

Responses to City Council Questions on the 2015 Proposed Utility Budget

**The following report is sorted
alphabetically by councillor.**

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor McKeen

Question #: 15-001U

Budget Page #: 7

External Services, \$13.8 million for design and construction. Are these design costs in-house for an external consultant?

Question Answer:

The \$13.8 million for Design & Construction is for external contractors and consultants.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor McKeen

Question #: 15-002U

Budget Page #: 8

EPCOR is charging more in this budget for billing. What is the increase from previous years? Is this an inflationary increase?

Question Answer:

The increase in customer billing costs for Drainage Services is \$268K over the 2014 budget. This reflects the new activity based methodology recently developed by EPCOR and the City of Edmonton Utilities to more accurately reflect the costs of providing billing services. The specific increases in the budget relate to changes in customer accounts, inflation and conservative forecasting of EPCOR's regulated customer base.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor McKeen

Question #: 15-003U

Budget Page #: 12

How much of our sewer system remains combined? Does the City have a specific goal or target date for eliminating all combined sewers? Or is this not feasible?

Question Answer:

In length 945km of combined sewers exist (close to 15% of City area). The target is to reduce the average annual number of overflow events (from 89 to 46) and increase the volume of capture to 93% from 56%. We also have a program to gradually eliminate all combined sewers over the long term as the opportunity arises. There is no set date to eliminate all combined sewers.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor McKeen

Question #: 15-004U

Budget Page #: 14

Please explain whether drainage services staff has the capacity to handle development demand with this budget allocation.

Question Answer:

The proposed budget does not include any additional FTE staff for Development support. We are pursuing Temporary staffing in order to meet peak demands. In addition we are examining our processes to identify internal improvements we can incorporate and external improvements the development industry and their consultants can address. This will enable the Branch to have the capacity to handle all of the development demand anticipated in 2015.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor McKeen

Question #: 15-005U

Budget Page #: 32

Please explain the addition of 1.5 FTE's in community relations and marketing. How are the positions justified, given the City staff and expenditures in central communications, marketing, public engagement, etc

Question Answer:

The 1 FTE for a commercial waste marketing specialist provides strategic marketing support to the sales team in Waste Management Services, who solicit commercial customers, negotiate contracts and provide ongoing customer support. This position also provides strategic marketing support for Waste Management Services to attract commercial customers to the Edmonton Waste Management Centre, as well as for the sale of compost products. This is a highly specialized marketing position that requires a unique, in-depth understanding of the waste industry, including the major waste haulers and processors in the Edmonton market. This waste industry expertise does not exist in other areas of the City.

Waste Management Services' Community Relations section delivers social marketing and education programs. While this section works very closely with Corporate Communications, the work performed is unique. The education programs deliver curriculum-based tours and classroom presentations. Social marketing identifies and reduces the barriers to behaviors such as recycling and grasscycling. The behavior change tools often include building community norms and acquiring commitments from residents, often through face-to-face interactions. Corporate Communications provides support for these education and social marketing programs, through advertising, print and video production and media relations. The .5 social marketing position performs work that is specifically focused on waste reduction.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor McKeen

Question #: 15-012U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Operating costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).

Question Answer:

We are unable to answer this question. Treatment is provided by EPCOR.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-006U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.

Question Answer:

Please note that for the data included in the table, the pipe lengths includes both sanitary and combined pipes.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Operating Costs" are defined as all applicable direct costs to provide the identified services. This excludes all overheads (e.g. depreciation, interest on long term debt, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Wastewater Main	9,570	8,973	9,328	10,417	12,375

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-007U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.

Question Answer:

Please note that for the data included in the table, the pipe lengths includes both sanitary and combined pipes.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Total Costs" are defined as all applicable direct and indirect costs to provide the identified services. This includes all applicable overheads (e.g. depreciation, interest on long term debt, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Wastewater Main	20,500	21,028	22,254	23,699	26,371

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-008U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.

Question Answer:

Please note that for the data included in the table, the pipe lengths includes both sanitary and combined pipes.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Total Costs Net of Interest on Long Term Debt" is defined as all applicable direct and indirect costs to provide the identified services excluding interest on long term debt. This includes all applicable overheads except for interest on long term debt (e.g. depreciation, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Wastewater Main	17,298	17,666	18,727	19,967	23,002

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-009U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.

