

Township of Centre Wellington
2025 Development Charges Background Study
Questions & Answers

1. What is the definition of Attainable Housing?

The province has yet to define this term; however, our draft by-law has introduced the term for use once it has been defined via Provincial legislation.

2. For developer-initiated urban boundary expansions, the linear portion of water and wastewater is included in DCs, but what if development requires update to wastewater treatment or water supply?

Based on comments and discussions with the development community, the Local Service Policy has been revised to remove the Developer Initiated Urban Boundary section. With respect to studies; however, Developer Initiated Urban Boundary expansions will necessitate updates to Township master plans and the DC background study/by-law. As such, these will be required as a local service.

3. There appears to be a 2-tier system being proposed, one for lands in the urban boundary and none for those that are not in the urban boundary.

Based on comments and discussions with the development community, the Local Service Policy has been revised to remove the Developer Initiated Urban Boundary section. With respect to studies; however, Developer Initiated Urban Boundary expansions will necessitate updates to Township master plans and the DC background study/by-law. As such, these will be required as a local service.

4. How are capital projects determined?

Projects are from Council approved studies and reports, such as Master Plans. Where appropriate, projects and capital costs are identified by staff and confirmed by Council through the background study process.

5. There appears to be land acquisition costs included when they shouldn't be?

Examples:

- a. Table 5-1: Wastewater Facilities, Project 6**
- b. Table 5-3: Water Facilities Project 8 (double counted with Land in Table 5-9, Project 4?)**

With respect to item a, this project did include land. This has been revised to remove land in the addendum report. With respect to item b above, the cost related to land acquisition has been removed from Table 5-3.

6. Active and passive recreational land were assigned the same development cost, please explain?

The development cost is a weighted average of active and passive parkland. The cost was based on recent parkland development for the following parks:

- Farley
- Harrison
- Forfar
- Granwood
- Kirvan

7. What's the rationale for including so much oversizing?

Oversizing recommendations are coming from the Council approved Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan, which plans for growth within the current urban boundary.

8. Where did the following projects come from? They are not in the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan:

- a. **Table 5-2 Wastewater Services, Project 1, 13 to 24**
- b. **Table 5-3 Water Services, Projects 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 16, 18, 21, 22, 31, 32, 33 to 43**

With regards to items a and b, Township staff have identified growth and non-growth-related capital requirements that are attributable to new development that fall outside of the master plans. Note that some of the projects listed in item b are identified in the Water Supply Master Plan.

9. The Traffic Master Plan (WSP, 2019) identified \$28 million of short-term capital works to be completed by 2023 (Table F-8). It appears these costs are included in the DC Study where some projects may already be completed?

Capital projects listed in the Traffic Master Plan that were not completed are included in the DC Background Study.

10. According to the Wellfield Capacity Assessment Report prepared by AECOM (December 2023), work for wells F2-R and F5-R was completed in 2022/2023.

These costs are identified in the DC Study, Table 5-3 as DC projects. Please clarify.

The planned capital works related to wells F2-R and F5-R are included in the DC Background Study. Some of the work was completed, but there is more growth-related work required.

11. Provide the justification for MURF being 100% DC funded.

The Multi-use Recreation Facility (MURF) constitutes new recreation space to address the increase in need for recreation services in the Township. The facility is not intended to replace any existing facilities as per the recent Parks and Recreation Plan.

12. Active Transportation – Do Figures 37 and 38 in the Active Transportation Plan (pg. 79/80) reflect the active transportation projects in the DC Study? Benefit to Existing assignments appear to be too low as many reference existing streets. Can more details be provided on each active transportation project?

DC projects were not differentiated in the Active Transportation Plan, as this study was completed in advance of the DC Background Study. The DC Background Study assessed active transportation project drivers and the type/location of proposed improvements to attribute growth versus benefit to existing splits. Active transportation projects on existing streets were assigned a growth component when it was determined that the active transportation facility would result in increased transportation capacity within the existing road allowance.

13. Infrastructure and Transportation costing suggests deductions funded by developers as per the Township Local Service Policy. Please clarify why these costs are not included in the DC Charges.

If the proposed Local Service Policy identifies costs that are to be a direct developer responsibility, they are shown as a reduction in the DC calculations, as these costs are not to be funded from DCs. These costs are not paid back to the developer or provided through DC credits as they are the direct responsibility of the developer.

