Bloomfield Industrial Park, be awarded to A-Xcavating Limited at the tendered price of \$789,049.54, including GST.
2. The Chairperson and the General Manager be authorized to sign the necessary agreements.

**BACKGROUND**

Warren Gibson Ltd. recently purchased a 4.74 acre lot at the Bloomfield Industrial Park. The trunk water and sewer servicing to the Industrial Park is completed but the interior area requires servicing.

Dillon Consulting prepared the drawings and specifications for Phase I Internal Servicing Contract for the Bloomfield Industrial Park. The project includes the following items:

1. Installation of 570 m of 300 mm watermains
2. Installation of 550 m of 300 mm sanitary sewers
3. Installation of 550 m of storm sewers (450 mm-600mm)
4. Roadway Construction

The estimated cost for the project was \$754,000.00, not including GST.

**COMMENTS**

Five (5) bids were received for the Bloomfield Industrial Park, Phase I Servicing Contract and they are summarized as follows:

<b>Bloomfield Industrial Park Phase I Servicing Contract No T05-142</b>	
A-Xcavating Ltd. 200 Fourth St., Rodney	\$789,015.02
Henry Heyink Construction Limited Chatham, Ontario	\$858,782.00
Sherway Contracting RR #1, Windsor	\$918,985.76
Goodreau Excavating Ltd, P.O. Box 640, Tilbury	\$1,033,717.79

Ben Bruinsma and Sons Ltd Box 1225, Chatham	\$1,043,662.81
--	----------------

The low tender from A-Xcavating Limited has been reviewed by Dillon Consulting. The tender includes a contingency allowance of \$25,000.00.

It is recommended that the Chatham-Kent PUC approve the award of the Bloomfield Industrial Park Phase I Servicing Contract No. T05-142, to A-Xcavating Limited at the tendered price of \$789,015.02, including GST.

**COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT**

The recommendations in this report support the following objectives and strategic directions:

A: Health - We are a healthy community.

**A1: Provide sufficient capacity to sustain community health and economic growth.**

B: Economy – We are a prosperous community.

**B3: Maintain and enhance new and existing infrastructure to support economic and smart growth opportunities.**

C: Environment: We are a green community.

**C2: Establish standards for environmental excellence.**

Desired Outcomes / Proposed Activities:

- Continue to expand and improve local transportation and other services that support a municipal-wide transportation network
- Support infrastructure investments and modernize existing infrastructure
- Maintain and improve the quantity and quality of ground and surface waters

The recommendations will not adversely impact on the remainder of the Community Strategic Plan.

**CONSULTATIONS**

Dillon Consulting Limited prepared the preliminary engineering information and reviewed the tenders submitted.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

All costs associated with the project will be recovered through the sale of property at the Bloomfield Industrial Park.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Sonneveld,  
General Manager,  
Chatham-Kent PUC

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerry Wolting, B.Math., CA  
Acting CAO, Chatham-Kent

**Moved by Commissioner McGregor and seconded by Commissioner McGuigan.**

**“That Contract T05-142, Internal Servicing (Phase I) at the Bloomfield Industrial Park, be awarded to A-Xcavating Limited at the tendered price of \$789,049.54, including GST.**

**The Chairperson and the General Manager be authorized to sign the necessary agreements.”**

**Motion carried**

d) Investigation and Upgrading of Ridgetown Well Fields

MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT  
**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**TO:** PUC Chairperson and Commissioners  
**FROM:** Jack Sonneveld  
General Manager, Chatham-Kent PUC

**DATE:** May 26, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Investigation and Upgrading of Ridgetown Well Fields

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that:

1. Administration proceeds with a Public Meeting for the Ridgetown Well Supply System on June 28, 2005 at the Ridgetown High School.

**BACKGROUND**

The Ridgetown area potable drinking water supplies are being drawn from a moderately deep aquifer located beneath the southeastern section within the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. These groundwater-based, drinking water supplies are generated through wells located in two well fields, one (Erie Street Well Field) located within the community Ridgetown and the second, (Scane Well Field) associated with the southwest corner of Ridgetown. The Chatham-Kent Public Utilities Commission (PUC) is responsible for the supply, treatment and distribution of this municipal water in Ridgetown.