Question Answer:

We are unable to answer this question. Treatment is provided by EPCOR.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-010U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.

Question Answer:

We are unable to answer this question. Treatment is provided by EPCOR.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-011U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.

Question Answer:

We are unable to answer this question. Treatment is provided by EPCOR.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-013U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).

Question Answer:

We are unable to answer this question. Treatment is provided by EPCOR.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-014U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).

Question Answer:

We are unable to answer this question. Treatment is provided by EPCOR.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-015U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.

Question Answer:

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Projected)
Blockages per 100km of mainline sewer	2.1	1.5	2.6	1.8	2.3

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-016U

Budget Page #:

*For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.
Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.*

Question Answer:

Year	Estimated CSO vol	% overflow
2010	2,212,638	2.44%
2011	2,481,196	2.67%
2012	1,371,554	1.47%
2013	3,588,349	3.75%
2014 (Projected)	2,329,183	2.40%
Average	2,396,584	2.55%
Total	11,982,920	

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-017U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system. (Broken down by Wards)

Question Answer:

Administration does not collect data on the operating costs of rural stormwater management separate from urban stormwater management. The following answers are therefore the costs of all stormwater management operations - urban and rural. Administration also does not track the information by wards.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Operating Costs" are defined as all applicable direct costs to provide the identified services. This excludes all overheads (e.g. depreciation, interest on long term debt, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Storm Water Management	2,766	3,451	3,671	5,552	3,860

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-018U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

Administration does not collect data on the total costs of rural stormwater management separate from urban stormwater management. The following answers are therefore the costs of all stormwater management operations - urban and rural.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Total Costs" are defined as all applicable direct and indirect costs to provide the identified services. This includes all applicable overheads (e.g. depreciation, interest on long term debt, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Storm Water Management	5,388	6,219	6,841	9,117	8,244

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-019U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

Administration does not collect data on the total costs net of interest on long term debt of rural stormwater management separate from urban stormwater management. The following answers are therefore the costs of all stormwater management operations - urban and rural.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Total Costs Net of Interest on Long Term Debt" is defined as all applicable direct and indirect costs to provide the identified services excluding interest on long term debt. This includes all applicable overheads except for interest on long term debt (e.g. depreciation, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Storm Water Management	4,582	5,190	5,710	7,760	6,685

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-020U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

Administration does not collect data on the operating costs of rural stormwater management separate from urban stormwater management. The following answers are therefore the costs of all stormwater management operations - urban and rural.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Operating Costs" are defined as all applicable direct costs to provide the identified services. This excludes all overheads (e.g. depreciation, interest on long term debt, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Storm Water Management	2,766	3,451	3,671	5,552	3,860

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-021U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

Administration does not collect data on the total costs of rural stormwater management separate from urban stormwater management. The following answers are therefore the costs of all stormwater management operations - urban and rural.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Total Costs" are defined as all applicable direct and indirect costs to provide the identified services. This includes all applicable overheads (e.g. depreciation, interest on long term debt, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Storm Water Management	5,388	6,219	6,841	9,117	8,244

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-022U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

Administration does not collect data on the total costs net of interest on long term debt of rural stormwater management separate from urban stormwater management. The following answers are therefore the costs of all stormwater management operations - urban and rural.

For the purposes of answering the question, "Total Costs Net of Interest on Long Term Debt" is defined as all applicable direct and indirect costs to provide the identified services excluding interest on long term debt. This includes all applicable overheads except for interest on long term debt (e.g. depreciation, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 (Forecast)
Cost per KM of Storm Water Management	4,582	5,190	5,710	7,760	6,685

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-023U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

See answer to question #15-017U.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-024U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

See answer to question #15-018U.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-025U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

See answer to question #15-019U.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-026U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

See answer to question #15-020U.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-027U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

See answer to question #15-021U.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-028U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

Question Answer:

See answer to question #15-022U.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-029U

Budget Page #:

*For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.
Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household.*

Question Answer:

Please note that the approach for answering this question is slightly different for the Utility Budget vs. similar questions in the Operating and Capital Budget for Municipal Tax Levy. This is due to the differences in how the Utilities are managed per the approved Utility Fiscal Policies.

