

From: [Philip Wendland](#)
To: [Knipfel DWS](#)
Cc: [Clerks](#); [Council](#); [Natasha Salonen](#)
Subject: Re: Petersburg Drinking Water System - Jan 6th Council meeting
Date: January 6, 2025 10:38:49 AM
Attachments: [10-Year-Capital-Plan - 2023.pdf](#)
[10-Year-Capital-Plan - 2020.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open any attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning,

I did have two more questions that I wanted to highlight ahead of the council meeting tonight. I understand that a response may not be possible before this evening but I wanted to get it out there all of the same.

Roadwork/Surface Work expense

On page 95 of the agenda:

Why are Surface Works Costs included in the total to be divided amongst users? This is \$1,102,209.00.

Should this not be paid from what we pay as part of our property taxes? The road repaving work was part of previous capital plans and any ditch work, that is on township property, should be paid from the same source of funds, not billed to us directly.

Previous 10 year Wilmot Capital plans are attached and screenshots are below.

Paving work on Alice, Deerfield and Redford was:

2020 Capital Plan: \$233,835 to be done in 2024

image.png



2023 Capital Plan: \$304,070 to be done in 2026

image.png



1338 Notre Dame // Petersburg Park

Currently the park is included in the 65 properties listed as an existing user of the DWS and is, presumably, apportioned an equal part of the cost. Given that the park requires substantially more work (in terms of distance, materials, etc) on a per user basis and is owned by the Township, shouldn't it be apportioned a higher percentage of the overall cost? All of the other users are closely grouped together so apportioning equal costs makes sense for them.

Thank you once again.

Regards,
Phil Wendland

****Clerks team, feel free to record this on public record****

On Sat, Jan 4, 2025 at 1:50 PM Philip Wendland <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thank you for your quick response and highlighted points. I appreciate that our concerns are being noted.

I was at that meeting in October and have the handout but do appreciate the digital copy that you attached.

I did register as a delegate for the council meeting on January 6th.

I'll leave my other thoughts for then but will comment on two of your points below:

- Page 13-17 – Schematic level replacement plans that identified potential of additional serviced properties (the same as presented in the MTE memo within the Council report)

Yes, this is noted but my question on this was more on the low positive response rate from those currently not on the water system in terms of joining. Current users clearly have no

choice in the matter but I suspect that there will be firm pushback from non-users on being forced to join (at least in terms of paying, if not directly connecting immediately). I think this is a potentially big issue. From a cost perspective I in theory support any measures that reduce my own direct expense but this has the potential to be very divisive in the neighbourhood. My immediate neighbour has their own well, and has had one since they built the house (I believe), for example. From their perspective I don't think they'll take being forced to join laying down. Forcing non-users to join now versus allowing them to join later, and the related complication of reimbursing current users, makes sense but there needs to be more discussion on this.

- Page 17: "Further reporting will be required over the life of the 2-year design and construction organization process. Staff are looking to expand road repairs and ditching works as part of watermain construction works; however, the costs for this work are not included within the costs presented here."

This is noted but this statement is very different from what is on page 80 of the council meeting agenda:

"Scenario 1b) would transition the currently rural road cross section within the Deerfield subdivision to a semi urban road cross section (no sidewalks, but introduction of curbs and drainage features). This would include full width and depth asphalt replacement on local roads along with the installation of concrete curbs, catch basins, and storm sewers. Boulevards would also be graded to drain onto the roads."

In particular the point about curbs is a shock to most people in the neighbourhood. Our rural road cross section certainly has a nice feel and does allow cars to park partially or fully park on lawns temporarily keeping the road itself wide enough for cars to pass through easily. I'd urge seeking community feedback on this plan.

Thank you again and see you on Monday.