A public presentation was held in the community of Ridgetown facilitated by the PUC and Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon) on October 27, 2004. Several key hydrogeologic and water supply issues were identified at the presentation that necessitated action by the PUC.

The quantification of aquifer capacity was required in order for the PUC to appropriately plan for future water infrastructure improvements. It was important to determine if additional groundwater resources could be developed within close proximity to Ridgetown, or whether future supplies (ground water or surface water) would be needed. To achieve this, it was essential to collect the necessary hydrogeologic data and provide a quantification of the local aquifer's production capacity.

The evaluation of wellhead integrity was also required because it was historically noted that construction methodologies used to complete several of the Ridgetown wells, may have resulted in potentially hazardous conditions.

The development of backup supply wells became critical to ensure a consistent and secure supply of water is always available for Ridgetown. At the present time, the production capacity of the six wells is sufficient (with backup storage) to meet the needs of the Ridgetown system. However, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) dictates that additional backup sources of supply must be available to meet system demand in times when all wells may not be in production.

The main purpose of the work was to review the requirements for upgrades to the existing system to meet safety requirements and also provide the PUC with the necessary information regarding the long-term viability of the groundwater resource.

**COMMENTS**

Dillon Consulting Limited has completed a detailed study of the Ridgetown Wellfields that included the following areas of review:

I. Ridgetown Area Geology

- a. Study area
- b. Geology
- c. Existing wells

II. Groundwater Production

- a. Cumulative production
- b. Scane wellfield production
- c. Layne/Harris/Hitch (Erie Street) production

III. Wellfield Water Levels

- a. Scane Wellfield hydrographs
- b. Erie Street Wellfield hydrographs
- c. LTVCA monitoring data.

IV. Well Structural Conditions

- a. Scane Wells
- b. Well 1A
- c. Harris Well
- d. Hitch Well

The review of the geologic and hydrogeologic conditions provided several indications of where improvements could be made to improve the Ridgetown potable water supply and distribution system.

**Additional Water Sources**

The development of additional water supplies in the most economic manner was reviewed. The options considered included: 1) development of a back up well in both the Scane and Erie Wellfields, 2) connection with the PUC-owned wells located approximately 3 kilometers west of town, and 3) connection to regional water mains in both Blenheim and Thamesville. The costs for all three scenarios were developed to allow a comparison of the best alternatives available to the PUC and the residents of Ridgetown.

As outlined below, Scenario #1 includes development of a new back-up well in both the Erie and Scane Wellfields, as well as several operational upgrades. Scenario #2 entails interconnecting the existing wells controlled by the PUC and most of the operational

upgrades to the Erie and Scane Fields. Scenario #3 entails costs generated by the Master Plan for connecting to the regional distribution systems at either Blenheim or Thamesville.

The estimated costs for the three scenarios are:

Scenario #1:	\$ 759,000
Scenario #2:	\$ 1,824,000
Scenario #3 (Thamesville):	\$ 2,950,000
Scenario #3 (Blenheim):	\$ 5,900,000

A detailed description of the activities and costs associated with all scenarios has been developed below.

### **Scenario #1: Back-up Well Development Option**

The following sections provide a brief description of the proposed activities under Scenario #1.

#### Well Structural Review Hitch (Well #2) and Harris (Well #3):

The construction of the existing wells involved drilling a large diameter (24") down to within a few feet of the aquifer and then drilling the well down through the large diameter hole (annulus) and down into the aquifer. The area around the well casing was backfilled with gravel. It is recommended that the annulus area at the Hitch (Well #2) and Harris (Well #3) be backfilled with bentonite material.

This will provide significantly increased water quality protection for the groundwater resource. The existing wellheads will also be raised above the exterior surface elevation.

#### Rehabilitation of Hitch (Well #2) and Harris (Well #3) Wells:

The pumping levels have declined in relation to the static water levels in the aquifer. This pattern is generally indicative of a decrease in well efficiency, whereby more energy is required to draw water into the well, and is generally reflected in a declining pumping water level. This occasionally occurs in older wells and can be corrected through a regime of well screen physical and/or chemical cleaning.