14. Clarify the breakdown for the Operations Centre funding between DC funded vs benefit to existing.

The amount detailed in the DC study represents only the growth-related portion of the construction. The non-growth portion of this facility is being facilitated by property divestitures (post commissioning), and contributions from reserve funds.

On balance, the growth/non-growth split is expected to come in around 75/25, respectively.

15. Clarify the Persons Per Unit (PPU) assumptions? Do they include Guelph?

The medium and high-density new unit PPUs are based on the County of Wellington Census Division, which is inclusive of the City of Guelph.

16. How is post-period benefit calculated? Appendix G provides the high-level methodology, but we would like to see supporting calculations for each project.

Post-period benefit reflects the share of project costs that benefit growth outside of the forecast period. This is calculated on a case-by-case basis. If there are specific projects for which there are questions, please identify the projects accordingly.

Appendix G provides the methodology for calculating Benefit to Existing development deductions.

17. How were Benefit to Existing (BTE) ratios calculated?

Appendix G to the background study identifies the methodology for BTE deductions by service, as required in the changes to the Development Charges Act via Bill 60. If there are specific projects for which there are questions, please identify the projects accordingly.

18. Confirm the portion of HST included in project capital costs.

Answer: The non-rebatable portion of HST (1.76%) is included in project costs.

19. How were cost estimates determined for projects that were not included in a Master Plan or other publicly available documents?

Cost estimates are based on the best available data and may vary by project type. Where recent projects of a similar nature were undertaken by the Township, these costs were utilized. If there were no recent projects, costs of similar projects in neighbouring communities were utilized. In some instances, project costs may be based on recent vendor quotes. If there are specific projects for which there are questions, please indicate the projects and the Township will provide a response accordingly.

20. Is the Local Service Policy an actual policy or a guideline?

The Local Service Policy is a policy that will be followed by the Township in assessing costs that are a developer's responsibility vs. costs to be funded from DCs.

21. We urge the Township to prioritize projects that support core infrastructure, specifically roads, wastewater, and water.

The Township's Strategic Plan places a significant emphasis on the activity, health, and wellness of the community. This includes services like parks, recreation, and active transportation. Fire services are also a critical service area. As the Township grows towards 58,000 population by 2051, impacts on all services will take place. By only focusing on "core infrastructure" the Township would not be planning for growth appropriately.

22. Given the housing crisis, we welcome an opportunity to discuss with the Township an alternate timing or phased approach one market conditions improve.

As outlined in the DC Act, Affordable Housing (as defined by the Province) is exempt from DCs. Also, Township staff are proposing a DC Deferral Policy for housing that is within 20% of affordability. This is an attempt to promote more affordable housing in our community. Significant growth occurring in the Township comes at a cost. With no other mechanism being offered by the Province, funding options are limited to DCs or current taxpayers of Centre Wellington. Deferring a DC rate increase or not approving an increase passes this burden onto the taxpayer.

23. What is the rationale for project timing?

Project timing is a high-level estimate of when projects will occur based on information known today. As new information becomes available and development progresses, timing can be modified.

24. Table 5-1 – Sanitary: Project 6 and 7 – rationale for 2034 timing?

These projects were identified during the creation of the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan. Without having particular development phasing/staging information, all projects that were development driven were placed into 2034. These timings would then be adjusted as development in areas advanced.

25. Table 5-2 – Sanitary: Project 1 – rationale for 2034 timing? Funding from grants and subsidies?

These projects were identified during the creation of the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan. Without having particular development information, all projects that were development driven were placed into 2034. These timings would

then be adjusted as development in areas advanced. There has been no grant funding for this project to date.

26. Table 5-2 – Sanitary: Projects 2 & 7 – what is the rationale for the distribution of BTE, Grant/Subsidies and DC?

There is an existing urban residential area on well and septic with the catchment of the South Fergus SPS that will have the opportunity to connect to municipal services constructed for the South Fergus Secondary Plan Area.

27. Table 5-2 – Sanitary: Project 8 – Where are those Sanitary Sewer sewers on a plan? This is not clear on Figure ES-5 of RVA Master W/WW report? Why is FE3 and FE4 lumped together?

This project is identified in Figure 7-13 on page 83 of the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan. The sanitary sewers within the South Fergus lands have been combined into one project to service the areas identified as FE3 and FE4.