The Utility Fiscal policies place an emphasis on maintaining consistent stable rates through balancing costs for all operating (including all applicable overheads) and capital requirements (through the managing of debt financing vs. cash needs for Pay as You Go Financing) to ensure financial sustainability.

Operating Costs

For the purposes of answering the question, "Operating Costs" are defined as all applicable direct costs to provide the identified services. This excludes all overheads (e.g. depreciation, interest on long term debt, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

Total Costs

For the purposes of answering the question, "Total Costs" are defined as all applicable direct and indirect costs to provide the identified services. This includes all applicable overheads (e.g. depreciation, interest on long term debt, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

Total Costs Net of Interest on Long Term Debt

For the purposes of answering the question, "Total Costs Net of Interest on Long Term Debt" is defined as all applicable direct and indirect costs to provide the identified services excluding interest on long term debt. This includes all applicable overheads except for interest on long term debt (e.g. depreciation, shared services, branch administration costs, etc.).

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

5 Year Trends in Collection, Disposal and Diversion Costs

Cost / House		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Collections	Operations	\$98	\$97	\$95	\$104	\$105
	Total	\$112	\$116	\$119	\$130	\$132
	Total Net of Interest	\$111	\$115	\$116	\$127	\$130
Disposal	Operations	\$27	\$28	\$30	\$34	\$38
	Total	\$42	\$44	\$46	\$49	\$53
	Total Net of Interest	\$40	\$41	\$43	\$47	\$51
Diversion	Operations	\$77	\$74	\$79	\$78	\$79
	Total	\$152	\$142	\$146	\$144	\$149
	Total Net of Interest	\$126	\$116	\$122	\$121	\$125
Total	Operations	\$202	\$199	\$204	\$216	\$222
	Total	\$306	\$302	\$311	\$323	\$334
	Total Net of Interest	\$277	\$272	\$281	\$295	\$306
Complaints	per 1,000 houses	19	24	19	20	16

Note: The complaint information is for the entire City. The current reporting structure does not accommodate separation of complaints into Wards.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-030U

Budget Page #:

*For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.
Total costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household.*

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-031U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for garbage collection per tonne or per household. (Specify)

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-032U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household.

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-033U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each..

Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household.

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-034U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for garbage disposal per tonne or per household.

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-035U

Budget Page #:

*For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.
Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household.*

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-036U

Budget Page #:

*For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.
Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household.*

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-037U

Budget Page #:

*For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.
Total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household.*

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-038U

Budget Page #:

*For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.
Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household.*

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-039U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household.

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-040U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Average total costs, net of interest on long term debt, for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household.

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Nickel

Question #: 15-041U

Budget Page #:

For these questions I would like a 5 year history on each.

Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households. (Broken down by Ward)

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-029U.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Oshry

Question #: 15-051U

Budget Page #: 7

External Services - What is the % of consulting vs. in-house? With some projects being more long-term - should we not be using in-house? If no, why not?

Question Answer:

About 50% of design work, based on budgets, is performed by in-house staff. In-house staff work on long term programs such as Drainage Neighbourhood Renewal, Drainage System Rehabilitation and tunnel projects. We use external consultants to supplement our resources during periods of high demand, and when we need their specialized knowledge.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Oshry

Question #: 15-052U

Budget Page #: 30

Fleet Services - Please explain the reclassification

Question Answer:

The Fleet Services Branch will change its business model from a municipal enterprise operation to a tax-supported / cost recovery operation beginning in January , 2015. This is to address the misalignment between the enterprise business model and the nature of Fleet's business as over 90% of branch expenditures relate to managing and servicing fleet units within the City of Edmonton.

One of the key differences between a municipal enterprise and a tax-supported branch is that enterprises are fully charged for shared service charges (corporate overhead) whereas tax supported branches are not. With the transition to a tax-supported model, Fleet Services will no longer be charged for shared services and as such will no longer include a provision for shared service recoveries in fleet charges to internal customers. As a result, the model change involves a one-time adjustment (reduction) of Fleet charges to internal customers (including the Waste and Drainage utilities).