#### Backup Well Drilling:

While the incremental increase in water production resulting from the redevelopment of the Harris and Hitch wells will provide some additional water supplies, it is only recommended that the PUC develop additional water supplies to meet the MOE requirements for additional capacity.

The development of an additional well within each of the wellfields will provide suitable backup capacity and the potential for increasing water supplies in the future. These wells can be constructed within the existing infrastructure without significant capital expenditures. The placement of the new wells in close proximity to the existing infrastructure will limit the capital expenditures required to tie the new wells into the distribution system. The prospective locations of the backup wells will be determined following the identification of property ownership within the two fields and completing the geophysical testing.

#### Erie Wellfield Transmission Main Replacement

In order to efficiently continue to operate the wellfields, the existing collector 150 mm water main also requires replacement and should be upgraded to 200 mm. The transmission main connects the Harris and Hitch wells to the water treatment facilities located near the Layne Well at 45 Erie Street N. There were 12 major breaks in this line during 2004. The total length of the transmission main and connector lines is approximately 1500 meters. The estimated cost of this line replacement is \$200,000.

#### Water Reservoirs:

The review of the water supply also identified additional potable water storage requirements. The additional storage is required to:

- provide adequate storage to meet provincially mandated CT (disinfection contact time) requirements
- perform maintenance/cleaning that is required annually
- provide additional storage for fire fighting purposes.

It is recommended that 225 m<sup>3</sup> (60,000 US gallons) storage be constructed at the Scane Wellfield and 760 m<sup>3</sup> (200,000 US gallons) of additional storage be constructed at the Erie Street location. The estimated cost is \$ 419,000 and this includes the additional pump capacity required to assist with fire flow demands.

#### Methane Gas Removal Equipment:

The previous evaluations completed by Dillon Consulting Limited confirmed that the existing aeration equipment does not adequately remove the methane gas found in the ground water. It is recommended that the aeration equipment be upgraded. The estimated cost for an upgraded system is \$ 30,000.

#### Permit To Take Water:

The existing Permits To Take Water (PTTW) create a number of minor issues, particularly relating to the number of hours for taking water. It is recommended that the Ministry of the Environment be approached to investigate the unitizing of each of the PTTW for the wellfields.

In essence, when a production field is unitized, each of the permitted values are cumulated into a single production permit, thus allowing pumping based on the best schedule according to the PUC's economics or operational/maintenance schedules, as long as the total values are not exceeded.

This would allow the PUC to efficiently integrate the additional wells within the field and develop a pumping scenario (i.e. order of pump turn-on to meet increasing demand), or well idle schedule which fits the PUC's or community's specific needs.

#### Upgrades in System Telemetry

In order to efficiently operate and monitor the water production and treatment system several upgrades in the system telemetry will be required. This includes automated dialers and SCADA equipment to monitor water quality and quantity. The estimated cost of these upgrades is \$15,000.

#### Summary

In total the activities and cost components detailed above total to \$759,000.

#### **Scenario #2: Connection of Existing PUC Wells Option**

As noted previously, the PUC controls two wells, located approximately 3 kilometers west of town. This scenario identifies the process and estimated costs for connecting these wells to the Ridgetown distribution system.

#### Well Development

While the wells have been drilled, they would need to be outfitted with the appropriate pumps, controls and housing. We estimate the cost of these improvements to be \$25,000.

#### Connector and Transmission Main

The two wells are separated by approximately 1000 meters. Since it will be more economical to build a single water treatment facility, the construction of a connector main (estimated cost \$75,000) is required. Once the water has been treated, it will be transported through a three kilometer transmission main to interconnect to the existing Ridgetown distribution system. The estimated cost for the transmission main is \$500,000.

#### Water Treatment

At the well site, we have planned for the construction of methane removal and chlorination to address water potability. The estimated cost for these facilities is \$65,000.