28. Table 5-2 – Sanitary: Project 9 – Where is the Force main on a plan? This is not clear on Figure ES-5 of RVA Master W/WW report?

This project is identified in Figure 7-13 on page 83 of the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan. The force main is proposed from the future sewage pumping station south of Second Line within area FE3 to a point in which gravity can convey to the proposed South Fergus sewage pumping station.

29. Table 5-2 – Sanitary: Projects 13, 14, 15 and 16 – New Sanitary Sewers on Barnett, Chambers, Cummings and on Guelph down to new South Fergus SPS. Why are these Growth costs? Shouldn't it be BTE as these are existing developed lands within the Urban Boundary of Fergus?

There is development and intensification potential in the Barnett, Chambers, and Cummings Crescent area. Projects 13, 14, and 15 have been revised; however, to include a BTE to reflect the benefit to the existing properties.

30. Table 5-2 – Sanitary: Projects 20 & 21 – How do those items relate to Project 8? Why are these Grant, Subsidies? And why not Project 8 as a Grant, Subsidies cost? How are they different?

These projects would tie into Project 8 and are isolated to these development areas. These projects are considered local service. Project 8 has multiple contributing developments.

31. Table 5-4 – Water: Project 2: McQueen Watermain – why is this not covered under Grants/Subsidies? No Benefit to Existing?

This watermain falls under the local service policy as it is internal to the development lands.

32. Table 5-4 – Water: Project 3 has BTE and Grants, Subsidies portions. Why does Project 4 not have similar/same allocation? Also, Projects 3 and 4 appear to ‘start’ South of Cummings Cres, but one extends to Union Street (Project 3) and the other extends to Second Line (Project 4). Is there double counting of the portion of watermain South of Cummings Cres to Union in Project 4?

There is development and intensification potential in the Barnett, Chambers, and Cummings Crescent area. Project 4 does not have this possibility.

33. Table 5-4 – Water: Project 21 – Timing is denoted as 2034, what is the trigger for watermain upgrade on Union being needed? Is it the existing South Fergus Lands, or development in FE3 coming online?

This upsizing will be completed as part of the external works associated with extending municipal services to the South Fergus Lands.

34. Table 5-4 – Water: Projects 34 – 36 -New Watermain on Barnett, Chambers, Cummings to Guelph Street. Why are these Growth costs? Shouldn’t it be BTE as these are existing developed lands within the Urban Boundary of Fergus?

The intent is that the watermains related to any new development fronting onto Barnett, Chambers, and Cummings Crescents will be either local service or local improvement. Projects 34, 35 and 36 will be moved to the “Grants, Subsidies, and Other Contributions...” category with a benefit to existing component.

35. Table 5-4 – Water: Projects 39 – 40 – How do these items relate to Projects 29 & 30? Why are these Grant, Subsidies? And why not Projects 29 & 30 as a Grant, Subsidies cost? How are they different?

These projects are internal to these development areas and fall under the local service policy.

36. Table 5-5 – Roads - Projects 16-18 – Where are New Roads 23, 26 and 28 identified on a plan?

Refer to Figure 45 in the Transportation Master Plan (2019) for clarification on the reference to internal roads in the South Fergus Secondary Plan Area.

37. Table 5-5 – Roads - Project 12 - Guelph Street (Cummings to Union) has BTE, Grants, Subsidies, and Growth portions, but Project 22 - Guelph Street (Cummings to Second Line) has ONLY BTE and Grants, Subsidies, no Growth. Why the difference in allocation for the two projects?

Project 12 includes the Housing Enabling Water Systems Fund grant received from the Province.

38. Table 5-5 – Roads - Project 22 – Guelph Street timing is 2026-2031, however the infrastructure in the road (Projects 3 & 4 on Table 5-4, Projects 7 & 16 on Table 5-2, i.e. watermain and sanitary/forcemain) timing is 2034. Why the disconnect?
The timing of the 2034 projects are dependent on the phasing/staging of development, which is currently being reviewed by the Township.

39. Table 5-5 – Roads – Projects 36 & 37 – How are these different from Project 16 & 17?

Projects 16-18 are duplicates of Projects 36 and 37. Projects 16-18 will be removed from Table 5-5. We note these are roads internal to the development and are considered local service under the LSP.

40. Table 5-5 – Roads - Project 58 – Why is timing 2032-2041? Our understanding is that MTO was completing design in 2026 and constructing in 2027.