The change in cost allocation methodology requires a one-time off-setting adjustment (increase) of shared service charges to the Drainage Services and the Waste Management Utilities. The shared service charges that were previously allocated to the Fleet enterprise are now directly allocated from the shared service providers to relevant City of Edmonton branches (including the Waste and Drainage utilities) based on estimated usage.

In the case of the utilities, Waste Management utilizes Fleet Services to a greater degree than Drainage Services, and conversely utilizes shared services to a lesser degree than Drainage Services. As a result, the adjustment involved a slight net decrease in charges to Waste Management and a slight net increase in charges to Drainage Services.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Oshry

Question #: 15-053U

Budget Page #: 31

Shared Services - Please explain the reclassification

Question Answer:

Please refer to the response to Question 15-052U

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Oshry

Question #: 15-054U

Budget Page #: 407

Addition of 1 FTE - How are the 29 staff being supervised currently?

Question Answer:

The staff at the Construction and Demolition Recycling Facility are currently supervised by foremen under the direction of a management position whose responsibilities are very broad across a number of other facilities and programs. With the growth in operations, and the complexities and variability of the Construction and Demolition Recycling operation, a dedicated management position is required.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Oshry

Question #: 15-055U

Budget Page #: 428

Why are we not waiting to see the impact of the Kennedale Eco Station before building a new one?

Question Answer:

The existing Coronation Eco Station is over capacity, and there is increasing risk of unsafe situations for customers and staff, as well as significant traffic congestion, adversely impacting the public road system and neighbouring property owners.
The proposed location of the Northwest Eco Station is geographically far enough away from the Kennedale Eco Station, that patronage numbers using the new Kennedale Eco Station would not significantly impact the North West Eco Station.
The Business case recommends construction to begin in 2019. Acquiring the property in 2015 limits the risk of cost escalation, as the Utility is unique in the City and is required to pay market rates for land held in City inventory.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Oshry

Question #: 15-056U

Budget Page #:

Coronation sees lower volumes than Strathcona. Are the services the same? Why the need for expansion?

Question Answer:

The services at Coronation and Strathcona Eco Stations are similar but the site logistics and space restrictions are different. Coronation has been recommended due to the availability of land that meets siting regulations, the location and the appropriate size to improve service levels and site safety.

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Oshry

Question #: 15-057U

Budget Page #: 534

Do you track "justification" savings to see if projected savings happen in future and include the original justification numbers and the actual in following budgets (report back to Council)?

Question Answer:

Projected operational savings or cost avoidance are incorporated in Waste Management Services proposed budgets by reducing the proposed budget rate increase.

Waste Management Services tracks the actual costs versus the budget costs for programs. In this way we can determine, on a broader level, the success of the project. As example, developing a central warehouse for spare parts at the Edmonton Waste Management Centre requires capital funding of \$1 million, and may result in as much as \$200,000 in EWMC Site operational savings and cost avoidance. The proposed budget rate increases were reduced by \$200,000.

Currently, we do not have a structure in place that directly tracks projected savings and cost avoidance specific to the projects identified in the Waste Management Facilities and Infrastructure Business Case. We will work towards establishing a structure to track the savings and cost avoidance.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Sohi

Question #: 15-050U

Budget Page #:

What do we anticipate our waste diversion percentage from landfill to be in 2015?

Question Answer:

Referring to Page 352, Key Measures, in the 2015 Utilities Budget document, Waste Management Services is targeting 60% diversion in 2015.

The many factors that influence residential waste diversion include: peak volumes related to weather, residents' waste generation patterns and the Waste Management Utility's ability to process waste as it arrives at the Edmonton Waste Management Centre.