#### High Lift Pump

The need for a large-scale pump is based upon the significant distance through which the water needs to be pumped. The cost for the construction of a pump station to service these wells is estimated to be \$100,000.

#### Electricity and System Controls

The site will require the development of three-phase power (estimated cost \$100,000) and automated system monitoring and controls (estimated cost \$25,000).

#### Water Storage

In order for the system to operate effectively, the development of a water storage tank is necessary. The cost for this feature is \$250,000.

#### Erie/Scane Wellfield Improvements

While the development of the distant wells does satisfy the need for an increase in water supplies, it will still be necessary to complete most of the wellfield improvements discussed in Scenario #1 (except for drilling the back-up wells). The cost for these improvements is estimated to be \$684,000.

#### Summary

In total the activities and cost components detailed above total to \$1,824,000.

#### **Master Plan Alternatives:**

The Master Plan for Water and Wastewater identified the possibility of supplying potable water from Blenheim to Ridgetown and ultimately to Thamesville and Bothwell. The estimate costs were:

- Blenheim to Ridgetown -\$5.9 million
- Ridgetown to Thamesville -\$2.95 million
- Thamesville to Bothwell (including Moravian on the Thames)- \$3.2 million.

Based on the estimated cost of \$759,000 to upgrade the existing Ridgetown well supply system, it is recommended that the East Chatham-Kent water supply issues be reviewed during the updating of the Master Plans which is tentatively scheduled for 2006.

#### **Summary of proposed recommendations (after presenting to the public for comments):**

1. It is recommended that the annulus area be backfilled with bentonite material and thus provide significant water quality protection for the groundwater resource.
2. It is recommended that the PUC develop an additional water supply well in both the Scane and Erie Wellfield areas.
3. The existing aeration systems be replaced and the 150 mm collector watermain be upgraded to 200 mm.
4. The Harris and Hitch Wells be cleaned through a regime of well screen physical and/or chemical cleaning.
5. That 225 m<sup>3</sup> storage be constructed at the Scane Wellfield and 760 m<sup>3</sup> of additional storage be constructed at the Erie Street location.
6. That an application be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment to utilize the Permits To Take Water for the Ridgetown Well Supply

**COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN**

The recommendation in this report supports the following objectives and strategic directions:

A: Health- We are a healthy community

A1: Provide sufficient capacity to sustain community health and economic growth

B. Economy-We are a prosperous community

B3: Maintain and enhance new and existing infrastructure to support economic and smart growth opportunities

C. Environment-We are a green community

C2: Establish standards for environment excellence

**Desired Outcomes / Proposed Activities**

- Advocate for essential provincial and federal investment and equitable tax policies to support financing and effective operation of sustainable transportation systems, water, sewer and waste management services.
- Support new infrastructure investments and modernize existing infrastructure.
- Maintain and improve the quantity and quality of ground and surface waters
- Increase the number of homes, businesses and farms on municipal water and sewage
- Establish proactive approach to maintain integrity of our lakes and rivers

**The recommendation will not adversely impact the remainder of the Community**

**CONSULTATIONS**

The Manager, Water & Wastewater Services South, worked directly with Dillon Consulting during the review of the Ridgetown Wellfield Water Supply. The public consultation is scheduled for June 28, 2005 at the Ridgetown High School.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The total projected cost for the entire undertaking is estimated to be \$759,000. The major expenditures (\$649,000) will not occur until 2006 and will be included in the Water Budget for 2006.

The telemetry upgrades, well remediation, construction of the backup wells and discussion with the Ministry of the Environment on the revised Permit To Take Water will be completed in 2005. \$110,000 is included in the 2005 Budget.