Project 58 is the responsibility of the MTO. The timing identified in Table 5-5 is considered approximate.

41. Table 5-5 – Roads - Project 60 – Where are the Pedestrian Crossings located?

Refer to Figures 5.6 and 5.7 in the Active Transportation and Mobility Plan.

42. Table 5-5 – Roads - Project 70 – Where are \$54M (Growth portion) of active transportation projects located?

The detailed list of projects and their locations are included in Appendix I.

43. Table 5-6 – Public Works - Project 2 – Why is there no BTE for the Operations Centre \$21.7M)? Existing or New?

Please refer to the answer in question #14 above.

44. Table 5-7 – Fire - Project 1 – Why is there no BTE for New Fire Hall (\$9.3M)? Where is the location?

The new (third) fire hall is only required to accommodate growth and would not be required otherwise. The existing two stations can accommodate the existing population.

45. Table 5-8 – Parks - Projects 5 & 8 & 11– Why is there no BTE for the JECC Ice Pad (\$26.1M) or MURF (\$55.1M) or Aquatics Centre (\$9.4M)? Where are the locations?

The projects noted above are all new facilities, or expansions to facilities, that will create additional capacity for recreation programs that did not exist before; hence why they have been classified as growth projects. At this time, the JECC Ice Pad expansion is planned to be located on the existing JECC property, the MURF on the Sportsplex grounds, and the Aquatics Centre on the Sportsplex grounds.

46. Table 5-8 – Parks - Projects 34-37 – Total (~\$24M) Where are all the new playgrounds, neighbourhood parks, community parks and township wide parks located?

The playgrounds, neighbourhood parks, community parks, and township-wide parks identified in Table 5-8 are future parks and they do not have defined locations at this time. The 2025 Parks and Recreation Plan identified Township park needs to 2051, and the estimates included in Table 5-8 are representative of these requirements.

47. Overall, can the Project Lists in the Tables include the references to project identification in the Master W/WW report?

The project descriptions for the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan match the corresponding project descriptions in Tables 5-1 through 5-4.

48. Table 5-2 – Wastewater Collection - Project 22. Local Servicing for Area FE5. These lands are included in OPA126 and included in the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan (RVA June 2025). Project is to be paid 100% by developer per the DC Study but the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan shows this project being a local servicing gravity main. This Township pre-installed a 300 mm diameter sanitary sewer crossing on Garafraxa Street to facilitate the extension of the existing trunk sanitary sewer to approximately 50m away from the southwest corner of the Skeoch lands. Approximately 350m of external gravity sewer will be required within Garafraxa Street to connect to this sanitary sewer. The existing sanitary sewer system downstream of Garafraxa was oversized to provide capacity to the Skeoch lands. This leaves approximately 565 units of capacity for the Skeoch lands. Based on our calculations, this

means a 300 mm diameter size is needed to service the Skeoch lands, which should be funded by DCs as per your Local Service Policy (i.e. greater than 250 mm), not the developer. Please clarify.

Any growth components of sanitary sewers that meet the definition of a growth-related sanitary sewer as per the local service policy will be reviewed and considered by the Township.

49. Insufficient time was provided to review the DC Background Study.

The DC background study was posted on the Township's website on December 19, 2025, which provided for 60 days review time prior to Council considering the by-law on February 23, 2026. This meets the requirements of the DC Act. In addition, the public meeting is being held on February 9, 2026 to allow for additional time to review the background study prior. This provides for more than 50 days from the release of the report, where the minimum time is 14 days in the legislation.

50. The Township's Local Service Policy's treatment of Developer Initiated Urban Boundary Expansions are concerning:

- a. Infrastructure work that would otherwise meet the definition of a DC-eligible work (arterial roads, etc.) where other lands were added to the Township's urban boundary through other statutory planning processes.**
- b. The broadness of clauses such as those requiring any oversized works to also be 'local services' could create issues with landowners paying for more than works that are solely needed by their individual development and would therefore be the type of work that DCs are contemplated to be raised for.**
- c. In cases where an oversized road is required to be constructed as a local service, there does not appear to be an offsetting reduction or exemption from the Township's Roads DC.**
- d. Once a UBE is approved, there is no basis for such a distinct set of policies for one area versus another solely based on how they were approved for urban development. The Township would have ample opportunity to review or update DC background studies to incorporate any identified capital works that would otherwise meet the standard of DC eligibility.**

Through discussions with the development community and review by Township staff, the Local Service Policy has been amended to remove the Developer Initiated Urban Boundary section. With respect to studies; however, Developer Initiated

Urban Boundary expansions will necessitate updates to Township master plans and the DC background study/by-law. As such, these will be required as a local service.