Diversion of residential waste from landfill will increase with the introduction of the Anaerobic Digestion Facility in late 2016 and full operation of the Waste to Biofuels Facility in 2017.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Walters

Question #: 15-042U

Budget Page #:

Can you please provide the program within the drainage utility that will fund the following projects:

- Aspen Gardens Forcemain Diversion
- Aspen Garden Sanitary Relief
- Greenfield Sanitary Relief (east)
- 48/49 Avenue Sanitary Relief
- 51 Avenue Alley Sanitary Relief
- 113 A Street Sanitary Upgrade (north & south)
- Westbrook Dry Pond
- Fairview Drive Sanitary Upgrade
- Westbrook Drive Sanitary Upgrade
- Parkallen Dry Pond
- 106 Street from 29 Avenue to 34 Avenue Sanitary Sewer Upgrade
- 104 Street Sanitary Sewer Upgrade in Empire Park
- Storm and Sanitary Sewer Upgrade on 106 Street from 42 Avenue to Whitemud Drive & 42 Avenue from 106 Street to 107 Street
- Storm Sewer Upgrade on 32 Avenue west of 109 Street to 111 Street

Question Answer:

CM-31-9611 Expanded Neighbourhood Flood Mitigation Program (p. 242):

- Aspen Gardens Forcemain Diversion
- Aspen Garden Sanitary Relief
- Greenfield Sanitary Relief (east)
- 48/49 Avenue Sanitary Relief
- 51 Avenue Alley Sanitary Relief
- 113 A Street Sanitary Upgrade (north & south)
- Westbrook Dry Pond
- Fairview Drive Sanitary Upgrade
- Westbrook Drive Sanitary Upgrade
- Parkallen Dry Pond

CM-31-9511 Neighbourhood Flood Prevention Program (p. 236):

- 106 Street from 29 Avenue to 34 Avenue Sanitary Sewer Upgrade
- 104 Street Sanitary Sewer Upgrade in Empire Park
- Storm and Sanitary Sewer Upgrade on 106 Street from 42 Avenue to Whitemud Drive & 42 Avenue from 106 Street to 107 Street
- Storm Sewer Upgrade on 32 Avenue west of 109 Street to 111 Street

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Walters

Question #: 15-043U

Budget Page #:

The Evolving Infill Road Map proposes a city infill team to provide more timely approvals of development permits. Can you comment on whether this budget provides sufficient lot inspection personnel for resources to be dedicated to this infill team?

Question Answer:

Drainage lot grading personnel looks after inspection requests for both infill and new development. The one additional FTE requested in the current budget is based on existing data and the forecasted demand. Drainage Services is undertaking an internal process review to look for efficiencies and possible share of existing resources to take on the challenge. If all the existing resources are exhausted and there is still need for more FTEs, the new positions will be reflected in a future budget.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Walters

Question #: 15-044U

Budget Page #:

How much money has the City of Edmonton spent on flood mitigation projects between 2006 and 2014? How much spending is projected between 2015-2018? How much spending is projected between 2019-2024?

Question Answer:

Flood Mitigation spending from 2006 to 2014 was \$115,459,395. Proposed Flood Mitigation spending for 2015 to 2018 is \$124,125,000 (p. 18). Forecast Flood Mitigation spending for 2019 to 2024 is \$324,776,000 (p. 18).

Total Flood Mitigation Costs		
(000's)		
Year		Capital Spent
2006		3,626,101
2007		14,271,921
2008		37,295,468
2009		10,141,479
2010		11,687,514
2011		14,616,769
2012		6,709,122
2013		7,879,021
2014 (forecast)		9,232,000
Total		115,459,395
2015		29,198,000
2016		30,750,000
2017		29,222,000
2018		34,955,000
Total		124,125,000
2019		51,174,000
2020		48,508,000
2021		58,803,000
2022		64,006,000
2023		51,421,000
2024		50,863,000
Total		324,775,000

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Walters

Question #: 15-045U

Budget Page #: 242

Can you provide information on the available provincial and federal funding programs designed to assist municipalities with the increased costs associated with Flood Mitigation?

Question Answer:

Utility committee reports on April 25, 2014 (CR_1049) & September 18, 2014 (CR_1294).

Two potential funding programs (the Alberta Community Resilience Program and the National Disaster Mitigation Program) have been identified that are targeted specifically at flood mitigation measures. All other existing grant programs are also potential sources of funding for the City's non utility infrastructure. The City submitted a grant funding application to the Alberta Community Resilience Program on September 30th.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Walters

Question #: 15-046U

Budget Page #: 274

Can you please provide more detailed benefits that we hope to derive from the River for Life Program?