The recommended expenditures are summarized in the following table:

<b>Ridgetown Well Supply Upgrades Summary of Costs</b>	
<b><u>Description:</u></b>	<b><u>Estimated Cost:</u></b>
Telemetry Upgrades	\$ 15,000.00
Well remediation	\$ 20,000.00
Backup wells	\$ 75,000.00
Aeration equipment upgrades	\$ 30,000.00
Storage systems/pumps	\$419,000.00
Replacement collector main	\$200,000.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$759,000.00</b>

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Sonneveld  
General Manager,  
Chatham-Kent PUC

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Praill, C.E.T., B. Comm.  
Director,  
Chatham-Kent PUC

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerry Wolting, B.Math., CA  
Acting CAO, Chatham-Kent

**Moved by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner McGuigan.**

**“That Administration proceeds with a Public Meeting for the Ridgetown Well Supply System on June 28, 2005 at the Ridgetown High School.”**

**Motion carried**

e) Water Meter & Backflow Prevention Policy

**Municipality of Chatham-Kent**

**Public Utilities Commission**

**TO:** PUC Chairperson and Commission Members  
**FROM:** Jack Sonneveld,  
General Manager  
**DATE:** May 26, 2005  
**SUBJECT:** Water Meter & Backflow Prevention Policy

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that:

- 1. The revised Meter and Backflow Prevention Policy be approved.

**BACKGROUND**

The Chatham-Kent Public Utilities Commission approved a Water Meter and Backflow Prevention Policy in 2000. The policy included the requirement for all new water services in the rural area to have a backflow prevention device installed.

**COMMENTS**

The current Chatham-Kent PUC policy for back-flow prevention includes the requirement that all rural customers and all institutional, commercial and industrial services in Chatham-Kent be required to install back-flow prevention devices. The policy did not include the urban residential properties.

The revised policy also includes the requirement for backflow prevention devices on all fire service line installations.

It is recommended that the Chatham-Kent PUC adopt the revised policy (Appendix A) requiring all new urban and rural water service installations and all commercial, industrial and institutional water services in Chatham-Kent be required to install a Back-flow Prevention Device on the outgoing side of the meter.

**CONSULTATIONS**

Chatham-Kent Building services are currently requesting that all new residential water services have a backflow prevention device.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial impacts for the Chatham-Kent PUC.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Sonneveld  
General Manager, Chatham-Kent PUC

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerry Wolting, B.Math., CA.  
Acting CAO

**APPENDIX "A"**

Water Meter & Backflow Prevention Policy 2005:

1: The issuing of a Water Permit includes:

- the inspection of the water servicing on private property
- the issuance of a water meter
- setting up of an account
- commencement of billing within one (1) month

*Note: To cover an exception, the permit will be held from proceeding to the account set up and billing commencement until the condition that warranted exception is corrected, but not for a period exceeding three (3) months, upon written request to the PUC.*

- 2: All water supplied to any customer shall be metered. The meter must be located inside the building and not in a crawl space under the building.
- 3: Where in the opinion of the Manager, it is not practical to locate the meter inside the building to be served, the meter may be located in an approved crawl space or meter chamber outside such building, with the written approval of the approval of the Manager.
- 4: If a meter is damaged after it is installed through carelessness, or neglect, the owner of the premises shall pay the Commission the entire cost of repairing or replacing such damaged meter or its appurtenances attached thereto.
- 5: In all new residential installations and any replacements, the owner shall install a PUC supplied meter, installed horizontally, with a shut off valve on the incoming side and the outgoing side, and a Backflow Prevention Device on the outgoing side of the meter.
- 6: All institution, commercial and industrial customers must install Backflow Prevention Devices in all new and/or replacement services on the outgoing side of the water meter.
- 7: All fire service installations must have approved Backflow Prevention Devices installed on the service line.
- 8: The Manager or his appointed representative shall have the right to remove and test any meter, at any time or times or to substitute another meter for any defective meter in the opinion of the Manager, and the cost shall be the responsibility of the PUC.
- 9: The Manager or his appointed representative shall have the right to require the relocation of any meter which he deems to be improperly or inconveniently located and the cost of such relocation shall be paid by the owner of the building served by the meter.