51. Wastewater - Can the detailed calculations for the PPB and BTE for the Future Expansion of Fergus WPCP be shared?

The BTE deduction of 10% has been applied to the calculations to reflect an allocation due to the re-rating of the plant upon expansion. The PPB calculations are as follows:

Total Capacity of Plant – 10,500 cubic metres
Capacity required at end of forecast – 9,383 cubic metres
Amount of flow available at end of forecast – 1,117 cubic metres
Total flow from expansion – 2,500 cubic metres
PPB – 44.68% (1,117/2,500)

52. Wastewater - Can the changes to cost (an increase of 116% from 2021 DC Study) and timing (moved from 2025-2027 to 2036-2042) for the Future Expansion of the Fergus WPCP be justified or explained?

Timing for Fergus WWTP was based on projected growth to 2051 from the County of Wellington Municipal Comprehensive Review. The Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan provides the rationale and cost estimate to expand the Fergus WWTP.

53. Wastewater - Do the \$8.3 million in capital costs for the South Elora Pumping Station (project 4), New Lift Station at Elora WWTP (project 5), New SPS in South Fergus (project 6) include land acquisition costs?

Land cost is included in these project estimates. The Township will remove the land acquisition costs from these projects.

54. Wastewater - Can the basis for the new sanitary sewers on Barnett Crescent and Chambers Crescent being related to new growth be provided? Will these also service existing properties or only provide capacity for development parcel(s)?

The intent is that the sanitary sewer related to any new development fronting onto Barnett, Chambers, and Cummings Crescents will be either local service or local improvement. Projects 13, 14, and 15 will be moved to the “Grants, Subsidies, and Other Contributions” category with a benefit to existing.

55. Water - Can the amount of capacity expansion through the replacement of F2 Well be provided, to understand the 25% BTE allocation?

The permitted capacity of F2 was 409 m3/d. The new permitted capacity of F2-R is 1,641 m3/d.

56. Water - Projects 16 and 17 relate to land acquisition for the Middlebrook Well site – these costs should be moved to the Land – 2051 DC service category as they would no longer be eligible for inclusion in base DC service categories.

Thank you for noting this. We will revise through an addendum report.

57. Water - There are several watermain projects with significant cost increases, and significant variance in percentage increase from one project to the next compared to the Township's 2021 DC Study, ranging from 20% to 1341% in five years. Can the Township provide justification or supporting information (such as project sheets detailing the cost elements making up the stated capital costs) for the significant cost increases shown in the table below?

Comparison of Costs for Water Distribution Works, Centre Wellington 2021 and 2025 DC Studies

Proj#	Description	2021 DC Study	2025 DC Study	% Change
1	Irvine Watermain Extension – Bricker to SR15	\$ 798,000	\$ 910,000	14%
2	McQueen Watermain Extension -Fergus/Nichol Boundary to Guelph St	\$ 272,000	\$ 880,000	224%
4	Guelph St. Watermain Extension - South of Cummings Cres. (South Fergus SPS) to Second Line	\$ 548,000	\$ 2,660,000	385%
8	Second Line Watermain Extension - HWY 6to Guelph St	\$ 490,000	\$ 1,530,000	212%
9	Scotland Watermain Extension - ExistingLimit to Second Line	\$ 530,000	\$ 1,590,000	200%
10	HWY 6 Watermain Extension - Existing Limitto Second Line	\$ 656,000	\$ 1,430,000	118%
11	Woolwich Watermain Extension - Irvine toJames	\$ 436,000	\$ 1,620,000	272%
12	W.R.7 Watermain Extension - David St. to Woolwich	\$ 1,209,000	\$ 2,090,000	73%
13	Woolwich Watermain Extension - W.R.7 to New Well 3	\$ 1,267,000	\$ 6,510,000	414%
16	Sideroad 10(11) Watermain Extension -W.R.7 to Well Area 5	\$ 691,000	\$ 830,000	20%
17	First Line Watermain Extension - ExistingStub to ERS (East Limit)	\$ 817,000	\$ 1,040,000	27%
18	Carlton Place Watermain Replacement –Victoria to W.R.7	\$ 363,000	\$ 1,400,000	286%
19	Beatty Line Watermain Extension - Farley toSDRD 15	\$ 824,000	\$ 2,250,000	173%
20	SDRD 15 Watermain Extension - Beatty Lineto Well Area 7	\$ 145,000	\$ 2,090,000	1341%
22	Replace Existing 150mm Watermain with300mm Watermain on WR 7 from 105m north of Ross to WR21	\$ 350,000	\$ 612,000	75%
	Total - Selected Projects - Watermains	\$ 9,396,000	\$ 27,442,000	192%

