

Transcript of exchange between committee member Garry Leveck and MPW Phil Dwyer at the July 29, 2011 Sauble Sewer Ad Hoc Committee meeting

GL: Phil, at the July meeting in 2010, the public meeting ...

PD: Yes

GL: which I wasn't able to attend ... was there a recommendation put forward for a preferred option at that meeting?

PD: Yes there was. And the reason that there was a preferred option put forward was to give some point of reference ... because people were coming to this meeting not really having a point of reference ... and within the EA you can make a preferred starting point and that was all that was intended to do. It was not intended that if somebody wanted to say ... I believe it was option three that was put forward as the preferred option but it was ... it did not mean that somebody couldn't say well I prefer 2, or I prefer 4.

GL: I understand.

PD: So, it was just to give a reference point for sewers.

GL: I understand the process. I think what I'm driving here at, getting at, is that ... I thought the preferred option at that time was the DCA ... sort of the consolidated downtown core area ... and I think what I'm concerned about is the process in the EA ... that from that meeting to the thanksgiving meeting, the preferred option changed.

PD: Based on the responses that we heard from people, and, all of those documents are upstairs. Most of the people were looking at between a 4 or a 5, and ... what we came up with was a 5a. So, it was never intended that we would go ahead and build a seventy million dollar system. It was intended that we would capture probably in the neighbourhood of twenty-six, to twenty-eight million dollars as a phase one ... and even that might have to be broken out into two phases. But, to start digging and put it in all at one time was never a consideration.

GL: I think, I know, I'm going to just pursue this, if you don't mind, to get there in my mind the process that just happened. In July, whatever the system that was recommended or preferred at that meeting. There's a difference between recommended and preferred in the EA process. Up until council approves the preferred option, it's not a recommended one, OK, it's a preferred one ... and so at that meeting ... I was just trying to get in my mind that there was responses from the public on the preferred option ... and it was based on that preferred

option ... I think perhaps I'm concerned that there was a misstep in the process because in October, which is the next point of contact with the public, ... there was a jump over to another preferred option ... without an opportunity for consultation in between, and you need to have that. In the EA process, and you know I think you know this Phil, is that when you go to the public there's points of contact in the schedule process, and this is an addendum to the original schedule "C" process that we're dealing with here, but the rules are the same ... and ... it's my understanding, anyway from my experience in the process, that I would never, on an EA process... be caught by going with a new preferred option ... based on public response to the preferred option that was presented originally ... without having an intervening opportunity for them to... because what's happened is that preferred option at the second meeting has become now, in the report by Genivar, as the recommended option ... and so there was never any opportunity in my mind for the public ... and you heard the response from the October meeting.

PD: Yes but I do not believe that it was based on rational thought ...

GL: Well, maybe it would have been a different response if there was that intervening opportunity to say we changed the option ...

Phil: Well the opportunity was presented at the second meeting, I mean ...

GL: But there hasn't been an opportunity since then other than this report Phil ... this is now on paper as a recommended option ...

PD: Yes it is.

GL: And yet, in October we heard strongly from the public that this isn't acceptable ...

PD: Ah, what you heard from the public in October was an outcry, because of misinformation indicating that the systems, per property, were going to be \$40,000. That was never put forward, ever. ... There are those in the community, for whatever reason, ... have chosen to take a opposition to any thought regarding sewers, and the misinformation out there was absolutely tremendous leading up to the October meeting. That's what we were reacting to.

GL: I don't want you to take me the wrong way here, I'm just trying to explore ... I hope we don't get personal here, I'm just trying to make sure we ...

PD: I'm not getting personal, I just telling you what people were reacting to ...

GL: But I think that ... I was at that meeting, and probably everybody here was at that meeting, and I was hearing dollar values of six point some odd million was the grant...

PD: Correct.

GL: That hadn't changed ...

PD: That's correct.

GL: And now the project costs per lot is going to be in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars per lot ... I'm not sure about the forty ... but ... it was going to be significant ...

PD: That's correct.

GL: And now of course the report is now telling us that it is two-thirds grant which is a heck of a lot more than six point some odd million dollars ... of twenty seven million ...

PD: But, Garry if I may, this was what we were putting forward ... and I was the driver on it ... I stand up to that. Would I recommend going ahead without additional grants ... absolutely not? But what I had to report out to the public was ... I have six million ... it's going to cost twenty eight ... if we go at this ... this is what it's going to cost ... but, I would never put forward to council with that.

GL: I think that's probably what the message that came across at that meeting, that ...

PD: But I can't tell people ... that ... I can't tell people what the cost is going to be if I have two thirds funding because I don't have it.

GL: Well, why didn't we go back to the public then with another meeting, saying Ok we're still going to recommend this plan 5a ... but, but I think now ... based on discussions with or at good roads, whatever it was you were at,

PD: Yes

GL: that ... we may be able to apply for something greater than the six point some odd million. I think there would be a different response if people knew that the cost was now going to be twelve thousand dollars per lot, something along that order, as opposed to twenty five to say even thirty ... and these are estimated costs,

PD: that's correct

GL: and you know that the tenders came in twenty per cent higher than what the original costs, and as an engineer I always know, unless you have a big contingency allowance built in, you've got to be prepared for escalation. I mean even as you go per year, each year you wait ...

PD: That's correct.

GL: the cost goes up.

PD: That's correct. And, and I totally agree with you. What we did on the basis of coming up with a dollar value of this plan was we took the prices that we had received in January, ... applied a percentage to them, and there, I can tell you there is a good contingency in there, because there are unknowns that ... we don't run into in other municipalities ... there's consultations with the aboriginal peoples in the area ... and that is more than just ... Saugeen Indians ... you also have to ...consult with the Metis ... and there are about seven in the area that are represented ... again ... archeological studies will be required, natural heritage studies will be required, so we built in some healthy dollar values there.

GL: I guess I can assume because the ad hoc committee has been structured by council ... that this report has not been filed in the public record yet.

PD: No it has not.

GL: And, It's waiting for this report?

PD: It is waiting to determine if ...

GL: So one of the recommendations that this ad hoc committee could be, potentially, I'm not saying it will be, could be, a recommendation to go back to the public for another meeting to present the new results of this report before it is filed on the public record ... because whenever you do a filing, you want to be sure that you're not going to get part two orders

PD: Correct. And that's certainly...

GL: You want to avoid these as much as you can, because what that does is it just delays the process

PD: Absolutely and that certainly could be a recommendation out of this committee.

GL: So, I just want people to know that.