**Moved by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner Faas.**

**“That the revised Meter and Backflow Prevention Policy be approved.”**

**Motion carried**

f) Coatsworth Road, King and Whittle Road Area Waterline Extension

**MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT**

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**TO:** PUC Chairperson and Commissioners

**FROM:** Jack Sonneveld,  
General Manager, Chatham-Kent PUC

**DATE :** May 26, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Coatsworth Road, King and Whittle Road Area  
Waterline Extension (Community of Tilbury East)

---

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that:

1. The Coatsworth Road and King and Whittle Road Area Watermain Servicing Contract, No. T05-127, be awarded to Sherway Contracting (Windsor) Limited at the tendered price of \$1,410,636.64, including GST.
2. The Chairperson and the General Manager be authorized to sign the necessary agreements.

**BACKGROUND**

The Coatsworth Road, King and Whittle Road Area petition was submitted to the Chatham-Kent Public Utilities Commission in January 2002 from residents along Coatsworth Road, King and Whittle Road, Grove Road, Gray Line, Rosedale Line, Hornick Line, Quinn Line, Carless Line and Herman Line in the Community of Tilbury East.

The proposed water distribution system will meet present and future demands associated with the service area derived from the petitions received. The distribution network for this area will be interconnected with the 600mm watermain along Wheatley Road and Middle Line and the 100mm and 150mm watermain along Goodreau Line. Twenty seven (27) residents located along King & Whittle Road, between Middle Line and Hornick Line, are currently serviced by a private 50mm watermain. It was anticipated that these residents were to be serviced by the proposed municipal water distribution system in the future.

The attached drawing identifies the proposed water distribution system that was considered to address the needs of the water service area. A water distribution system comprised of 45.5 km of 100mm watermains was proposed.

The estimated cost per connection for the proposed Coatsworth Road, King and Whittle Road Area waterline extension was \$15,010.00.

The twenty-seven property owners, currently connected to a "private 50 mm waterline", were offered a connection to the proposed new waterline at a reduced cost of \$7,505.00 or the option to defer connecting.

The estimated cost of \$202,635.00, for carrying the property owners that are currently connected to the private waterline, will be funded through the Capital Water Works Budget and recovered in the future.

**COMMENTS**

The pre-tender estimate, including GST, was \$1,558,000 for the proposed project. A total of three (3) tenders were received and they are summarized in the following table:

<b>Coatsworth Road and King &amp; Whittle Area Watermain Servicing Contract No. T05-127</b>	
<b>Contractor:</b>	<b>Tender amount: (including GST)</b>
Sherway Contracting (Windsor) Limited Windsor, Ontario	\$1,410,636.64
G.W. Clarke Drainage Contractors Blenheim, Ontario	\$1,538,568.49
Delway Contractors Chatham, Ontario	\$1,758,010.00

Todgham & Case Associates (T&C) have reviewed the tenders and a copy of their correspondence is attached.

The low tender received is 9% below the engineer's estimate and 10% below the average of the three tenders received. The final cost per connection will be calculated (including project costs, engineering and contingencies) following the completion of the project. The projected completion date is October, 2005.

<b>Project Cost Summary</b>	
Project cost	\$1,318,352.00
10% contingency allowance	\$ 131,835.20
Engineering	\$ 130,516.00
Total	\$1,580,703.20

T&C are satisfied that Sherway Contracting (Windsor) Ltd. has the required equipment and labour expertise to undertake the project.

It is recommended that the Chatham-Kent PUC award Contract No. T05-127 to Sherway Contracting (Windsor) Limited at the tendered price of \$1,410,636.64, including GST, and that the Chairperson and General Manager be authorized to complete the necessary agreements.

**COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN**

The recommendations in this report support the following objectives and strategic directions:

B: Economy: We are a prosperous community

B3: Maintain and enhance new and existing infrastructure to support economic and smart growth opportunities.

Desired Outcomes/Proposed Activities

- Support new infrastructure investments and modernize existing infrastructure.
- Provide a safe and adequate water supply to meet the needs of the growing community by maintaining high quality water and sewer facilities.

The recommendations will not adversely impact on the remainder of the Community Strategic Plan.