Source: KR Planning Group based on Township of Centre Wellington 2021 and 2025 DC studies

Detailed project sheets, including cost estimates, are provided in Appendix 6 of the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan.

58. Services Related to a Highway - What is the basis for \$54 million in projected expenditures on Active Transportation projects? What is the nature of the \$3.633 million in “Other Deductions” for the AT projects? What is the nature of the \$16.717 million in “Other Contributions” for the AT projects?

As noted in the background study on page 5-12, the detailed list of Active Transportation Projects is provided in Appendix I. The Other Contributions relates to the share of project costs anticipated to be recovered through local services. With respect to the Other Deductions, this applies to two projects, and these costs

should have been shown in the Other Contributions column as they represent the share of costs intended to be recovered through local services.

59. Services Related to a Highway - Projects 51 to 57 and 59 have a 5% BTE allocation for intersection improvements – what is the basis for the allocation made? Are there no existing deficiencies or modernization upgrades required at these locations?

As noted in Appendix G to the DC Background Study a 5% benefit to existing deduction has been made on an allocation basis to provide recognition of a minor benefit to the existing community. The scope of the intersection improvements will be determined at detailed design, but could include signalization, turning lanes, or a roundabout.

60. Services Related to a Highway - What is the nature of the provision of \$383,100 for “Short-term improvement – Provision for Design, Approvals, Permits” – what permits and approvals are being referred to?

This project refers to engineering design required to obtain approvals, permits, and costing for external infrastructure related to development.

61. Parks & Recreation - What is included in the \$3.74 million cost for “Sportsplex Lands Grading”, and what type of land parcel is proposed to be graded?

The scope of this capital project includes grading future expansion lands adjacent to the east of the existing Sportsplex grounds to prepare them for development of new recreational facilities. Historically, the lands have been used for agriculture.

62. Parks & Recreation - Does the Township have proposed gross floor areas (GFA) for the JECC Ice Pad, New Ice Pads, MURF, Double Gymnasium, Senior Centre addition, and Aquatics Centre expansion?

Future expansion requirements for these facilities are outlined in the 2025 Parks and Recreation Plan, and in the 2025 MURF Feasibility Study.

63. Parks & Recreation - Does the Township have an existing skatepark? If not, there should be some BTE allocated to project 28 to reflect the extent to which the existing community will benefit from the capital project and have their existing deficiency addressed by the project.

The DC Act (Section 5(1)2) refers to the increase in need for service. Therefore, recreation services are contemplated overall and are not identified on a project-by-

project basis. The new skatepark helps meet the increase in need for recreation services arising from growth.

64. Parks & Recreation - The Green Houses were in the 2021 DC Study LOS inventory under Public Works facilities at a value of \$15 per square foot but are in the 2025 DC Study LOS inventory for Recreation facilities at a value of \$200 per square foot. What is the basis for the 1233% increase in value since 2021 and the rationale for the change in categorization?

This has been revised in the addendum report to reduce the replacement cost for these facilities.

65. Parks & Recreation - Why is the Weigh Scale Washroom included in the Recreation Facilities LOS inventory? Is this a Public Works facility?

The weigh scale building is a public washroom (former converted weigh scale building) that belongs in recreation facilities.

66. Parks & Recreation - Why is the “Stone House” included in the Recreation Facilities LOS inventory? What service does this facility provide for recreation programming?

The “Stone House” is a heritage farmhouse that is used exclusively for parks and recreation office and workspace.

67. Parks & Recreation - Can the increase in per linear metre costs for stone dust path trails from \$46/metre in the 2021 DC Study to \$117/metre in the 2025 DC Study be substantiated with background information, data, or studies?

