

Council

In reference to 2019 KLV Waste Water budget accounts Administration Watson Report shows 4660 residential annual base charge 354.24

1/22/2020

LSW Kingsville Sewage Gosfield South Sewage and Ruthven Sewage

4660 x 354.24	=	\$ 1,650,758.40
2019 Budgeted Amount	\$	2,036,000.00
Delta (Positive)	\$	385,242.00

Mayor claimed difference was what was collected for apartment buildings, condos, commercial, institutions, schools, greenhouses and bunk houses.

2019 Actual budget now shows \$399,741.00 deficit in accordance with the Watson report and residential rate. At this time still based on the flat rate, residential rate still has nothing to do with flow.

Amount not collected	\$	399,741.00
Missing Amount	\$	385,242.00
—	\$	784,983.00

Not only does administration show residential amount wasn't fully collected, administration shows absolutely no money collected for anything other than residential.

Where in the budget does this difference of over \$600,000.00 (approx) show? Money was collected, where is reflective in the budget?

2020 Page 40 - Line Item 02-242-066-40853

G.S. Sewage Ruthven \$ 160,000.00

Why is there such a drop shown? This figure doesn't reflect the original 400 residents that were on the sewage line. It does not reflect new development greenhouse and many bunk houses, etc.

Shows considerable increase GS Sewage 2020, big drop in Ruthven, Kingsville increase after big dip in 2019. Kingsville Water does not make sense with sewage.

In the last five years, residential sewage has been the only sewage coming forward to Council for a raise. Residential and everything over and above are separate on our fees and charges bylaw. Anything over residential is collected different, yet it remains the same. It has not come up for review or a raise in the past five years.

Council has approved future change (April) to sewage billing a possible 25 savings for some budgets and information coming forward are about accountability.

These accounts are based on residential only and not even that other funds are being diverted to cover sewage projects. Capital charges have been paid by Gosfield North and Cottam over 15 years. Specific charge and specific amount not disclosed. *Sewage Capital Charge never applied*

All information coming forward to Council and rate payers should be ~~current~~ ^{correct} and accurate.

see ATT: LAST YRS.

Joanne Wenzel

Council;

I am asking for delegate status for the April 23, 2019 meeting. I would like to discuss concerns regarding the Watson Report, (on the agenda on March 25th, 2019) and the budget numbers, relative to LSW sewage and Cottam Sewage.

Watson Report:

2018 LSW Base Charge (\$332.00) x Residential (4604) = \$1,528,528.00

2018 Budget:

2018 LSW;	G.S. Sewage	\$402,274.00
	G.S. Sewage - Ruthven	\$226,774.00
	Kingsville Sewage	<u>\$857,350.00</u>
		\$ 1,486,387.00

Delta: *Shortfall of \$42,141 reported in 2018 budget vs. Watson Report*

In Summary: Budget figures show shortfall of \$42,141 on residential amount actually collected from flat rate. This is not affected by flow rate despite mayor's implications of such in meeting on March 25, 2019. In addition there are no funds showing collected for semi-detached units, apartments, commercial buildings, schools (4), nursing homes, industrial buildings and greenhouses. Where do the mayor and administration account for these funds in the 2018 budget?

Watson Report:

2019 Forecasted LSW Base Charge (\$354.24) x Residential (4660) = \$1,650,758.40

2019 Budget:

2019 Forecasted LSW;	G.S. Sewage	\$555,000.00
	G.S. Sewage - Ruthven	\$297,000.00
	Kingsville Sewage	<u>\$1,184,000.00</u>
		\$ 2,036,000.00

Delta: *Difference of \$385,242.00.*

In Summary: How does the \$385,242.00 account for the semi-detached units, apartments, commercial buildings, schools (4), nursing homes, industrial buildings and greenhouses? Any funds collected over and above residential were said to be at a higher rate than residential, however these budgets numbers do not reflect that.

Cottam Waste Water

Watson Report:

2019 Forecasted Cottam Base Charge (\$355.32) x Residential (566) = **\$201,111.12**

2019 Budget:

2019 Forecasted Cottam; G.N. Sewage	\$213,000.00
	\$ 213,000.00

Delta: *Difference of \$11,888.88. Is this what has been collected for semi-detached, apartments, commercial / industrial and the school? Additionally do we have greenhouse waste coming into Cottam lagoon?*

In Summary:

- * 2010 Assessment based on 574 customers, which was proven incorrect on February 11, 2019 public meeting
 - * In agenda of 2012 council meeting number given was a customer base of 600
 - * Budget numbers achievable annually of 600 x annual fee
 - * No extra funds shown after school came into system
 - * No change to budget after homes built on Fox Street
 - * Sewage has been extended to Belle River south area, approximately 18 homes built
- Budget does not reflect any of these additional homes added.*

In Closing:

Since 2008 there has been \$13,000,000 collected for the Cottam project through the Cottam budget and assessment.

With that being considered, I do not believe that Cottam rate payers should still have to incur the million dollar debt.

There needs to be accountability to complete projects within budget and a limit on over charges for any project.

Inaccurate information on the budget, specifically sewage, needs to be addressed.

Is it the Mayor's and administration's intent to have residential pay for all expenses related to sewage?

Or should I ask how many years this has already been going on?