**CONSULTATIONS**

Todgham and Case Associates Ltd. prepared the detailed engineering information and reviewed the tenders submitted.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The costs associated with the project will be recovered through local assessment. The estimated cost of \$202,635.00 for the deferred portion of the project will be funded through the Capital Water Works Budget and be recovered in the future. A number of the residents currently connected to the private water line have expressed interest in connecting to the new water line.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Sonneveld,  
General Manager,  
Chatham-Kent PUC

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerry Wolting, B.Math, CA.  
Acting CAO

**Moved by Commissioner Faas and seconded by Commissioner McGuigan.**

**“That the Coatsworth Road and King and Whittle Road Area Watermain Servicing Contract, No. T05-127, be awarded to Sherway Contracting (Windsor) Limited at the tendered price of \$1,410,636.64, including GST.**

**The Chairperson and the General Manager be authorized to sign the necessary agreements.”**

**Motion carried**

**5. INFORMATION REPORTS****a) Water/Wastewater Revenue & Expenditure**

**MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT  
Public Utilities Commission**

“INFORMATION REPORT”

**TO:** PUC Chairperson and Commissioners

**FROM:** Jack Sonneveld  
General Manager, Chatham-Kent PUC

**DATE:** May 26, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Water/Wastewater Revenues and Expenditures

For information of the Commission.

**BACKGROUND**

The Summary of Revenues and Expenditures for water and wastewater are prepared monthly for the Commission's review and information.

The year-to-date revenues and expenditures (April, 2005) are on historical usage patterns and no significant variances are projected in 2005. The debt related payments have been projected based on twelve (12) equal monthly charges.

**OTHERS CONSULTED**

Chatham-Kent Utility Services prepared the summaries of budget information.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLACATIONS**

No budget impacts are anticipated at this time.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Sonneveld  
General Manager, Chatham-Kent PUC

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerry Wolting, B.Math, CA.  
Acting CAO

## b) Rural Waterline Assessment Policy Revision

MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT

### **PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

"INFORMATION REPORT"

**TO:** PUC Chairperson and Commissioners

**FROM:** Jeannie Medeiros  
Technical Assistant/Projects Co-ordinator,  
Water & Wastewater Services

**DATE:** May 19, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Rural Waterline Assessment Policy Revision – To Account for  
Full Cost Recovery Waterlines Initiated by Local Area Residents

---

Information for the Commission

### **BACKGROUND**

The Chatham-Kent Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and the Municipality of Chatham-Kent have developed general principles for voting to initiate projects and a cost allocation formula for application on rural waterline extension projects.

The Rural Waterline Assessment Policy was approved on March 21, 2002. The policy applies to projects for rural municipal water servicing.

The PUC passed a motion to add a full cost recovery option to the Rural Waterline Assessment Policy at the February 24, 2005 Commission Meeting.

### **COMMENTS**

While current policies are very fair and the comments from the public are generally of a positive nature, a number of concerns have been brought forward after a waterline has been deemed defeated which needed to be addressed. In order to consolidate the recommendations we have amended the current Rural Waterline Assessment Policy which replaced the initiation, assessment, connection policies.

Currently the policy states that when there is public and neighbourhood interest in water main installation, but the presence of a water main is not required for general health and safety or Municipal interest, the project will be initiated by vote. The criteria will be a definite 66 % count in favour before a project will proceed. The support criteria of 66% will be based on the number of ballots returned.

In past waterline projects there has been a great deal of disappointment and frustration from property owners who were in favour of proceeding with the waterline, but the project did not have the required 66% support the project. Property owners who were in favour of past waterlines have indicated that they may be willing to pay for the entire installation costs if there is not the required support.

The commission has considered similar recommendations in the past, Communication Road/Hwy 401 Corridor Water Servicing Project, Thamesville Supply/Baseline Road Waterline, and a section of Wildwood Line on the Rondeau project, these projects allowed for owner to opt out of connections.

The goal is to provide water to the residence requesting it without carrying any additional debt. This will also avoid assessing any land owners that does not want the service.

The new policy will allow willing owners to opt in, and cover cost incurred by the local distribution system. The policy also promotes a common sense approach to encouraging participation. If an owner has a short term need for water (within 10 years) they would

consider participating to lower the assessed cost to all participating owners. There is no advantage to opt out, unless the property owner has no real need for a water service.

**COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN**

The recommendations in this report support the following objectives and strategic directions:

**C: Environment - Sustaining and enhancing our environmental assets**

C3: Establish standards for environmental excellence

**E: Leadership – Encourage community leadership that is supportive to the whole of Chatham-Kent**

E4: Achieve a balance between municipal wide identity and the uniqueness of each community

**Expected Results**

- Increase in the quality of air and water
- Decrease in division of voting on rural vs. urban issues by Council
- Greater acceptance of the reality of Chatham-Kent as one Municipality
- Reduction in the number of regionally based complaints

**The recommendations will not adversely impact on the remainder of the Community Strategic Plan.**

**CONSULTATION**

No other departments were consulted during the writing of this report.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial implications associated with this report.

Prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Jeannie Medeiros  
 Technical Assistant/Projects Co-coordinator  
 Chatham-Kent PUC

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Jack Sonneveld  
 General Manager  
 Chatham-Kent PUC

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Gerry Wolting, B.Math., CA  
 Acting CAO

**Moved by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner Faas.**

**Amendment to 5 (b) to add the petitioning policy to the Waterline Assessment Policy and to defer 3 (ii) Full Cost Recovery Waterlines Initiated by Local Area Residents.**

c) Mount Clemens Michigan Meeting

**MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT**

Public Utilities Commission

**“INFORMATION REPORT”**

**TO:** PUC Chairperson and Commissioners

**FROM:** Tom Kissner  
 Area Manager (North), Water/Wastewater Services  
 Chatham-Kent Public Utilities Commission

**DATE:** May 18, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Meeting (Mount Clemens, MI) – An Alternate Approach to  
 Effective Spill Response and Water Quality Monitoring

For information of the Commission

### **BACKGROUND**

A meeting was held on April 6, 2005 at the Macomb County Health Department in Mount Clemens, Michigan with regards to source water protection of the St. Clair River, real-time monitoring and spill response.

### **COMMENTS**

Macomb County, and their partners that surround Lake St. Clair, propose to implement a comprehensive water quality-monitoring program that builds upon proven successful programs. The monitoring program that is envisioned would initially be focused on the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and portions of the Detroit River. Where applicable, and where current ongoing programs or volunteer efforts exist, the program will include the monitoring of portions of the major tributary streams.

This program coordinates the efforts of several federal, state and local agencies and is funded from the federal, state and county levels of American government. A major portion of the funding will be utilized to purchase and install on-line analyzers at sites on the American side of the St. Clair River. These sites have yet to be determined. The remainder of the funding will develop and maintain a notification system to be used in the event of a spill or adverse raw water quality event.

Presently, water treatment facilities located on the Canadian side of the St. Clair River depend on notification from the Ministry of the Environment, Spills Action Centre, of any raw water quality issues or concerns. There is also a monitoring station located at Courtright, Ontario that is operated by the Samia Lamton Environmental Association (SLEA) that monitors the water of the St. Clair River for twenty chemical substances that are associated with oil refining and the production of petrochemicals.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

No others have been consulted.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial impacts associated with this report.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Kissner,  
Area Manager (North),  
Chatham-Kent PUC

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Sonneveld  
General Manager,  
Chatham-Kent PUC

**Moved by Commissioner McGregor and seconded by Commissioner Faas.**

**“To receive items A – C for information.”**

**Motion carried**

## **6. INFORMATION**

- a) Drinking Water Source Protection
- b) From MOE re: Proposed New Regulation for Drinking Water Systems Serving Non-Residential and Seasonal Residential Uses
- c) Chatham-Kent PUC contact listing (Commission use only)

**Moved by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner Faas.**

**“To receive the information and add contact number 352-6300 for after hours watermain issues, not #911 as per 360-1998 instructions.”**

**Motion carried**

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

NONE

8. **NEXT MEETING**

The next PUC Commission meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 16, 2005 at 4:00 PM at the PUC boardroom.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Moved by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner Faas.**

**“That the Regular meeting be adjourned at 5:05 PM.”**

**Motion carried**