Unit rates used to estimate costs to construct stone dust paths/trails were informed by background work done through the 2025 Active Transportation and Mobility Plan and the 2025 Parks and Recreation Plan.

68. Parks & Recreation - The Township’s Active Parkland and Passive Parkland each have a value of \$104,700 per acre in the LOS inventory (page B-14). Were the passive parks meant to have a lower development cost? If this is a blended average cost, can details be shared of what the average cost was for each of the Active and Passive parkland types?

The development cost is a weighted average of active and passive parkland. The cost was based on recent parkland development for the following parks:

- Farley
- Harrison

- Forfar
- Granwood
- Kirvan

69. Parks & Recreation - Can a detailed inventory of the individual parkland areas (name, address and active/passive/NOS parkland area for each) included in the Active Parkland, Passive Parkland and Natural Open Space be provided?

The locations of Township parks can be viewed online through the Township's Public Map Centre application:

<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/4a012c6df7ae41f6846fda546cbdd0f7>

70. Levels of Service - A comparison of the non-building value for each asset in the 2021 DC Study which includes land and site works, with the 2025 DC Study which only includes site works and now excludes land (consistent with the changes from Bill 60) shows that despite the removal of land, the values are increasing by 30-120% even with the inclusion of land in the older values.

- a. Can the Township share the land area and assumed land values/acre for each facility that would have been used in the 2021 DC Study and help substantiate these increases?**
- b. If land was removed from the 2021 DC Study values, this would result in increases vastly higher than 30-120%. What assumed costs/acre are assumed in the 2025 DC Study regarding site works?**
- c. Does the Township apply these cost assumptions to the entirety of the site or only the area of the site not covered by a building?**

The land values used in the 2021 DC study were \$133,000 per acre. For facilities in the 2021 DC study, the land value represented approximately \$10 per sq.ft.

Equipment costs of 5% to 10% were added to the base construction costs, depending on the service. Then an additional 5% was added for parking, site works, landscaping, etc.

The equipment, site works, parking, etc. are added as percentage assumptions to the base building construction cost. The site area is not utilized in these calculations.

71. Levels of Service - A comparison of the LOS inventory shows (see figure below) that building values have escalated significantly since the 2021 DC Study, with many assets increasing by 100-300% over a four-year span. Can the Township

provide the supporting background study where these replacement values are from? Has the Town retained a qualified cost consultant to provide the building cost estimates?

Change in Building and Non-Building Values, 2021 and 2025 DC Studies, Township of Centre Wellington

