

**City of Port Colborne
Meeting to Consider Addendum**

Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025
Time: 6:30 pm
Location: Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall
66 Charlotte Street, Port Colborne

Pages

4. Municipal Drain

4.2 Delegations

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|
| *a. | Christine Allen - 2591 Firelane 3 | 1 |
| | Written Delegation | |
| *b. | John McAdam - 519 Pinecrest Road | |
| *c. | Cathy Kalynuik | 3 |
| *d. | Jim Vance - 6 Northgate Dr., Hamilton | |
| *e. | Sonia Sawdon - 568 Pinecrest Road | |
| *f. | Dee Sawdon - 568 Pinecrest Road | |

From: Christine Allen [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:08:48 PM
To: Jessica Beaupre <Jessica.Beaupre@portcolborne.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Oil Mill Creek Drain Meeting to Consider May 6, 2025

Hi Jessica,

Cathy Kalynuik will be reading my delegation in my absence this evening.

1) During the last meeting to consider on September 3, 2024 there were a few references made to the last Engineering report on file as being from 1977 from both staff and council.. which would make the report 48 years old.

This is very misleading as there is an Engineers report from 2000 which is 25 years old, and is referred to as being the last report on file in the engineers report under consideration tonight. Why the repeated reference to the 1977 report?

2) Under Section 6.1.1 Admin & Engineering Costs.. page 34

The cost quoted has not been updated from the previous report and is therefore incorrect, as it does not reflect the new revised lower cost, due to the wetland in the park being eliminated from the report.

3) Why are HST charges for the Engineering Fees being charged to the assessed homeowners? I understand they have to be paid to the Engineer as per his invoice, but doesn't the City then claim the HST back from the Federal Government as a HST input credit?

4) There is a fee for GST municipal portion (5%) for \$5,527.34 is this fee not claimed back from the Federal Government as an input credit?

5) Interest cost numbers are very rounded and appear random. Also, even at 10 % per year (which is a very high interest rate), the charge is excessive in comparison to the related costs.

6) Construction Fee Interest charges of \$10,000. Why interest on construction work that hasn't even started yet?

7) The cost of the City's supply of CAD fees is too expensive. The salary of an experienced CAD designer in Canada ranges from 70K to 85k per year, this fee represents over 8 months of full time work. Is that reasonable? Are there timesheets to quantify this charge?

Why was this service not sent out for tender?

8) The report resubmitted tonight is is not a bare bones report council requested when refered back to the Engineer. Cost are still ruinous to a number of homeowners in the watershed.

If council are under pressure to have an updated Engineer Report on file, and should this report be approved,

Council should direct staff NOT to complete all the construction work listed in the report in one year, and spread it over a few years to ease the burden on homeowners.

There has been some drain maintenance done in the last few months (assuming this was done from the specs listed in the 2000 report, as per Staff, maintenance can only be completed according to last report on file). This recent maintenance has greatly improved the workings of the drain. During and after exent significant rainfall, Vimy Ridge Rd had not flooded.

Christine Allen

2591 Firelane 3



From: Cathy Ann
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2025 11:56 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Oil Mill Creek Drain Questions to Council

Member of City of Port Colborne Council

Please have these questions addressed at the May 6 2025 council meeting.

Why are the non-tangible "Eligible Administrative Costs" \$46,083.68 dollars more than the actual construction cost?

Why aren't the extraordinary costs (administrative costs that occur once such as the Engineer's fees not amortized over the life of the report??? The last Engineer's report by K Smart Ass. was produced in the year 2000, 25 years ago so is it not safe to say that this report will outlive the residency of most of the people who are being assessed and billed today.

When did the City become a for-profit entity??? Why is the City charging Prime Plus 2% on Engineering Fees for funds that have been transferred (loaned) from the General Levy Account to the Drainage Account. THE CITY OF PORT COLBORNE DID NOT BORROW FUNDS THEREFORE THERE IS NO DEBT!!!!

Why did the City have City Staff perform the CAD services rather than going to a cheaper Third Party provider?

Why did the City not require a benefit cost statement as Per the "Ontario Drainage Act" Section 7(1)?

Why are there 3 different dates listed in the Drainage Reports and in notices to members of the watershed, listing when the Engineer was appointed. - July 23, 2018, October 28 2019, and December (??) 2019?

Why was the application of the Drainage Act requirements improvement process (Section 78) of the Drainage Act not followed?

What is the definition of an "on-site" meeting?

Why does the City of Port Colborne not have to adhere to proper notification procedures? Is the City aware that most of the owners of residential lands in the watershed did not receive the "February 2, 2022 "Notice of On-site (zoom) meeting" because the notices were not properly addressed to the members? "Attn Propert Owner" is not an address.

In the K Smart Engineering Report January 2000, in the assessment explanation, the "Engineer" states on page 11 that " In Order to have an equitable assessment to the residential lands in the watershed which benefited by past drainage improvements", "require existing City roads to gain access to their properties", ... and "for the cost of preparing the updated assessment schedules each property will be

assessed a universal fee of \$100. Why is there not a universal fee for those same benefits in this February 27, 2025???

These are just a few of the questions that the ratepayers of the Oil Mill Creek Drain should have addressed.

Cathy Kalynuik