Question Answer:

The mission of the River for Life program is 'The prevention of pollution by continuously reducing discharges of contaminants to the environment towards a goal of net zero impact from human activity'. The strategy has a strong partnership component as well as other engagement initiatives to work towards that mission. Other City departments, EPCOR and NGOs are organizations that Administration will be working with to achieve strategy goals. Progress of the River for Life strategy is tracked, evaluated, and guided by an adaptive management process. Program and project success will also be quantified to ensure that the right kind of projects are being done in the right areas of the city. The measures currently included in the adaptive management process are;

- kg of total suspended solids discharged to the North Saskatchewan River
- kg of total phosphorus discharged to the North Saskatchewan River
- kg of total nitrogen discharged to the North Saskatchewan River
- kg of biological oxygen demand discharged to the North Saskatchewan River
- # of E.coli discharged to the North Saskatchewan River
- Unit volume of treated wet weather flows in the combined sewer system
- Dry weather treated wastewater flow discharged to the North Saskatchewan River
- Per capita dry weather treated wastewater flow discharged to the North Saskatchewan River
- Per capita water consumption
- Combined sewer overflow events per year
- Combined sewer overflow volume
- Normalized combined sewer overflow volume (cubic meters per millimeter precipitation)
- Normalized stormsewer discharge volume (cubic meters per millimeter precipitation)
- Normalized total discharge volume (cubic meters per millimeter precipitation)
- Portion of new development serviced with green infrastructure
- Area of city serviced by green infrastructure
- Tableland natural areas preserved
- City tree canopy coverage added
- Public awareness of the River for Life strategy and citizens knowledge of their personal impact on the environment
- Number of industrial orders issued annually
- Overstrength Sewer samples taken annually

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Walters

Question #: 15-047U

Budget Page #:

How much funding will be spent on drainage neighbourhood renewal in the 2015-18 Utilities Capital Budget? And is work coordinated with Neighbourhood Renewal in every neighbourhood where Neighbourhood Renewal is occurring?

Question Answer:

CM-23-9510 Drainage Neighbourhood Renewal program in 2015-2018 includes funding of \$108,670,000 for coordination with the City's neighbourhood renewal program (p. 18). Drainage coordinates with every full reconstruction neighbourhood under the Neighbourhood Renewal Program, but not the overlay and microsurfacing neighbourhoods.

Branch: Drainage Services

Asked By: Councillor Walters

Question #: 15-048U

Budget Page #: 270

How is the City's Odour Control Program working to alleviate concerns being raised by the Steinhauer and Duggan communities adjacent to 106 Street and 34th Avenue?

Question Answer:

Administration is currently working with the University of Alberta to investigate on-going odour issues throughout the sewer system. We will ensure that this location is included in the study to develop a long lasting solution to this particular odour issue along with others throughout the City. Since January 2013, we have received ten odour complaints regarding the intersection at 34th Avenue and 106th Street. As a result our crews have sealed the manhole lids to the frames with silicon and installed manhole plugs to the manholes in the area. Crews continue to inspect this location every two months to ensure the maintenance of the plugs and seals. The area is serviced by a deep trunk sewer into which the local sewers discharge. The sewage is dropped approximately 125-ft to the deep sewer through a dropstructure at the intersection of 34th Avenue/106 Street. The odour emission is likely caused by the turbulence created at the dropstructure which forces the sewer air to escape into the surrounding neighbourhood. In the meantime we will continue to monitor the effectiveness of our operational changes at this location and manage the odours within the system as best as we are able.

2015 Utility Budget Questions By Councillor

Branch: Waste Management
Services

Asked By: Councillor Walters

Question #: 15-049U

Budget Page #:

What is our plan to attract back non-residential customers lost due to the construction on the Anthony Henday near the Edmonton Waste Management Centre?

Question Answer:

Waste Management Services is currently performing market research. This research will be used to develop a multi-year marketing plan to attract commercial customers to our Edmonton Waste Management Centre, our Construction and Demolition Recycling Facility, and our Commercial Collection program.

The marketing plan will be implemented in 2015 and carry through to 2017, after completion of the North East leg of the Anthony Henry Drive construction.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss in private in greater detail, as the marketing plan develops.