Public Works Facilities	2021 DC Study			2025 DC Study			Changes 2021-2025 DC Studies	
	Building Value	Value with LAND, Site Works, etc.		Building Value	Value with Site Works, etc. (excluding LAND)		Building Value	Value of Site Works, etc.
		Value	Land, Site Works, etc.		Value	Land		
Equipment Depot/Office	\$ 240	\$ 274	\$ 34	\$ 500	\$ 551	\$ 51	108%	50%
Sand/Salt Shed	\$ 129	\$ 152	\$ 23	\$ 224	\$ 247	\$ 23	74%	0%
Storage Shed	\$ 64	\$ 80	\$ 16	\$ 200	\$ 221	\$ 21	213%	31%
Equipment Depot/Office	\$ 180	\$ 208	\$ 28	\$ 500	\$ 551	\$ 51	178%	82%
Sand/Salt Shed	\$ 78	\$ 96	\$ 18	\$ 224	\$ 247	\$ 23	187%	28%
Public Works Office	\$ 260	\$ 296	\$ 36	\$ 500	\$ 551	\$ 51	92%	42%
Equipment Depot/Office	\$ 166	\$ 193	\$ 27	\$ 500	\$ 551	\$ 51	201%	89%
Equipment Depot/Office	\$ 142	\$ 166	\$ 24	\$ 500	\$ 551	\$ 51	252%	113%
Equipment Depot/Office	\$ 138	\$ 162	\$ 24	\$ 500	\$ 551	\$ 51	262%	113%
Storage	\$ 159	\$ 185	\$ 26	\$ 200	\$ 221	\$ 21	26%	-19%
Storage Shed	\$ 64	\$ 80	\$ 16	\$ 200	\$ 221	\$ 21	213%	31%
Fire Facilities								
Fire Hall - 250 Queen	\$ 319	\$ 378	\$ 59	\$ 620	\$ 716	\$ 96	94%	63%
Fire Hall - 72 Guelph	\$ 319	\$ 378	\$ 59	\$ 620	\$ 716	\$ 96	94%	63%
Storage Shed - 250 Queen	\$ 106	\$ 132	\$ 26	\$ 200	\$ 231	\$ 31	89%	19%
Storage Shed - 250 Queen	\$ 106	\$ 132	\$ 26	\$ 200	\$ 231	\$ 31	89%	19%
Recreation Facilities								
Centre Wellington Community Sportsplex	\$ 361	\$ 408	\$ 47	\$ 775	\$ 854	\$ 79	115%	68%
Park Washrooms & Showers at Sportsplex	\$ 237	\$ 271	\$ 34	\$ 351	\$ 387	\$ 36	49%	6%
Storage Shed	\$ 64	\$ 80	\$ 16	\$ 200	\$ 221	\$ 21	213%	31%
Stone House	\$ 191	\$ 220	\$ 29	\$ 500	\$ 551	\$ 51	162%	76%
Tennis Change Rooms	\$ 140	\$ 164	\$ 24	\$ 207	\$ 228	\$ 21	48%	-13%
Victoria Park Seniors Centre	\$ 242	\$ 276	\$ 34	\$ 700	\$ 772	\$ 72	189%	112%
Rugby Building	\$ 244	\$ 279	\$ 35	\$ 361	\$ 398	\$ 37	49%	6%
Belwood Hall	\$ 151	\$ 176	\$ 25	\$ 700	\$ 772	\$ 72	364%	188%
Elora Community Centre	\$ 235	\$ 269	\$ 34	\$ 750	\$ 827	\$ 77	219%	126%
Green House #1	\$ 15	\$ 26	\$ 11	\$ 200	\$ 221	\$ 21	1233%	91%
Green House #2	\$ 15	\$ 26	\$ 11	\$ 200	\$ 221	\$ 21	1233%	91%

Source: KR Planning Group based on Township of Centre Wellington 2021 and 2025 DC studies

The replacement values for the facilities are based on various sources of information. Where possible, recent construction or tenders for similar facilities was used to inform the replacement costs. In the absence of that information, replacement costs of recently constructed facilities in other communities were used. Where neither of the above was available, replacement costs used in other municipalities or other data sources such as the Altus Construction Cost Guide or RSMeans were used.

For example, the Equipment Depot/Office replacement cost was based recent tender amounts for the new operations centre. The sand/salt shed replacement cost was based on a review of similar facilities in other municipal DC background studies. With respect to the fire halls, the low end of range identified in the Altus Construction Cost Guide was used. With respect to recreation facilities, specifically the sportsplex, Victoria Park seniors centre, Belwood Hall, and Elora Community Centre, replacement costs were provided through the Parks and Recreation Plan.

72. Land Acquisition - The Land – 2051 DC calculations include \$3.327 million for existing debt associated with the Operations Centre land. Can additional details be provided regarding the land area acquired and how the debt breaks down between that for the facility and that for the land?

The total anticipated cost of the operations centre is currently estimated to be \$34.6M. This cost is comprised of land acquisition costs of \$4.1M and construction, equipment, tooling, and soft costs totalling \$30.5M. The \$3.327M stated in the DC study represents the residual debt servicing costs associated solely with the original land acquisition.

73. Land Acquisition - The land for the two ball diamonds (\$1.42 million) and the new tennis courts (\$640,000) appear to represent the purchase of land for parks, which is not an eligible cost under the DC Act. If so, please remove these costs from calculation of DC rates.

As defined in the Parks and Recreation Plan, these facilities are defined as recreation services. As such, land has been included in accordance with the DC Act.

74. Land Acquisition - What is meant by “Land Adjacent” to the Centre Wellington Sportsplex? If this is land used for parkland purposes, this would not be an eligible cost under the DC Act. Does this line item relate to the ‘grading’ costs in the Parks & Recreation DC?

The “Land Adjacent” to the Centre Wellington Sportsplex refers to an approximate 90-acre site located directly to the east of the existing Sportsplex grounds which is owned by the Township and planned for future expansion of outdoor recreation facilities. The lands are currently used for agriculture and are planned for future development. The line item related to “grading” costs represents a capital project to prepare these future expansion lands for development of outdoor recreation facilities.