Have a great weekend,
Phil Wendland

Clerks team, feel free to record this on public record

On Fri, Jan 3, 2025 at 9:22 AM Knipfel DWS <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Good morning, thank you for your email. For your information, attached is a pdf copy of the presentation material from the 2nd PIC in October 2024. This material was also provided in an 8.5x11 handout package for those that attended in person. A few points:

- Page 5-12 – these pages summarize the current system assessment (the same as presented in the MTE memo within the Council report)
- Page 13-17 – Schematic level replacement plans that identified potential of additional serviced properties (the same as presented in the MTE memo within the Council report)
- Page 17: "Further reporting will be required over the life of the 2-year design and construction organization process. Staff are looking to expand road

repairs and ditching works as part of watermain construction works; however, the costs for this work are not included within the costs presented here.”

- Page 21: Next Steps include reporting back to Council on the public process and evaluation content, and continue exploring cost-savings for system upgrades to meet Ministry and Township standards. Anticipated timeline includes: • **Final Design Completion: Q3 2025** • **Construction Period: 2026 to 2027** • **Capital Billing Start: 2028** (to recover costs)

Please note: This agenda includes a report seeking direction to proceed with design of the Petersburg Drinking Water System, for replacement of the Knipfel Private System. Note that the Township’s meeting format has changed slightly, with the format of this meeting being a committee structure that makes recommendations to Council flowing out of the meeting. The Council meeting to formally approve the report will be later in January. There is an opportunity to delegate on the 6th, and speak on the agenda item, if you wish. If you have additional questions that you wish to have answered, we encourage you to reach out to project staff in advance of the meeting. Alternatively, you can register as a delegation at the Committee meeting on Monday. Delegations can register [here](#).

From: Philip Wendland <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 2, 2025 12:29 PM
To: Clerks <clerks@wilmot.ca>; Knipfel DWS <[REDACTED]>; Council <Council@Wilmot.ca>; Natasha Salonen <natasha.salonen@wilmot.ca>
Subject: Petersburg Drinking Water System - Jan 6th Council meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open any attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

This email pertains to item 9.4 on the Wilmot Township Council agenda - the Knipfel Private Drinking Water System (DWS) in Petersburg.

TL;DR: Please consider delaying the decision on how to proceed on the DWS until residents, and council, have had more time to digest the only recently received information contained in the agenda.

My family and I have lived in [REDACTED] since [REDACTED] and love it here. When we bought our house we were under no illusions that the private community well and drinking water system would eventually need to be upgraded and that we would bear some portion of the cost. So we are not entirely surprised by the process getting underway and, in many ways, welcome it.

What is surprising is in the manner in which it is being brought forward.

It is of particular surprise to us, and many of our neighbours, that the replacement of the water system is being brought forward for council to move forward on with only 6 days notice to current users of the DWS. The agenda for the council meeting was only discovered/received by a neighbour on Dec 28th. That doesn't leave us as residents with much time to digest the information or to provide feedback.

The sentiment among neighbours, and myself, is that the decision to move forward, and which of the options laid out by staff/MTE to pursue, should be delayed and not voted on during the January 6th council meeting.

It also seems a little overzealous to vote on this with so many unknowns still out there. Would staff/MTE be so eager to proceed if it was the township's money being spent, and not ours?

Some of those unknowns are:

- the EA and long term water supply strategy will only happen in 2027
- the option for road urbanization was not mentioned prior to this document and, as far as I can tell, not one resident of the neighbourhood is for it. It would drastically alter the feel of where we live.
- Option 2 is being recommended (connecting additional users) but only 15% of those surveyed were interested. How will this work?

To be clear, the system needs to be upgraded, but it seems a bit premature to make decisions if there are unknowns and not more community input.

Thank you in advance for considering my point of view.

Regards,

Phil Wendland



WILMOT STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY: This electronic transmission, including any attached document(s), may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law and is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). If the receiver of this information is not the intended recipient, or the employee/agent responsible for delivering the information to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, reading, dissemination, distribution, copying or storage of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this information in error, please notify the sender by return email and delete the electronic transmission, including all attachments from your system. If you have received this message as part of corporate or commercial communications and wish not to receive such please send a request to unsubscribe@wilmot.ca